United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jude 25: *To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever.*

O Thou eternal God, source of light and of love, in this moment of prayer may we experience the fellowship and blessings of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We humbly acknowledge that in seeking the right answer to our many perplexing problems we are becoming increasingly aware of our own failings and limitations and that we need Thy guidance.

Grant that we may understand more clearly that our own spiritual life, in its simplest motive and highest manifestations would be a life of sanctity and of service.

May the social order, which we are longing and laboring to establish upon the earth, have in it the spirit of reverence for Thee, of good will toward all mankind, and mutual trust and helpfulness.

We offer our prayer in the name of Him who is our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 10, 1966, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with amendments to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 9. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 10, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate in due form of law showing the election of WALTER B. JONES as a Representative-elect to the 89th Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of North Carolina, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Herbert C. Bonner, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. JONES of North Carolina appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY THE HONORABLE DON FUQUA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, due to important business in my district, it was necessary for me to be absent for the following rollcalls: Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall No. 11, the peacetime veterans benefits bill, and "yea" for rollcall No. 13, the Bank Merger Act amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Speaker, there is no further legislative business for this week. There are some messages to be read.

Monday is District day. There are no District bills, and no legislative business.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

For Wednesday and the remainder of the week—and I am not able to advise Members yet whether the bill will come up on Wednesday or Thursday—the only bill we can now announce is S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, on the assumption that the Rules Committee meets, S. 1666 will be scheduled Wednesday or Thursday of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if he has any additional information concerning the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966?

Mr. ALBERT. I have just been advised by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. Speaker, that they will not be able to obtain a rule on that bill early enough to bring it up next week, so that it probably will be brought up the following week.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the so-called post-Korea GI bill has just passed in the other body by a vote of 99 to nothing, with a very minor amendment, which actually changes nothing.

All of the amendments are technical in nature except one.

In accepting this one amendment I would like to point out that under the World War II and Korea education and training programs, veterans did obtain high school training. Many thousands attended accelerated or specialized education courses offered by public schools for the purpose of completing their high school education. I expect this practice will continue under the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. Some problems were encountered in the World War II program by a few individuals attempting to enroll and attend classes with youngsters. By concurring in this amendment I do not wish it to be inferred that I expect that practice to be tolerated. Practically all veterans, I am sure, who need high school education will obtain it in classes specially designed for adults. In those rare instances where it is necessary for the veteran to attend regular high school classes, I certainly expect the Administrator to handle these applications very carefully and grant his approval in such a manner as to preclude abuse of and to eliminate local administrative problems.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, with Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 11, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive.

Page 11, line 13, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "'(e)" and insert "'(d)".

Page 16, line 3, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "veterans'" and insert "veteran's".

Page 22, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21, and insert:

"(7) striking out in the first sentence of section 1772(a) the phrase 'under subchapter V of this chapter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'under subchapter V of chapter 35 of this title', and striking out the phrase 'this chapter' the first two times it appears in the first sentence of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in the second, third, and fourth sentences of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in section 1772(b) and in sections 1773 and 1774, and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 34 and 35'."

Page 31, line 17, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "programs of" and insert "program or".

Page 32, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 9 and 10 and insert:

"(m) Section 1734 of such title 38 is amended by (1) striking out '33' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '34', and (2) striking out '1634' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '1684'."

Page 38, line 5, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(b)" and insert "(2)".

Page 38, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 18 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"(c) (1) Section 2001 of title 38, United States Code, clauses (3) and (5) of section 2002 of such title, and sections 2003 and 2004 of such title are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears therein.

"(2) The first sentence of section 2002 of such title 38 is amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veteran of any war'.

"(3) Clauses (1) and (4) of section 2002 of such title 38 are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955,' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears in such clauses."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON N. PETCHERS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when Solomon N. Petchers died recently, New York lost more than a philanthropist and businessman: it lost a fighter for civil liberties. The newspaper obituaries reported that he gave away almost a million dollars during his lifetime. But his greatest investments were in Jewish charities, in the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, and in the library for the blind in Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to count Solomon Petchers as a friend and constituent. His abiding sense of justice and his concern for humanity motivated him to play a leading role in our community. He will be greatly missed by all those who were associated with him in his many endeavors.

I knew Solomon Petchers best as the national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress. He was always at the forefront of that organization's many battles for human dignity. His own career, from Turkish immigrant to New York realtor and philanthropist, embodied what is best in mankind.

I want to take this occasion to express my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Petchers, their son Jesse, and all the other members of his family.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times and New York World Telegram and Sun paid tribute to Solomon N. Petchers in full obituaries. I wish to include them at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1966]

S. N. PETCHERS, 65, DONATED MILLION—PHILANTHROPIST DIES, MADE FORTUNE IN REAL ESTATE

Solomon N. Petchers, real estate investor, manager, developer, and broker and a philanthropist who, his associates say, had given away about $1 million, died Thursday at the Lenox Hill Hospital. He was 65 years old and lived at 200 Central Park South, with an office at 33 Riverside Drive.

Mr. Petchers, a short, heavy-set, energetic and quiet man, started in real estate in 1921, the year he came here as a poor immigrant from his native Turkey. He had been graduated from the Alliance Francaise in Istanbul and spoke English, French, Turkish, Hebrew, Yiddish, and Russian.

From his small beginnings, he rose to become sole owner and part owner, through corporations he headed and partnerships, of many business buildings and apartment houses, mostly in Manhattan, the Bronx, and Queens. Others were in Westchester County, Camden, N.J., and Inglewood, Calif.

As a youth, he worked in a real estate office during the day and taught Hebrew at night in a Jewish religious school until he began to branch out for himself with great success.

Mr. Petchers had been a crack chess player from the age of 7 until a few years ago.

He had been national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress and was a director and an associate chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York. In 1961, he received its distinguished service award.

He was a vice president and a director of the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, the Bronx, and had been a founder and president and honorary president of its men's club. He was also a vice chairman of the home's foundation fund.

Mr. Petchers was the founder and president of the Central Library for the Blind in Jerusalem. He was also active in the development of port facilities in Ashdod, Israel, and of housing facilities for immigrants in that country.

He was a founder of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, a director of the American Association for Jewish Education and a member of the Town Club of the City of New York and the Real Estate Board of New York.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Frances Sack Petchers; a son, Jesse N. Petchers of Manhattan; six brothers, Isaac N., of Los Angeles, Hyman, of Freehold, N.J., Louis, of Bayside, Queens, Benjamin, of New Rochelle, N.Y., and John Joseph, of Manhattan; four sisters, Mrs. Ruth Bukantz, Mrs. Shirley Rosen, Mrs. Mollie Hascoe, of Scarsdale, N.Y., and Mrs. Dora Kossoy, of Manhattan, and a granddaughter.

A funeral service will be held at noon tomorrow at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

[From the New York World Telegram and Sun, Jan. 29, 1966]

S. N. PETCHERS RITES SET; PHILANTHROPIST GAVE $1 MILLION

Services for Solomon N. Petchers, 65, president of S. N. Realty Investments and a prominent philanthropist who gave away $1 million, will be held tomorrow at noon at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, West 76th Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

Mr. Petchers, of 200 Central Park South, died Thursday of cancer in Lenox Hill Hospital.

A native of Turkey, Mr. Petchers came here in 1921. He worked in a real estate office during the day and taught Hebrew at a Jewish school at night.

Mr. Petchers rose to head a number of corporations in the city which controlled several business buildings and apartment houses.

An active leader in charitable and philanthropic organizations, Mr. Petchers served as national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress and as a director and associate chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York. In 1961 he received the UJA's distinguished service award.

Mr. Petchers was a founder of the Albert Einstein Medical College at Yeshiva University and was a founder and president of the Central Library for the Blind in Jerusalem.

He was also a vice president and a director of the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, Bronx, and a founder of its men's club. He was a member of the American Association for Jewish Education, the Town Club of the City of New York and the real estate board of New York.

Mr. Petchers is survived by his widow, Frances; a son, Jesse, six brothers and four sisters.

MEDICARE DISCLAIMER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, has advised me that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will recommend the repeal of those provisions in the medicare bill by virtue of which the Department has required the filing of disclaimer statements by persons who are not eligible for cash benefits under the social security program or the railroad retirement program.

In a letter to me yesterday, Mr. Ball stated that the Department believes "this exclusion is undesirable." He went on to say that the Department would recommend to the Congress that the provisions be repealed.

On January 10, when this session of Congress opened, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11922, to strike out these disqualifying provisions.

I urge that the House move expeditiously and pass this bill so that some 2 million elderly Americans, who might otherwise be denied much needed hospital benefits, may meet the March 31 deadline for applying for inclusion in the medicare program.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Mr. Ball and the Social Security Administration that the medicare law specifically requires applicants to sign a disclaimer.

This requirement is based on an administrative decision and is not mandated by law. However, I certainly hope that the Congress will repeal the provisions on which the requirement is based so that this inequity can be corrected.

TAYLOR CAN HELP MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, since there has been some criticism of my good friend and fellow townsman, Mr. Tony Taylor, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., I would like to call your attention to this editorial in the Santa Fe New Mexican, Santa Fe, N. Mex., which appeared January 28, 1966. I think it is most appropriate and certainly echoes my feelings:

TAYLOR CAN HELP MIDDLE EAST

It is widely recognized that Government service often is a losing proposition for successful business and industry leaders—whether it be for a Democratic or Republican regime. This holds true for many high officials, Members of Congress, and part-time consultants.

Such is the case of Tony Taylor, successful Santa Fe importer, who has drawn criticism from a couple of Republican Members of Congress in conjunction with a current trip to the Middle East to promote native handicrafts.

The criticism resulted from Taylor's fortune in being the brother of the First Lady, Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson. Is this relationship a valid reason to ignore Taylor's vast knowledge of handicraft importing? We think not.

Taylor has operated the Old Mexico Shop in Santa Fe for decades and is nationally recognized as a leading authority on selling of handicrafts and folk art from south of the border and across the seas. There is no doubt that his vast experience can be highly helpful to the handicraft industry of Jordan and other Middle East countries.

As for those Middle East nations, most are in serious trouble because of unfavorable balance of trade. Successful promotion of handicrafts could go a long way toward solving the trade deficits of these nations. Taylor's consultant payments of $75 daily for the 3-week junket is a mere drop in the bucket if he can whip ease this deficit balance of trade.

Meanwhile, Taylor is paying his wife's expenses with personal funds while losing valuable time from his own business.

Would those tossing criticism send a lesser man—little versed in imports—to tackle the mountainous job? Would the critical Congressman and Congresswoman deny that each cannot break even in their own governmental service or that they could make more money in private business?

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This bill would restore the labor provisions of the immigration laws to the status which existed prior to December 1, 1965.

Today every alien immigrant other than one coming here in a relative status must secure a certificate from the Secretary of Labor attesting that there are insufficient workers available to perform the type of work he is engaged in and that his entry will not affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed. These provisions apply to aliens coming here from Canada, England, Europe, Asia, Central and South America—from anywhere in the world. Today, we permit 170,000 immigrants to enter the United States from all countries of the world other than Western Hemisphere countries which have no quota limitations.

The procedure set forth in the present immigration laws have bogged down our Labor Department and our Secretary of Labor with thousands of applications for certifications and have so multiplied the paperwork of labor agencies throughout the country that a Frankenstein of impracticalities has been established. Applications are required to be processed through local, city, State, regional, and national offices. The time lag in processing these applications strains the patience and endurance of employers. The employment offices throughout the country are cluttered with alien forms which take them 6 months to a year to process. Instead of devoting themselves to actual employment of persons needing jobs, these agencies are weighted down with forms and procedures which may never result in bringing jobs and applicants together.

Nothing was the matter with the old law where by blanket negative certifications, alien workers were kept out if their entry would adversely affect working conditions in the United States. The new legislation has pyramided procedures, application forms, and the work of Government employees without accomplishing any benefits to our immigration or labor practices. Instead of improving our immigration policies, the new law has stultified and degraded them. Instead of giving us an efficient, practical, and rational process, we have incorporated into the administration of the law

a dilatory, aggravating, paper pushing, and frustrating procedure.

It is necessary to return the labor provisions of our immigration laws to reason, to practicality, and to efficiency. The procedure of the immigration laws prior to December 1, 1965, was far more practical and efficient than under the present law. My amendment therefore seeks to reinstate the procedure of the laws previously in force.

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTBACKS IN SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed budget calls for cutbacks in Public Law 874 and the National School Lunch Act and the companion program, the special milk program.

This is one of the best programs our Government has. One could say it is among the oldest of the antipoverty programs, because it aids in providing food to students of poor families throughout the Nation. And its long-range benefits are incalculable, for it aids in establishing better nutritional habits of millions of American schoolchildren.

In the Memphis school system, last year 11 million hot meals were served at a cost of 25 cents to the child. Without the assistance of the National School Lunch Act, prices would have to be raised to the point that thousands of children now buying their lunches could not afford them.

In addition to the lunch program, approximately a million free lunches are provided to Memphis children whose parents cannot afford this quarter a day charge. Any cutback in the availability of national school lunch funds would seriously reduce the number of lunches provided without charge to deserving children.

This same general argument also holds true regarding 12 million half pints of milk served each year in the Memphis city schools.

I realize that the President's message on these programs has not yet been received by the Congress. Our committees are still holding hearings on this general subject.

But I would hope that my colleagues would join in letting their opinions be known concerning any plan to cut back these programs.

REVISING AMERICAN MILITARY COMMITMENT IN EUROPE

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which would declare the sense of the House that the President should undertake revisions of the American military commitment in Europe to enable us to withdraw such troops as may be withdrawn without jeopardizing American security.

Last week, I introduced legislation to close American ports to ships trading with North Vietnam. This week, I announced that I would seek to amend this year's foreign aid legislation to make economic aid to South Vietnam payable in scrip usable only in the United States. This would keep the AID dollars from flowing into the black market and winding up bankrolling international Vietcong intrigue.

Today, my resolution would have the effect of freeing more troops for service on the home front and southeast Asia. It would also greatly aid our balance-of-payments problem. All these measures, in my opinion, reflect measures this administration should be taking to declare its real commitment to the southeast Asian war effort.

I am not urging escalation or deescalation. I am proposing measures which show that we mean business in southeast Asia. We would show friend and foe alike that we intend to roll up our shirtsleeves.

The resolution I introduced today speaks first of the strain on our military capability of protecting Europe while we fight an ever-more-difficult war in southeast Asia. Our European commitment clearly interferes with the strength we can bring to bear on Vietnam.

I would also hasten to point out that our European military commitment is very costly. The billions we are spending in Europe could be trimmed to bring our budget closer to balance, and help head off the need for a tax increase.

Not only is our commitment costly in budget terms, but it is costly in balance-of-payments terms. The administration has talked of success in dealing with our balance-of-payments problems. They have had about as much success in this respect as they have had in Vietnam. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have seen a mounting credibility gap with reference to the severity of our Nation's balance-of-payments problem.

Last year—in the middle of the administration's much-heralded war on balance-of-payments difficulties—this country lost $1.6 billion in gold. This was the biggest loss of gold since 1960. I would like to tell the Members of this House which countries take this gold. It is the Spanish and the French, and indirectly, the Germans. We have almost 300,000 troops stationed in these three countries, and the dollars paid to support these troops constitute a high proportion of the dollars traded in for U.S. gold.

There is nothing like gratitude. France, Germany, and Spain, directly or indirectly, have bilked us of $5 billion worth of gold since 1960.

Our military presence in Europe is a great boon to our allies and a great burden for the United States. This year, our commitment is helping to unbalance our budget. It keeps our taxes high and holds out the promise of even higher taxes. But what does it do for Europe? It keeps European taxes low. It eases the strain on European budgets through minimizing defense expenditures. The European nations, in effect, subsidize their industries through the lower tax rates made possible by American provision of military defense that Europe should be paying for.

The reduced European taxes subsidize European industry, making European exports more competitive with American exports. This hurts our trade situation. We are kicking ourselves indirectly, as well as directly.

I believe that the long-range impact on our balance of payments is best where we reduce Government spending overseas rather than private investment. Private investment reduction backfires.

Another reason for reduction in the United States troop commitment to Europe is the fact that some of our NATO allies are trading with North Vietnam. The British are even supplying North Vietnam with oil. How can we expect diplomats to take our war effort seriously while we tolerate a heavy strain in keeping up the military protection of those who trade with our enemies? No one is convinced by "Uncle Sucker."

I advocate substantial troop withdrawal from Europe for another reason. If we shift some troops from Europe to Vietnam, we can meet increased military needs in Vietnam without further resort to the draft of college students and other young Americans in unusual number. There are 330,000 American military personnel in Europe. There is no reason to keep this number of personnel in Europe—and now the Vietnam war underscores that point. As long as we are keeping troops in Europe that could better be used on behalf of American interests in Vietnam, we are making our boys face a military draft so that America can protect Europe while Europe's youth escape the service Europe might otherwise require of them. I do not want American students drafted so that we might fight in Vietnam and protect Europe. I do not want American students in rice paddies while American soldiers keep Europe's young people free for wine, women, and song. Perhaps the threat of troop withdrawal would make Europe take our Vietnamese effort more seriously.

I would like to make very clear my feeling that some of our American troops are there for Europe's benefit and not ours. I know that the Defense Department was considering some troop reduction last fall. Why not now? The need is great. I do not urge the removal of any troops in Europe who are clearly protecting our interests. Let us withdraw those who are protecting European and not American interests. Retired General Gavin said just this Wednesday that "our commitments in Europe are far in excess of our needs."

What exactly is wrong with Europe protecting Europe? Our strategies which say otherwise are based on postwar military psychologies which have ceased to be realistic now that the great

Communist threat is China—at least for the moment.

I urge the House to pass this resolution and express its opinion to the President that our military commitment in Europe ought to be revised to enable withdrawal of American troops consonant with U.S. security.

THE SO-CALLED COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the agreement on the so-called cold war GI bill. This is a tribute to one of the most able and beloved Members of the House of Representatives, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I am privileged to serve, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who has worked so painstakingly and diligently on this matter for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a tribute to another distinguished lawmaker from the great State of Texas, the senior Senator from that State, the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, who has done so much on this subject and guided the legislation so commendably through the other body.

SLASH IN IMPACT AID FUNDS MEANS MORE FEDERAL CONTROL ON SCHOOLS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn today that if the administration's plan to cut the Federal impact aid to education program is enacted that two-thirds of the fund now available to public schools in Duval County, Fla., under this program will be missing from the school budget in 1966–67.

In his budget message, President Johnson proposed to reduce the impact aid to education program from $400 to $200 million. This would mean to an area like Duval County, which has some 13,000 federally attached children in public schools and another 12,000 whose parents work on Federal installations in the county, that the entitlement under Public Law 874, enacted in 1951, would drop from $1.8 million in fiscal year 1967 to $425,000.

I have long been a supporter of the impact aid program, having been one of the original sponsors of this legislation when it was introduced in 1950. The public school system of my area asked for this program; they felt it was fair to the local community and that it was needed in order to take care of the federally attached children in the county. The uncertainty of the permanent residence of federally attached families and the vast land occupied by Federal installations causes important tax problems. In the first instance, with the temporary status of such families there is no normal tax base, and in the second instance, federally occupied and owned property is not taxable.

The local people of Duval County are solidly behind the Federal impact aid program. There are three major reasons:

First. The program is a logical one to have the Federal Government assist when it brings in the children for the county to educate while at the same time reduces the local real estate tax base.

Second. The community needs the money in order to provide adequate education for the children.

Third. The plan is not subjected to unwarranted controls from Washington.

In place of the Federal impact aid program the administration is directing its energies to another Federal aid to education program, but this one is controlled from Washington, and the local school system must fall into line in order to receive Federal aid so vitally needed across the country for public school education.

Under the new poverty-type program the school systems must think up projects and ways to spend the taxpayers' funds now available to them under the new law, and then these programs must be acted upon by Washington and they must be approved, bringing more and more Federal control over education. The end result is more Federal controls and less real assistance in the schools on an overall basis. The approved plans may in fact have little to do with lifting the overall educational facilities of the area even though more Federal dollars are spent.

This is distressing to me, and I plan to do everything in my power to retain the present impact aid to education program, which is not controlled money, to be spent in a way that the Federal Government directs. The impact aid program meets a local need caused by the presence of thousands of federally attached children, where the Federal Government has reduced the tax base available to local taxes.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on this subject:

[From the Sentinel, Orlando (Fla.) Feb. 2, 1966]

IMPACT FUNDS MUST BE FORTHCOMING

The Budget Bureau proposes to allocate only $183 million during fiscal 1967 to schools in communities with Government installations with large numbers of Federal workers or military personnel.

The Office of Education estimates that the need is for $416 million in these impact funds. In central Florida, such areas as Brevard, Orange, and Seminole Counties are affected because of the Federal installations and military bases.

If Congress should slash impact funds in half, the school year might have to be shortened, particularly in a heavy impact area such as Brevard. Teacher pay might have to be reduced.

It is true that Vietnam war expense impels certain budget reductions, but in our opulent society we are not yet reduced to paying for the war out of the schoolrooms of America.

Our Florida delegation in Washington can do a great deal to see that the cut in impact funds is restored to guarantee the children of our fighting men the kind of education they deserve.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1966: Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York; and Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1966: Hon. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; Hon. FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; and Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, 1966, REORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS IN AREA OF CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 379)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of community relations functions in the area of civil rights.

After a careful review of the activities of the Federal agencies involved in the field of civil rights, it became clear that the elimination of duplication and undesirable overlap required the consolidation of certain functions.

As a first step, I issued Executive Orders No. 11246 and No. 11247 on September 24, 1965.

Executive Order No. 11246 simplified and clarified executive branch assignments of responsibility for enforcing civil rights policies, and placed responsibility for the Government-wide coordination of the enforcement activities of executive agencies in the Secretary of Labor with respect to employment by Federal contractors, and in the Civil Service Commission with respect to employment by Federal agencies.

Executive Order No. 11247 directed the Attorney General to assist Federal agencies in coordinating their enforcement activities with respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs.

As a further step for strengthening the operation and coordination of our civil rights programs, I now recommend transfer of the functions of the Community Relations Service, established in the Department of Commerce under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to the Attorney General and transfer of the Service, including the office of Director, to the Department of Justice.

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress on the assumption that a primary need would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. That decision was appropriate on the basis of information available at that time. The need for conciliation in this area has not been as great as anticipated because of the voluntary progress that has been made by businessmen and business organizations.

To be effective, assistance to communities in the identification and conciliation of disputes should be closely and tightly coordinated. Thus, in any particular situation that arises within a community, representatives of Federal agencies whose programs are involved should coordinate their efforts through a single agency. In recent years, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has played such a coordinating role in many situations, and has done so with great effectiveness.

Placing the Community Relations Service within the Justice Department will enhance the ability of the Justice Department to mediate and conciliate and will insure that the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist.

In this, as in other areas of Federal operations, we will move more surely and rapidly toward our objectives if we improve Federal organization and the arrangements for interagency coordination. The accompanying reorganization plan has that purpose.

The present distribution of Federal civil rights responsibilities clearly indicates that the activities of the Community Relations Service will fit most appropriately in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters and deep and broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes. Congress has assigned it a major role in the implementation of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Department of Justice performs related functions under other acts of Congress. Most of these responsibilities require not only litigation, but also efforts at persuasion, negotiation, and explanation, especially with local governments and law enforcement authorities. In addition, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act the Department will be supporting local programs in the area of police-community relations.

The test of the effectiveness of an enforcement agency is not how many legal actions are initiated and won, but whether there is compliance with the law. Thus, every such agency necessarily engages in extensive efforts to obtain compliance with the law and the avoidance of disputes. In fact, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires each agency concerned to attempt to obtain compliance by voluntary means before taking further action.

Among the heads of Cabinet departments the President looks principally to the Attorney General for advice and judgment on civil rights issues. The latter is expected to be familiar with civil rights problems in all parts of the Nation and to make recommendations for executive and legislative action.

The Attorney General already has responsibility with respect to a major portion of Federal conciliation efforts in the civil rights field. Under Executive Order No. 11247, he coordinates the governmentwide enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relies heavily on the achievement of compliance through persuasion and negotiation.

In the light of these facts, the accompanying reorganization plan would transfer the functions of the Community Relations Service and of its Director to the Attorney General. In so providing, the plan, of course, follows the established pattern of Federal organization by vesting all the transferred powers in the head of the Department. The Attorney General will provide for the organization of the Community Relations Service as a separate unit within the Department of Justice.

The functions transferred by the reorganization plan would be carried out with full regard for the provisions of section 1003 of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relating to (1) cooperation with appropriate State or local, public, or private agencies; (2) the confidentiality of information acquired with the understanding that it would be so held; and (3) the limitation on the performance of investigative or prosecutive functions by personnel of the Service.

This transfer will benefit both the Department of Justice and the Community Relations Service in the fulfillment of their existing functions.

The Attorney General will benefit in his role as the President's adviser by obtaining an opportunity to anticipate and meet problems before the need for legal action arises.

The Community Relations Service, brought into closer relationship with the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, will gain by becoming a primary resource in a coordinated effort in civil rights under the leadership of the Attorney General. The Community Relations Service will have direct access to the extensive information, experience, staff, and facilities within the Department and in other Federal agencies.

Finally, the responsibility for coordinating major Government activities under the Civil Rights Act aimed at voluntary and peaceful resolution of discriminatory practices will be centered in one Department. Thus, the reorganization will permit the most efficient and effective utilization of resources in this field. Together the Service and the Department will have a larger capacity for accomplishment than they do apart.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will permit a fuller and more effective utilization of manpower and will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the history of law enforcement in this Nation emphasizes the importance of what has been called a climate of compliance. When Americans have been in ignorance of the law, or in strong opposition to it, we have frequently faced long and difficult periods of social tension. Under such circumstances, we have often quarreled and dissipated our national strength, and weakened the quality of life in a Nation based on a system of equal justice before the law.

The Justice Department, as the chief instrument for law enforcement in the United States, has long recognized the need for citizen support of the legal process. It has also had considerable experience with conciliation as a means of eliminating long and costly litigation.

This has been particularly true of recent activities in the civil rights arena. Here, the emotionally charged atmosphere has sometimes made it difficult to secure either justice or the best interests of the community. The solution to that problem is a program for community education and communication which can reduce the need for governmental actions of a punitive nature.

The Community Relations Service was created for the purpose of carrying out such a function. It has an intimate relationship to the Justice Department's own responsibility for assuring the civil rights of all American citizens. There is a natural link between the two efforts. A Community Relations Service within the Justice Department can anticipate conflict. It can work to prevent the escalation of conflict. Located within the Department of Justice, it can recommend alternative solutions for the wide range of problems which come to the Attorney General. And it can give the Attorney General competent professional assistance in implementing any such recommendations.

It is also worth noting that there is nothing unusual about conciliation or mediation functions being housed within the agency which also has the enforcement responsibilities. For example, more than 20 of the 28 States which have established civil rights agencies house both the conciliation and the enforcement responsibility within the same agency. This is also true with respect to more than 30 city agencies across the country.

The Justice Department, with its specific charge to coordinate title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is in particular need of a resource such as the Community Relations Service to bring about community understanding and commitment to the principle of equality guaranteed by the civil rights law. The Community Relations Service, which has the skills to accomplish this, merits the opportunity to use them within that Department of Government most vitally concerned and involved in achieving this goal.

For all these reasons, I urge support of the President's reorganization plan transferring the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there is a serious need for reorganizing the structure and functions of civil rights efforts within the executive branch of the Federal Government. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 is in line with that need. This proposes transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice.

There is need to deal with all aspects of civil rights problems as the interlocking unity they are—both in elimination of basic causes of civil rights strife and in enforcement and implementation of civil rights orders, laws, and judicial decisions. By Executive order, the Attorney General now has some responsibility for coordinating civil rights activities within the executive branch. He is also the President's principal adviser in civil rights matters. The Community Relations Service, because of its experience and knowledge of the problems of the whole community, can render invaluable service to the Attorney General by constantly keeping before him the interlocking nature of these problems.

There is also a need for the Attorney General to have additional resources at his command, with a broader range of alternative actions, in civil rights matters. Community disputes, disagreements, and difficulties arising from discrimination and local tradition are not always covered by Federal law but are nevertheless disruptive of racial harmony and retard compliance with the law. The Community Relations Service can furnish the Attorney General with just such an alternative action.

For these reasons, I support President Johnson's reorganization plan. It makes sense and I urge that we give it our approval.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 to the Congress, proposing to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. I wish to speak briefly in support of that measure.

I have followed the work of the Community Relations Service from its first days in 1964, both in its activities in the South and in the larger urban centers of the North. In this brief period, the Service has demonstrated its value in encouraging communities to move voluntarily toward compliance with the law. The transfer to the Department of Justice will serve to enhance this value.

Since the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, there has been a need for coordination of the various governmental activities in the field of civil rights. The President acted to meet this need last fall by assigning to the Attorney General the responsibility of supervising enforcement by all Federal agencies of title VI of the act. The Attorney General already had a major responsibility in the civil rights area as the officer charged with enforcement of civil rights legislation through litigation in the courts. Now, by making Community Relations Service a part of Justice, we will further advance the coordination of the Federal involvement in civil rights.

Some have questioned whether the move observes the desire of Congress to separate the conciliation function from the prosecutive activities of the Department of Justice. This separation, however, is not destroyed by the transfer. The Community Relations Service will not, under the plan, become a subordinate part of the Civil Rights Division of the Department, which is engaged in enforcement litigation.

The Service will be a separate internal unit, coordinate to the Civil Rights Division, with both units reporting directly to the Attorney General or his deputy. The prohibition in the act against participation of CRS personnel in litigation against violators will still be applicable, insuring, as Congress intended, that CRS personnel will not aid in the prosecution of a case in which they have previously been active for the Service.

This I am convinced, that the plan will increase the effectiveness of the Community Relations Service and of the Federal Government in dealing with the Nation's major domestic problem. I urge that the Congress permit it to become effective.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE—WORLDWIDE COOPERATION TO SUPPLY MANKIND WITH FOOD, CLOTHING, AND SHELTER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 378)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad, and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A WAR ON HUNGER

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A PROGRAM FOR MANKIND

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman, or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are underway.

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the surplus concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of millions of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis on nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

AMERICA'S PAST EFFORTS

This program keeps faith with policies this Nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the four freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that Continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction and development.

This great effort—the Marshall plan—was followed by President Truman's point 4, President Eisenhower's Act of Bogotá and its successor, President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition, and famine have been averted.

Schools and hopsitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

A BALANCE IS REQUIRED

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

IMPROVING LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of these who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

THE NEED FOR SELF-HELP

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Economic incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon United States food increased.

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two—but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

BETTER NUTRITION

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is 30 times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during preschool years leave indelible scars.

Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life—physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can—and must—be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this Nation to search out new ways to:

Develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world.

Improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops.

Apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR OUR ABUNDANCE

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided—

For American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes.

For American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high-quality food at fair prices.

For American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today—because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U.S. agriculture—our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for:

1. Domestic needs.
2. Commercial exports.
3. Food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves.
4. Reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by 10 percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the worldwide war on hunger.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will:

Make self-help an integral part of our food aid program.

Eliminate the surplus requirement for food aid.

Emphasize the development of markets for American farm products.

Authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate.

Emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of 5 years.

Continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.

Continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs.

Provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements food for freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

The productive genius of our farmers.

The potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within 12 to 18 months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

Under the two acts I recommended today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books—and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended—we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

A UNIFIED EFFORT

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past, in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilateral lending organizations, and of the United Nations development program should be expanded—particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as worldwide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake

a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating less-developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society—where every person can hope for life's essentials—and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the interdependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths:

That agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

That an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

That hunger and want—anywhere—are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep freemen free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

TRANSITION TO LONG-TERM DOLLAR CREDIT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important features of the President's new food-for-freedom program is its emphasis on systematic and orderly transition from the stage in which a recipient country pays for food aid only in local currency to the stage in which it buys on long-term credit payable in dollars.

To those familiar with the past Public Law 480 program, this means a transition from the title I approach to the title IV approach. Title IV is the Poage amendment and was added to the law several years ago.

This long-term dollar credit feature is an important part of the food-for-freedom program. It recognizes that many nations which have promising basic economies may not be able to buy our farm products on short-term commercial credit at this time, but can afford to buy when long-term credit is made available.

This program is growing. Last year it accounted for well over $200 million of export sales. Several countries have become dollar customers for part or all of their purchases through this route. Greece is on that list. So are Yugoslavia, Iran, Iraq, Formosa, Portugal, and some of the Latin American republics, and, of course, our best customer, Japan, was in the process of transition just at the time this amendment was put in the law. Today Japan is our best dollar market and she is now paying cash. As the nations of the world develop economically, we can sell more food for dollars and we can collect more dollars in cash. Our greatest sales are to the developed countries. Let us never fear that it will injure our trade to develop the productive capacity of other countries.

Experience has shown that the shift to long-term credit can be made successfully, but only as the underdeveloped country builds its own economy. I think that it would be a mistake to confuse emergency shipments of food to starving people with long-time market development. We can increase markets—dollar markets—but we will not do it simply by increasing our gifts to India or any other country, no matter how proper those gifts may be at the moment. I look upon the gift provisions of this program as temporary provisions. I foresee in the dollar sales provision an opportunity to expand American business on a permanent basis. Both are needed, and I understand the President envisions both.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—NEW AND ENRICHED FOODS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, because of its departure from the surplus disposal concept, the President's new food for freedom will provide for much greater flexibility in the commodities offered through the program. It will also enable us to introduce enriched and fortified foods that will greatly step up the nutritional contributions of the program.

Nonfat milk distributed under the program, for example, can be enriched with vitamins A and D. Wheat flour and cornmeal can be fortified with calcium, fats and oils with vitamin A, and cereals with vitamin B^6. Many other fortification possibilities that have been explored on an experimental or limited basis can now be expanded.

It will also be possible to introduce new foods with special nutritive qualities. For example, there has already been a favorable reaction in pilot programs to Ceplapro, a corn-based formulated food. Consideration has been given to including fish protein concentrate in the program. Tests have been made with a beverage made from soybeans for infant feeding.

The President's new program will make it possible to go ahead with these and a variety of other nutritional improvements. This is a modern, forward-looking proposal which deserves our full support.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD NUTRITION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the merits of the President's new food-for-freedom program is its approach to the worldwide problems of poorly fed children.

We know from our own experience that how we bring up our own children—through good schools, good meals, and good homes—determines the kind of citizens and the kind of nation we will have in the years ahead. Exactly the same thing is true in foreign nations. What happens to their children today determines the shape of those nations tomorrow.

More and more we are coming to realize that adequate nutrition is a basic key to child development. Scientists are finding that proteins are the building blocks of brains, bodies, and abilities in the growing child. Deny a child the essential proteins and his potential as a human being may never be fully realized. Let him have the proteins he needs, and the accompanying essentials of a balanced diet, and he has the opportunity then to absorb knowledge, to become physically and mentally vigorous, and to become the kind of active citizen a developing country requires.

We are doing much through present programs to help bring improved diets to children of other countries. More than 40 million children in such countries are eating school lunches made up in part of foods from the United States. But more needs to be done—not necessarily by us but more in joint projects or more by the countries themselves. The President's new program will give flexibility, it will give new emphasis, it will provide even better ways of bringing about progress in this highly important area of building tomorrow's citizens.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—EMPHASIS ON SELF-HELP

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President's new food-for-freedom program for the assurance it gives that recipients of food aid will undertake, or continue, efforts to help themselves by improving their own agricultural systems.

There is a danger in any assistance program that the recipient will fail to face up to reality, will come to look upon assistance as the natural state of affairs, and will make insufficient efforts to help himself. We all know this can happen

to people. It can happen to nations, as well.

If the food-for-peace program of the past has had this weakness, it is the President's obvious intention to eliminate it in the future.

We must never be in a position where the advanced state of our own agricultural technology substitutes for and in fact stands in the way of the development of a sound agriculture in the countries with which we share our bounty. For the time would certainly come when not even our own vast resources would be enough to feed the world's growing population.

The President's new food-for-freedom program, with its emphasis on self-help, assures that the developing nations will take greater steps toward self-sufficiency.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the message submitted by the President to the Congress today is a historic one. It brings into sharp focus our deep concern with mankind's eternal struggle to provide enough food for life and to allay the elemental fear of famine.

It is entirely proper that we should commit ourselves to eradicate hunger from the world. Man has, at last, the knowledge to do so. It is our responsibility to help make this knowledge available and put it into practice. This the President proposes to do.

But the President has called our attention not only to the hunger that prevails in so much of the world today, but also to the race we are in: The race to expand the food production of the world more rapidly than the rate at which the world's population is growing. So far, we have not succeeded in this. But it is a race that we must win. For the alternative is continued famine and starvation for individuals and the social and political turmoil for the nations in which food shortages occur. Peace and progress for the world depend upon a diffusion of agricultural technology, but this can have no positive effect if something is not done, on a massive basis, to cope with the onrushing population explosion.

The proposals made by the President for utilizing our own agricultural potential to help other nations in developing their agricultural resources are sound. It is proper that currencies generated by sales of food, which are not convertible into dollars, be used to assist in developing agriculture in the participating countries. For such a provision means that the program not only treats the immediate symptoms but also opens the way to the longrun solution of the problem of famine.

Mr. Speaker, close relationship of onrushing famine and exploding population growth prompts me to make an additional suggestion. A portion of the soft currency funds generated by this program—say 15 percent—could be set aside, in the manner of Cooley funds, to be made available at the wish of governments involved, for maternal and child health care, with a substantial emphasis on family planning and health programs.

Such funds could be administered through a number of agencies. One which seems particularly appropriate would be the World Health Organization, which has become increasingly concerned with family planning and child care.

Just as techniques of agriculture have improved to make it possible to feed the present population of the world, techniques of family planning have been developed and tested which make it possible to control the population explosion, without impinging on individual conscience or religious conviction. By bringing together agricultural development and family planning by using nonconvertible funds generated in the food-for-peace program, we may well have set the stage for fulfilling human hopes for security against famine, within the next generation.

DEATH OF JOSEPH RUSSELL KNOWLAND

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House the death of the Honorable Joseph Russell Knowland, the father of Senator William Knowland, who was Republican floor leader of the Senate until a few years ago. Mr. Knowland lived in Piedmont, Calif.

Mr. Knowland served in the House of Representatives from November 8, 1904, until March 3, 1915, when he was an unsuccessful candidate for election to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Knowland was a publisher of the Oakland Tribune and was noted for the work that he did as a member of the Beaches and Parks Commission in California, in preserving for future posterity the beauty spots of our State, and for his great work in the field of western history.

Although of a different political persuasion—and the Knowland papers have never supported me—I recognize in Joseph Russell Knowland a great American and a great patriot, a man who has made a great contribution to his country, and I regretfully inform the House of his passing.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Although I never met, and consequently never knew, Joseph Knowland, I had heard a great deal about his distinguished career in the Congress of the United States. He was, as everyone knows, the father of a former Senator from the State of California. This is a fine family of dedicated Americans, and I join with the gentleman from California in expressing our sorrow and deepest condolences to the family.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ENROLLMENT IN PROGRAM OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of this title.

The section of the Social Security Act dealing with the voluntary medicare program is rather important as it is available to all citizens 65 and over. However, since only 11.5 million of our senior citizens have enrolled in this program to date, it is apparent that there has not been enough time to adequately inform qualified individuals of the details of the program or of the financial responsibilities involved. In addition, if a qualified person does not sign up by the deadline, he must wait 2 years before he is again eligible to participate.

This is of particular concern to me as some 50,000 of my constituents might qualify for this program. Of these, almost 15 percent do not receive social security benefits and therefore have not been formally notified of the opportunities available to them under the supplemental medical insurance program. It seems unrealistic to believe that this complicated program can be fully explained to these individuals in the short time remaining before the presently scheduled termination of the enrollment period March 31.

Thus I am introducing this bill today in hopes that those individuals already contacted might have additional time to consider the program and that additional time might be made available to explain its details to those who have not yet been contacted. I hope this bill will receive favorable consideration by the committee to which it is referred and by each Member of Congress.

EQUALITY UNDER THE LAW

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to

further protect the rights and privileges of our Nation's citizens from discrimination on the basis of sex. This measure is strongly supported by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

While the rights of various minority groups throughout the country have received considerable attention of late, those of a far larger group also need attention. Discrimination on the basis of sex has plagued primarily the women of the Nation and has by no means been eliminated. Today's women participate in virtually every field of endeavor, many holding positions of great authority and responsibility. Yet in some sectors of the country the fairer sex does not always enjoy an equal opportunity to fair competition.

The amendment introduced by this joint resolution would provide means by which the rights of these citizens might be further protected. I urge my colleagues in both bodies of Congress to join in support of this measure, which is of such interest to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, as the following letter from Miss Emma C. McGall, national legislation chairman, of Westfield, N.J., attests. I include as part of my remarks this letter as well as the text of the joint resolution.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC. OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1966.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: It was a pleasure to be able to meet with you at the breakfast on Thursday, January 26, during the course of the National Legislative Conference of our federation. This was a very auspicious beginning to a most successful conference and it was a pleasure to be with you and to talk with you at this occasion.

In accordance with his promise Congressman PAUL KREBS introduced on January 26, House Joint Resolution 816 providing for the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution. If you have not already done so the members in our New Jersey federation, and particularly the members in your congressional district, would be most appreciative of your introducing a similar joint resolution.

Thanking you for taking time out of your very busy schedule to be with us, I am

Sincerely yours,
(Miss) EMMA C. MCGALL,
National Legislation Chairman.

H.J. RES. 834

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"SEC. 3. This amendment shall take effect one year after the date of ratification."

ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL TRADE POLICY REPORT SHOULD BE TIMELY, NOT A YEAR LATE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the President's ninth annual report on the trade agreements program for 1964, prepared by his special representative for trade negotiations, was sent to the Congress in final form in the first week of the current year, 1966, even though the President's letter of transmittal was signed on October 31, 1965. This report is required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1803 (a)), which reads:

The President shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the trade agreements program and on tariff adjustment and other adjustment assistance under this chapter. Such report shall include information regarding new negotiations, changes made in duties and other import restrictions of the United States, reciprocal concessions obtained, changes in trade agreements in order to effectuate more fully the purposes of the trade agreements program (including the incorporation therein of escape clauses), the results of action taken to obtain removal of foreign trade restrictions (including discriminatory restrictions) against U.S. exports, remaining restrictions, and the measures available to seek their removal in accordance with the purposes of this chapter, and other information relating to the trade agreements program and to the agreements entered into thereunder.

No date is fixed in this section by which the President shall submit to Congress his annual trade report.

It is reasonable to assume, however, that the intent of Congress when enacting the Trade Expansion Act was to have available at the beginning of a calendar year a comprehensive report on the trade agreements program for the year immediately past. Congress would expect this report at the beginning of the year because it would then have before it information on which to base legislative decisions having to do with foreign trade during the current year. Accordingly, the President's trade report for calendar 1964 should have been received in final form in Congress at least within the first 3 months of 1965.

Thus, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 402 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by inserting immediately after "Such report" in the second sentence the following:

shall be submitted on or before March 31 of each year and

This very simple amendment would make explicit the intent of Congress that it have available for reference and use early in each year the President's report on trade for the previous year. As evidence of the need for this amendment I cite the fact that since 1960 no trade report has been submitted before July 1. Incredibly, President Kennedy's report for 1961 was not transmitted to Congress until January 28, 1963.

The trade report is not only an important document through which the Congress can judge the operations of the Executive in this important field, it is also necessary for congressional decision-making. The trade report can in addition be an important vehicle for public information especially at present, when U.S. international trade negotiations are widely followed and the subject of public interest—if only by virtue of the name "Kennedy round." It would be source material for articles and papers prepared at the academic level as well as in the thousand-odd trade and professional associations and unions which have a deep interest in foreign trade and the U.S. trade agreements program. Of course, such an annual report is useless if it is a full year late, or even 9 months late. By that time the consumers of such information have gone to other, perhaps less dependable sources for information about the previous year's foreign trade program.

TOM CURTIS' CONTRIBUTION TO DEBATE ON THE BUDGET AND INFLATION.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the February 8 Washington Post praises my colleague, TOM CURTIS, Republican, of St. Louis County, Mo., "for performing a most useful function by subjecting the administration's budget to the scrutiny that it deserves in a period of great uncertainty."

Representative CURTIS has argued throughout the just ended Joint Economic Committee hearings on the President's Economic Report that inflation is now in progress due in part to the existence of high spending since September to support both a war economy and costly domestic programs, and is reflected in the rising wholesale price index. CURTIS argues that the fiscal year 1967 budget, and the revised fiscal year 1966 budget which increased the Federal deficit from $3.9 to $6.9 billion, is highly unrealistic in terms of the goal of price stability that the President and his Council of Economic Advisers claim to be seeking. In spite of the inability of administration witnesses to reconcile their stated goal with a budget that they have been forced under cross-examination to admit is potentially highly inflationary, officials refuse to concede that

inflation is in fact a clear and present danger.

Though the Washington Post disagrees with CURTIS, it has recognized the important — indeed crucial — function played in national decisionmaking by a loyal opposition, and cites TOM CURTIS' contribution to this process through his aggressive leadership and presentation of opposition viewpoints as "the leading Republican spokesman on economic affairs."

Following is the complete text of the editorial:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1966]

THE BUDGET AND INFLATION

If the current hearings before the Joint Economic Committee foreshadow future debate, the issue that separates Republicans from Democrats will be inflation. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, the leading Republican spokesman on economic affairs believes that the rise in Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year has already resulted in inflationary pressures, and he charges that the administration's 1967 budget will further intensify them. The administration, through the testimony of Budget Director Charles L. Schultze and Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, has counterattacked by denying that the current price increases are inflationary or that they are related to the budgetary deficit.

In replying to Representative CURTIS on the issue of prices, Schultze argued that the recent rise in the wholesale price index is principally the result of increases in the prices of agricultural commodities. Since farm prices are still somewhat below the high point reached in 1958, Schultze maintains that the increase in the wholesale price index is "not an inflationary phenomenon. It is a cyclical phenomenon."

Without quarreling over the term "cyclical"—over whether farm prices as a whole are subject to distinct cycles, it is sufficient to note that agricultural commodity prices are far more responsive to shifts in supply and demand than the prices of manufacturers. Therefore, the increases in agricultural prices that are experienced when aggregate demand expands rapidly may be ephemeral. To the extent that they are, Schultze's argument makes good sense. But there is, of course, always the danger that the rise in agricultural prices can affect nonfarm prices through their impact on wages.

On the second issue of whether the budgetary deficit for fiscal 1966 has contributed to inflationary pressures, the administration clearly has the better of the argument. But in awarding it points for debating, the administration must be faulted for the weakness of its defense against potential inflationary pressures.

It was refreshing to hear a Secretary of the Treasury warn the opposition, that "We have seen too many expansions turned into recessions by slamming too hard on the brakes." But Mr. Fowler's declarations about the administration's willingness to apply the brakes at the propitious moment would be more convincing if he were to make some specific proposals for a first line of fiscal defense. The 1967 budget, being approximately in balance is at best "neutral," neither augmenting nor diminishing the total stream of expenditures.

But that neutrality may be a serious weakness if excessive demands for goods and services develop. In that event, what will be needed is a neutralizing budget, a tight budget that absorbs the gap between aggregate demand and supply by incurring a substantial surplus. Two steps can be taken in advance of the forces of excessive demand. Congress should be asked to enact income tax increases without specifying an effective date. Action to raise taxes at the propitious moment can then take the form of a joint resolution. And Secretary Fowler's remarks to the contrary notwithstanding, action should be taken now to modify or temporarily suspend the 7 percent tax credit for business investment enacted in 1962. Tax incentives to invest are not needed in a year when outlays on plant and equipment are scheduled to rise by 15 percent.

Even where his line of reasoning misses the mark, Representative CURTIS is performing a most useful function by subjecting the administration's budget to the scrutiny that it deserves in a period of great uncertainty.

FREEMAN ADMITS HE WAS WRONG

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of one-price cotton legislation in 1964 I repeatedly warned that the bill advocated by the Johnson administration would be costly and ineffective, and would not benefit consumers. The facts now bear out my warning.

Secretary Freeman in 1964 took the opposite view. He predicted better prices for consumers, increased domestic consumption of cotton and lower costs to the taxpayer. In one of the most impressive displays of legislative arm twisting in history administration forces pushed the bill and hooked to it another legislative mistake, the wheat certificate program.

It is somewhat gratifying, therefore, to see that Secretary Freeman now admits he was wrong. He did so in a speech to the American Textile Manufacturers Institute January 27 in New York City.

Part of Mr. Freeman's speech is devoted to glowing predictions about the future success of the 1965 cotton bill—predictions which echo his erroneous forecast of the year before. Next year, no doubt, Mr. Freeman will belatedly explain to the long-suffering taxpayers that he was wrong in 1965, too.

Now the same administration which was so wrong about cotton legislation in 1964 in trying to put through more cotton legislation, this time a compulsory checkoff to finance additional research and promotion.

Here is Mr. Freeman's speech text:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, BEFORE THE AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, JANUARY 27, 1966

I have looked forward for some time for this chance to be together with you. It provides us an opportunity to discuss together some matters of mutual interest.

I am glad that I can meet here with you in these good times. We are in the midst of the longest sustained business prosperity in our peacetime history.

Only yesterday the Secretary of Labor predicted that the unemployment rate would be in the neighborhood of 3.5 percent by the end of June. This would be the lowest unemployment rate since 1953 and one of the lowest in the Nation's history.

More than 70 million people are gainfully employed in our country—a figure that was laughed at when predictions were made in past years that we would reach this level of employment.

Corporation profits last year were 20 percent up after taxes, and up 67 percent from 1960. Our gross national product will top $720 billion—a figure undreamed of a few years ago.

I am pleased when I look back over 1965 and see that net farm income was the best in 12 years; that per farm income is at record levels—and that 1966 promises to be even better.

This prosperity was not an accident. Since 1961 there has been a conscious effort on the part of the administration to bring about a cooperative effort between business and Government to develop programs and take administrative action to bring about these gains. I heard about wringing of hands among businessmen in this country when there was a change of administration in 1960. The hand wringing has changed to handclapping as the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have brought this Nation into the 20th century.

As Secretary of Agriculture, I am sure that many of you wonder why I have this interest in business. Food and agriculture is the largest single business enterprise in our Nation. As Secretary of Agriculture, I am concerned with your interests—business interests—with the interests of the farmer, the consumer, the taxpayer, and each and every one of our citizens.

I am gratified that the prosperity of the Nation has extended to the textile industry. Your investment of more than a billion dollars this year in new plants and facilities means that you are doing well and that you are confident enough to make a record investment in the future. Your investment will mean stronger economies in those places where new facilities are built or old facilities are expanded. It will mean new jobs for our workers and it will mean new markets for the cottongrower.

My task, and your task, is to build on the base we have constructed to insure that these trends will continue. Whether we improve or decline from today's level will reflect the decisions we make now and in the days, weeks, and months to come.

This is what I want to discuss with you. Let me first review briefly some of the steps which brought us to where we are today in the textile industry.

Five years ago the Nation's economy had dipped into the third recession in the past decade, and earnings in the textile industry showed little prospect for improvement.

There was a crisis in confidence in the textile economy. The administration set out to dispel it.

We negotiated with other textile producing countries arrangements which assured them of access to U.S. markets; in return, these countries have shown restraint in not flooding domestic markets.

A number of tax policy actions were taken to encourage greater investment by U.S. industry in general, and this has been of particular benefit to the textile industry. A more rapid tax depreciation schedule was instituted in 1961 and 1962, and corporate taxes were reduced in 1964 along with personal income taxes.

While these actions helped to strengthen the financial condition of the textile industry, even more basic changes in cotton production and cotton pricing policies were essential to the long run health of the cotton and textile economy.

The cotton program which had served the Nation well for many years had simply run out of gas. Cotton exports were declining, cotton consumption in domestic mills was losing ground to test tube fibers, and the cotton carryover was increasing rapidly.

New cotton legislation was enacted in 1964. It helped in some ways. It made the breakthrough on one-price cotton but the 1964

cotton program was not a success. You will recall that in 1964 many of us, and I include myself and I know many of you here, claimed that the move to one-price cotton would increase domestic consumption by more than a million bales and bring about a reduction in the cost of cotton goods to the consumer. We were wrong and it became obvious that a new program was needed. With the new legislation the carryover of cotton continued to increase; the annual cost of the cotton program moved toward a billion dollars and it appeared it would continue to rise.

This was the setting in which we considered cotton legislation in 1965.

The legislation we adopted last year sets price support loans at near world prices and should enable cotton to move freely—and without Government participation—in domestic and world markets. A system of direct payments will maintain grower incomes at levels which will enable the farmer to meet his costs and obtain a decent income for himself and his family.

With our price support loan at 21 cents per pound for the 1966 crop, and our export prices at more competitive levels, we can, and should have, larger cotton exports. Although exports during the current season will be low because countries abroad will be reducing their stocks on hand in anticipation of lower U.S. prices for the 1966 crop, we expect exports in the 1966–67 marketing year to increase sharply. Part of this increase will be to replenish the low stocks which will be held abroad on August 1, 1966, and part will be the result of the new program and its effect on production abroad.

We expect the new legislation to slow the rate of increase of world cotton production—but not to cause a decline in cotton production abroad. Lower cotton prices can encourage the consumption of cotton abroad because of more effective competition with rayon.

Slight changes in the rates of growth of cotton consumption and production abroad can cause a rather significant change in cotton exports from the United States. Cotton production abroad (excluding mainland China) totals around 31 million bales and cotton consumption is around 34 million bales. Foreign consumption has been increasing at a rate of about 2.7 percent a year and foreign production about 4.1 percent a year for the past 10 years.

If we could slow the rate of growth in production by just 1 percentage point and increase the rate of consumption by just 1 percentage point, U.S. exports could reach roughly 6 million bales in about 2 years. This is the kind of effort we must be making.

With higher exports and strong participation by producers in the new cotton program, we can bring a substantial reduction in the present record 16 million bale cotton carryover. Production on an annual basis likely will decline about 1.5 to 2 million bales from the recent levels of about 15 million bales.

Another factor which can help increase cotton consumption, and speed the decline in carryover, is an effective cotton promotion program. Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced yesterday a bill to establish a self-help research and promotion program for cotton. I believe this kind of activity can benefit the whole industry and consumers and taxpayers alike.

But the rate and extent to which the mountainous surplus of cotton is reduced will depend, as much as anything, on the actions and policies of you in the textile industry. In effect, it is within your power to help determine how successful the new cotton program will be, and whether the American people will accept it as reasonable public policy.

I emphasize this fact, not because it is a startling revelation, but rather to impress upon you the need for us to continue the spirit of cooperation which has brought the Nation's economy to its present level of efficiency and prosperity.

When the search for an effective cotton program began, the textile industry took the position it would support any program which would achieve one-price cotton. You soon discovered that sound public policy was not that simple. You had to decide what that policy should be, and then to give active and sustained support to that policy as it was being developed in the Congress.

There is no less need today for responsible action on the part of the textile industry.

Since early in 1964, prices paid by domestic mills for cotton have declined about 9 cents a pound. In 1964 the index on broad woven goods and yarns declined as well. It is an interesting fact that, during this same period, imports went down and exports went up.

Then late in 1964 the price on woven goods began to rise—the prices on yarns began to rise. The price for broad woven grey goods, for example, has increased nearly 8 percent during the period from 1964 to date. What has happened? Exports of cotton textiles have declined and imports of cotton textiles have increased.

This is what I am referring to when I suggest that you and everyone in the textile industry needs to give your full consideration and your every thought to action in this vital area of the cost of goods.

While it is true that mill consumption did increase last year by some 200,000 bales over 1964, to a level of 9.2 million bales, declines in exports and a sufficient increase in imports to bring about a 400,000-bale balance in favor of imports indicates that this is a 400,000-bale domestic market the textile industry has turned over to foreign producers.

I am sure we both recognize the value and worth of this new one-price cotton program, and we must make every possible effort to insure that it works for the benefit of all segments of the economy. Our failure would be a smashing blow at the textile industry of this Nation.

That is why I have come here tonight. We are beginning a new phase of the cooperation which has brought us a long way from the dismal outlook of just 5 years ago.

I pledge you to carry forward the spirit of cooperation undiminished, and I am confident that you will do the same.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS ON RHODESIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to visit the newly independent nation of Southern Rhodesia. Next week, I will present a full report on the observations which Ralph DeToledano, Dr. Max Yergan, and myself have after our visit, along with our recommendations. Specifically, however, I would like to make two of my own recommendations to the House of Representatives.

First, I believe we should authorize a special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to visit Southern Rhodesia and get a firsthand look at what is going on there. I ask this because it is my belief that we are not getting the whole story or the true story from our State Department. This request has been forwarded to the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Second, I believe this Congress should take a serious look at our State Department policy regarding Rhodesia. We should specifically consider, at minimum, a congressional resolution which would urge the State Department and the administration to withhold any cooperation in the British sanctions and boycott until that nation ceases its shipping into North Vietnam. It is a travesty of justice and offensive to commonsense that we should aid them in their boycott against Rhodesia, a questionable policy in the first place, when they give no reciprocity to our position in South Vietnam where we are fighting a Communist enemy and they are currently the chief free world shipper to North Vietnam.

Africa is in ferment. We failed in Asia because the people—indeed, as the late President Kennedy once pointed out, even the diplomats and the Congress—failed to understand the dimensions of what was taking place, the relative position of the contending forces and our policy therein. To make sure this does not happen in Africa we need the piercing light of public and congressional inquiry not the paper curtain of the State Department with its handed-down press releases and positions. We can do no less.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TRADES WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, American men are dying in Vietnam to preserve the free world from further encroachment by Communist aggressors.

It is ironic, therefore, that our free world allies persist in permitting their shipping interests to trade with North Vietnam. Although the exact figures are classified, it is a matter of record that in 1965 there were more free world than Communist ships carrying goods to and from North Vietnam.

Regardless of their cargoes—and we have only the assurance of the shipping firms involved that they consist of nonstrategic goods in most cases—this amounts to giving aid and comfort to our enemy. This is an economic war as well as a military conflict. If economic pressures can be applied to Ho Chi Minh, they must be, just as they have been to Castro.

I say it is time for the United States to talk the only language these free world foreign-flag shippers apparently understand: serve notice on them that they cease delivering goods of any sort to Hanoi or stand barred from doing any business at all in U.S. ports.

I am today introducing legislation which would prohibit foreign vessels which trade with North Vietnam not only

from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes but from doing any business at all in our ports. I urge the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to take prompt action on this bill.

SKI WEEK IN THE BERKSHIRES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, thanks to swift action by both the House and Senate last month we have just observed National Ski Week. May I say, as the Representative to this body who enjoys serving perhaps the finest large-scale ski area in the Nation, I welcomed the proclamation and the national observance.

I think it is entirely in keeping with the renewed emphasis in recent years from the National, State, and local governments on outdoor recreation and on wholesome sports activity in which all may participate. It also stresses the encouragement of recreational development of otherwise marginal mountain areas which we in Massachusetts have been doing for some years.

For anyone who skis, I know I need not extol the merits of the Berkshire Mountains in my district. Spotted throughout the Berkshires are the resorts and ski areas of Berkshire Snow Basin, Bousquet's, Brodie Mountain, Burrington Hill, Butternut Basin, Catamount, Chickley Alps, Dutch Hill, Jiminy Peak, Jug End, Otis Ridge, Petersburg Pass, and Thunder Mountain.

I am equally proud of Avaloch, Springside Park, Goodell Hollow, Happyland Ski Area, the Thunderbolt Trail on Mount Greylock, Oak N' Spruce, Osceola Playground, Pittsfield State Forest, and Shaker Village on Mount Lebanon.

Also in my district are the ski facilities of Cheshire Ski Area, Eastover, Mount Mohawk, Mount Tom, the Northfield Inn, and the Sawmill Hill Ski Area.

Most of these are as familiar to skiers as the names of Hialeah, Aqueduct, and Churchill Downs are to horse players. These resort areas and ski slopes rank among the best in the world and annually draw thousands to the Berkshires.

I am personally proud to serve the many enterprising and forward-looking men and women who have taken the initiative in developing these fine facilities in anticipation of the present boom in skiing and other winter sports. They are performing an invaluable service to the economic and physical well-being of our State and of the Nation.

Of course, the idea of ski week is nothing new to these ski lodge innovators. For quite some time now, most have been offering a package 5-day ski week for winter vacationers at reduced rates. The response has been most gratifying. Most of these package deals include lodging from Sunday through Thursday nights with skiing from Sunday through Friday. Many include ski lessons, meals, and special entertainment.

Prices start about $40 on up for the 5-day deal, a bargain in these days of increasing prices and costs. Full details, I might add, are available from the Berkshire Hills Conference in my hometown of Pittsfield, Mass.

The Berkshire Eagle, the largest daily paper published in my district, recently ran their annual ski supplement issue. While I regret that the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not equipped to reproduce the many fine illustrations which graphically reveal the scenic grandeur and fine facilities awaiting the skier in the Berkshires, I can request consent to include as a part of my remarks one of the articles from this special supplement. I am sure you will agree it captures some of the flavor of excitement and good fun that is an integral part of skiing and for which we designated National Ski Week.

The article follows:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Dec. 11, 1965]

RESORTING TO SKI

(By Lee Goerlach)

Berkshire resorts have catered to the ski bunny so effectively that winter may supersede summer as the busy season, despite Tanglewood and various other summer attractions.

Realizing that the majority of their guests are tackling the long boards for the first time, the resorts tailor their programs to a beginner's apprehensions.

Guests are pampered, protected, and taught the fundamentals of the sport by instructors chosen for personality and patience.

"We need men who can teach our guests how to put on their skis and walk, and how to do a snowplow, then stop at the bottom of our little hill," owner George Bisacca of Eastover in Lenox, says.

"We keep an eye on them, even to anticipating falls. If our efforts to keep them on their feet fail, we pick them up and serve them soothing hot chocolate right on the hill if they are shaken.

"We get them before they are beginners," Eastover ski director Jeff Roche says. "They become so accustomed to being served that they are apt to walk off the hill, leaving their skis behind them. So we pick up the skis and put them back where they belong. The key word here is attention."

Proving that nothing is too good for his guests, Bisacca installed a 1,500-foot chair lift last year to supplement the little rope tow.

The fact that he didn't have a hill big enough for the chair didn't faze Bisacca. He bought a neighboring hill and moved all 14,000 cubic yards of it truckful by truckful to Eastover.

Swimming, movies, skating, dancing, and various after activities keep the guests happy even if rain washes out the ski hill. "And skiing is so leisurely that we stop at noon for a full-course meal," Bisacca said.

This is the pattern in varying degrees at all four Berkshire winter resorts. With the exception of Avaloch in Lenox, all have snowmaking.

At Jug End in South Egremont, skiing seems more serious than at the other resorts. Ski director Dave Scott received his U.S. Amateur Ski Association (USEASA) certification along with Olympic skier Andrea Mead Lawrence last winter.

"I'll put my ski school up against the bigger areas anywhere," he says. But diplomacy and the value of individual attention also are part of the training he gives his staff.

"Focus your smile on the homeliest girl in the class." Dave tells his instructors. "She will be pleased and the rest of the class will love you for it. If you choose the prettiest girl, everyone will hate you," he warns.

Dave is from northern Ireland and has his full share of Irish wit and charm. "I'm probably the only certified instructor in the world from northern Ireland," he says.

Jug End has a 1,500-foot T-bar and a rope tow. The hill is challenging enough to attract transient skiers. Jug End also conducts a program for children of nearby towns. About 50 youngsters (from 9 to 16 years old) participated in the third year of the program last season.

Oak n' Spruce in South Lee also has a USEASA certified ski director, Rainer Schmidt of Germany, who has taught in famous ski areas all over the world, according to resort owner Frank Prinz.

Oak n' Spruce has the smallest hill and smallest snowmaking operation. "Isn't it ridiculous," Frank says, as he proudly displays the miniature electric compressor. "But it keeps the hill covered. That is what counts."

The South Lee resort has the largest skating rink of the foursome. It floods the tennis courts.

"We offer social skiing, a combination of both daytime ski activities and nighttime pleasures associated with resort life," Prinz says. "Our slopes have been designed for the novice. Our ski school knows how to instruct the beginner. The slopes are not challenging enough for the experts. The expert can find his match at nearby Berkshire ski areas."

Avaloch added a 1,000-foot T-bar to its ski complex this year. The 18-sided Gazebo, which serves as a summer dining room, is flooded for ice skating. Guests are provided most anything they ask for.

"We have a juke box and hi-fi for dancing, but if the crowd wants live music, we'll provide it," Manager Dave Green says.

Owner Michael Bakwin directs the ski program, assisted by Ed Weiss of Lenox. Accommodations are limited to about 100 overnight guests at present. But ground is being broken for an additional 20 units. "We expect the T-bar will increase interest enough to warrant construction of a ski lodge next season," Green says.

Swiss fondues, ski talk around the fire at night, parlor games, ping pong, skating on illuminated rinks—you name it, and the Berkshire resorts have it. (If they haven't got it, they'll get it for you.)

All four resorts have special midweek rates that run about half the cost of weekends or holidays. All four have rental equipment. Seldom does a beginner have his own skis and boots. When he does, they are apt to be unsuitable.

Dave Scott tells, for example, about the 86-year-old doctor from White Plains, N.Y., who arrived in class with head skis, marker toe piece and turntable heel with longthongs, equipment usually worn by racers or hot shot skiers.

Dave assumed that the doctor was one of the rare species to show up at a resort—the expert. But the doctor had never before been on skis. He had purchased the unsuitable gear from a salesman obviously as unfamiliar with skiing as his customer.

This was New Year's 2 years ago, a bitterly cold day if you remember. The doctor may not have known his ski equipment, but he knew frostbite when he saw it. About halfway through the lesson he said to Dave, "Sonny, your ears are turning white, you'd better go inside."

Eastover attracts mostly single people. The others have everything from singles to families. Some come dressed in the latest style. Others ski in car coats and levis.

"One girl had such an extensive wardrobe that she changed her clothes several times a day," Jug End's Scott remembers.

"By and large we get family groups at Avaloch," Green says. "We still are host to

singles in tour groups in January through March, but have mostly families on holiday weekends. Except for the tours, ours is a family business."

There is very little repeat business from the resort skier. "We get a whole new wave each season," Bisacca says. "Once the ski bug bites them, they go off to ski at the big areas," Prinz agrees. "We are the cradle of the industry."

Guests arrive at the resorts on Friday night for the weekend.

"They dance until midnight, then are up at the crack of dawn waiting in line at the ski shop to be fitted to boots and skis," Prinz says. "They stay up until all hours again Saturday. By Sunday they start to wear out a little. Activity on the ski slopes doesn't start until about 11 a.m. And they start leaving for home by late afternoon."

U.S. POSITION ON VIETNAM

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson went to Honolulu with the overwhelming support of the vast majority of the people of this country. I think the cause of peace can best be served at this juncture by reaffirming that support and making it clear to all the world.

What is the United States trying to accomplish in Vietnam? The answer to that question is quite clear. It is the same answer we have been giving for more than 10 years. We are in Vietnam to reaffirm the right of any people to determine its own destiny in its own way. We are there to prove that force and violence are no longer acceptable ways for any power to impose its will upon its neighbors. The fact that the kind of force and violence being employed in South Vietnam is aggression in a new disguise does not change the nature of what we are trying to do. President Johnson has stated our purpose in Vietnam again and again. He has said:

> Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way. We will do everything necessary to reach that objective and we will do only what is absolutely necessary.
>
> I wish it were possible—

And I am still quoting the President—

> to convince others with words what we now find it necessary to say with guns and planes: armed hostility is futile—our resources are equal to any challenge—because we fight for values and we fight for principles, rather than territory or colonies, our patience and our determination are unending. Once this is clear, then it should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

President Johnson has said on a score of different occasions that he is prepared to go anywhere, any time, and discuss with any government a peaceful solution for Vietnam—unconditionally. Dozens of world leaders have urged the Communists in Hanoi and Peiping to participate in such discussions. They have refused. They are trying to keep discussions out of the United Nations.

It is obvious that the Chinese Communists and probably the Communists in Hanoi do not want to talk peace. They do not want to talk peace because they still believe that they can achieve a military victory. They believe that we will get tired of the struggle, that the American Government will lose popular support and be compelled to retreat.

They are wrong.

We know they are wrong.

Support for American actions in Vietnam is and always has been widespread among the American people. This can be amply demonstrated by quotations from two great Americans. One is from a letter written by President Eisenhower to Prime Minister Churchill in 1954. Speaking of the situation in southeast Asia, President Eisenhower said:

> If I may refer again to history, we failed to halt Hirohito, Mussolini, and Hitler by not acting in unity and in time. That marked the beginning of many years of stark tragedy and desperate peril. May it not be that our nations have learned something from that lesson?

Now here is another quote from that same year of 1954. This was a speech at Harvard University by General Eisenhower's chief political opponent—the late Adlai Stevenson:

> It has fallen to America's lot to organize and lead that portion of the world which adheres to the principle of consent in the ordering of human affairs. It is an assignment we undertook not by choice but by necessity and without prior experience. The burden is without historic parallel and so is the danger, and so is our response. The first phase is ending. The outward thrust of aggression in Europe has been arrested. Now we shall have to address ourselves to Asia, to perpetual siege and to the unending tasks of greatness. For the quest for peace and security is not a day's or a decade's work. For us it may be everlasting.

There you have the political consensus in America on the subject of aggression in southeast Asia. We have not changed. Today we have a Democratic President—and he enjoys the same firm support from Republican former President Eisenhower that General Eisenhower received from Mr. Stevenson.

There are some who are honestly and sincerely confused about what is going on in South Vietnam. And there are some others who are more than willing to increase the confusion. But the facts speak for themselves.

What is being attempted in Vietnam is the same cynical totalitarian aggression we have fought for a generation. Only now it is trying out a new strategy. It is now trying to prove that a small group of well-armed and ruthless terrorists can be sent into a country to first subvert its government and then to enslave its people before the world realizes that an invasion has begun.

The whole history of our century proves conclusively that the appetite for aggression is unlimited. There is no known instance of an aggressor leaving his neighbors alone because his appetite was satisfied. If we do not stand by South Vietnam today, then—as surely as night follows day—we will be called upon to face the challenge somewhere else tomorrow.

President Johnson has chosen to face reality and meet the challenge here and now. He has the firm support of the vast majority of the American people.

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been devoted of late to what might occur in various of our State legislatures following reapportionment on a population-only basis.

Those of us who support the pending reapportionment constitutional amendment affecting State legislative reapportionment believe that the ultimate decision in such a vital area of government must lie with the American people themselves. That is the purpose of the pending resolution regarding reapportionment.

This issue is clear and fundamental.

The point, I believe, is interestingly made in a recent column appearing in the San Francisco Examiner by Jack S. McDowell where an excellent, whimsical commentary on the problem is set forth.

With unanimous consent, I therefore ask that this article be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 2, 1965]

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

(By Jack S. McDowell)

SACRAMENTO.—The time: 1967 or thereafter.

Californians have been saved from themselves by the U.S. Supreme Court. Reapportionment, back in 1965, made all State senate districts about equal in population—but not in geography or economic interests. Some new senators now represent a dozen counties.

Senator Paul Pullet of the first senatorial district answers the phone in his office in Petaluma. Sam Sawtooth, one of his constituents in Crescent City, is calling (at 90 cents for the first 3 minutes).

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Senator, a number of us are having nothing but trouble from the division and we need your help.

Senator PULLET. Always glad to help the people of our district, sir. Why don't you and your associates drop around to my office right after lunch and——

Mr. SAWTOOTH. After lunch. Why, Senator, it's 333 miles from here to Petaluma, not counting detours around the bridge washouts.

Senator PULLET. Yes, you are in the northern neighborhood of the district, aren't you? Well, maybe we can handle it on the phone. Now, you mentioned trouble with the division. Which division of the agriculture department is that, sir? Compliance, or the bureau of poultry inspection?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Ag, shmag, Senator. I'm talking about those division of forestry guys.

Senator PULLET. Oh, forestry, huh? Hmmm. Well, what seems to be the problem, Mr. Sawtooth?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Well, one of those division guys got so noisy shouting the rulebook at two of our scalers that the whistlepunk got so rattled he signaled wrong, somebody hit the winch and we almost laminated one of our best toppers into about 500 board feet of second-growth.

Senator PULLET. Scalers? Whistlepunk? Topper? Uh, by the way, Mr. Sawtooth, what's the name of your firm?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. The Mountainside Logging Co.

Senator PULLET. Logging? Oh, yes. I've heard of your company many times. Fine reputation. Well, it sounds as if you do have a problem and I will demand a full report from the director of agri * * * I mean from those forestry people. By the way, Mr. Sawtooth, how did you people up there ever come to plant redwood trees instead of raising chickens or some nice wine grapes?

As the senator hung up, his secretary stopped in.

"Senator Quartzly wants you to call him right away at his office at the Modoc Mining Co., in Alturas," she said. "He wants to know what peach blight and pear decline are, because he just told some of his Stanislaus County constituents he'll introduce a bill to have them repealed."

JUDGE PERRY B. JACKSON

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, between November 1947 and February of 1954, it was my privilege to serve as associate judge of the municipal court of Cleveland, a trial court of general jurisdiction in the city of Cleveland. In the course of this association, it was my privilege to serve with the Honorable Perry B. Jackson who has since become a judge of the court of common pleas of Cuyahoga County.

During my two terms of office on the Cleveland municipal court, I had the opportunity to frequently counsel with Judge Jackson and very often relied on his wise experience in trial procedure and legal research.

On Thursday, January 27, Judge Jackson celebrated his 70th birthday. His life story is a story of perseverance and integrity. Mr. James T. Cox, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, paid proper tribute to this eminent jurist on Sunday, January 23. Mr. Cox's article follows:

JUDGE JACKSON TURNING 70—RACIAL EMPHASIS ERASED

(By James T. Cox)

Judge Perry B. Jackson considers as one of his lesser achievements his indirect responsibility for tradition-bound newspaper writing in Cleveland.

For many years after 1942, when he was appointed a Cleveland municipal judge by Gov. John W. Bricker, a typical newspaper story about him would start like this: "Judge Perry B. Jackson, the first Negro to serve as a judge in Ohio."

Times changed, as do social attitudes. A Negro on the bench is commonplace today. And newswriting concentrates more on the person, not the race.

Judge Perry Brooks Jackson, now on the common pleas court bench, will celebrate his 70th birthday Thursday. He will be in court that day, presiding at a murder trial.

He wants only one birthday gift: an abundance of energy to preside at trials for many more years.

At 70, every man is entitled to philosophize a little. Sitting in his court chambers last week at the close of a trial day, a desk lamp reflecting on his ever-present Phi Beta Kappa key, Judge Jackson did just that.

"Oh, I guess I have much to be thankful for," he said, "and I thank Almighty God for giving me talents, the energies and the desire for public service. For giving me the finest parents a man could want, and the most devoted wife in the world.

Throughout his life, one of his talents has been for hard work. To earn his college and law school tuition, he worked at a variety of jobs—bus boy, waiter, steel mill employee.

"Those were the days, though, when it was literally possible to work one's way through college. The tuition today makes that ideal prohibitive," the judge said.

"Of course, the money was not as good in the old days. The summers I worked in a steel mill I worked 60 hours a week, for $9.60—a week. The next summer I got a rise—to 18 cents an hour, or $10.80 a week.

As a young man with a fresh law degree in 1922, Judge Jackson tried to prove to a law school dean that a large law firm would hire a Negro.

"After about a month of job hunting, I had less than a dollar in my pocket. An uncle gave me an old desk and chair, and I started my own practice in the anteroom of another Negro lawyer's office. The dean had been correct."

In 1942, Judge Jackson said, the time was at last politically "right" for a Negro judge.

"The feeling in Columbus, however, was that because four Negroes had been previously defeated for municipal judge, it might be best to appoint a Negro to the bench, to 'prove' to the community that a Negro was capable of doing the job, so to speak.

"To be quite honest, however," the judge said, "the idea of 'the first Negro' is more often annoying than amusing. One has hardly heard of the first Italian, or the first Jew, to hold an office. Only the Negro. You only have to study the mayoral race here last November."

This "first" concept does have rewards, however, he admits.

"As a judge, and as a representative of the Negro community, I was asked to serve on many civic committees. Too many, in fact, so I was able to recommend other Negroes. You'd be surprised how quickly the white community discovers the large number of qualified people in a minority group that can do an equally good job."

The youth who came from Zanesville carrying a cardboard suitcase containing a meager supply of clothes and a few celluloid collars, was elected to three terms in municipal court and elected twice to the common pleas court bench. He will be running again this November.

The signal honor in his life was receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree from Western Reserve University, in 1961.

"I believe," he says, "that an honorary degree given by one's college is the finest award a man can receive in his lifetime. That is how I feel about mine."

He did not say so, but Judge Jackson was the first Negro awarded an honorary degree by WRU.

PIGGYBACK RAILROADING

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more interesting to observe than a new idea that grows to be a success, bringing more efficient services to the public as well as profit to those who carry out the idea.

Right after World War II, a new idea was called "Piggyback Railroading." It was a proposal that the railroad and trucking industries cooperate to their mutual benefit by the transport on the railroads of loaded trailer vans over long distances. Upon arrival at the destination, tractors would be ready to pull the trailers away to distribute the goods at various warehouses. Piggyback railroading caught on and today comprises a large part of railroad business.

Now we observe the development of another piggyback program—called piggyback marketing by the Department of Commerce, although a more accurate name would probably be cooperative exporting.

The concept is easy to understand. It refers to a situation in which the products of smaller companies ride the back and shoulders of larger, big-name companies into world markets that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to reach. The Department of Commerce acts as a middleman or clearinghouse in order to bring prospective carriers and riders together.

Just as examples, a large flour milling company exports the jams and jellies of a small businessman; and a big steel corporation markets the metal doors and frames made by a small company.

When agreements between companies are worked out, the result is new opportunities for sales and profits for businessmen, in that it permits exporting by small companies whose marketing organizations are not geared to overseas trade. It enables the big companies to broaden the product lines which they can offer overseas and to bolster their export sales.

Though the mechanics of a piggyback operation are fairly basic, the arrangements vary from company to company. The most common arrangement is simply one in which the big company buys the products of the small company outright at the best price it can get, and sells on its own terms. Other arrangements are those in which the big company buys the smaller company's product at discount or it may sell for a commission.

The carrier companies also vary in deciding what products they will market. All companies want products they can market at a profit, but in addition, some companies will market only those products which are related to their own. The piggyback process is not necessarily limited to products that round out a marketing package, however. It can involve a variety of goods whether related or unrelated.

The clearinghouse services of the Government include communicating with companies established overseas to determine if they are interested in selling a product. Then when a rider company

applies for carrier service, the Government supplies it with the names of three interested carriers and helps the rider and carrier firms arrange negotiations. To expand the efficiency and scope of the program the Department of Commerce is now setting up an automatic data processing system which will enable it to pinpoint which U.S. companies might piggyback for which rider companies. It is anticipated that the computerized system will be ready by late spring, at which time the information will be available to any American manufacturer interested in the program. The eventual agreements regarding terms and cost are privately negotiated by the companies involved, with no government participation.

All in all, piggybacking or cooperative exporting seems to have a very bright future. A firm interested in the idea either as an exporter or as one which would like to export need only contact the Assistant Director, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. The local Commerce Department field office will also furnish information regarding this program.

Through piggybacking, thousands of companies whose business is now confined to the domestic market could grow and become exporters. This would be good for them and good for the country.

A SERVICE CORPS FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join many of my colleagues in seeking to establish a National Senior Community Service Corps. Today, I introduced a bill identical to the one offered by them, that would provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps.

The Senior Corps would be established within the Administration on Aging of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and would be charged with channelling the abilities and energies of our citizens, past 60, to projects of benefit both to the elderly, to their neighbors and to our communities. Sponsors would submit programs to State agencies, now responsible for formulating plans for the elderly, for approval of the Administration on Aging. This would make Senior Corps programs a major part of State plans.

The new program would give national impetus, technical assistance and funds to programs of benefit to our elderly, their neighbors and our communities. Our older citizens represent a potent reservoir of experience, wisdom and skills that we should not allow to dry up unused. To appreciate the wealth of human values stocked in this reservoir, we have but to consider that in 1960 there were 4.6 million persons 60 years of age and over in the labor force, many of whom are now retired or about to retire. Among them were 126,000 public school teachers, 35,000 lawyers, 18,000 college faculty members, 11,000 librarians, 32,000 physicians and surgeons and 43,000 professional nurses, to mention only a few categories.

Many of these people are vigorous, enjoy good health and wish to continue actively in the lifestream of their communities. These are people who can never be happy on the shelf no matter how comfortable it may be. In our expanding economy many of the skills possessed by these people can be put to good use. We should not shut the door on these people and exclude them from participation in the life of our communities.

I suggest that a new alternative be given to these people and that alternative is embodied in the senior service concept.

America with its prodigious production capacity tends to accelerate obsolescence to the point where much of its goods are relegated to the scrap heap long before they have outlived their usefulness. We must not allow that thinking to carry over to our human material. Such values as wisdom and understanding are slow to nurture and are found mostly in people who have lived full and useful lives. They are too precious to be lightly discarded.

What is it that these people would do under my bill. Briefly, they would serve the great social needs of our communities. Two new programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity come to mind. Under their foster grandparent program men and women past 55 years are giving care and attention to very young children in hospitals. All concerned are delighted with the new mood in the children's wards. Operation Medicare Alert enlists older Americans to notify isolated elderly citizens about their social security benefits before the March 31 expiration date.

This Nation should awaken to the present waste of the energies and abilities of our older Americans and should determine to stop this waste and to put it to effective use. The number of elderly American citizens is expected to increase in the years to come. Today we have 19 million people past 65, in 20 years their number will probably rise to 25 million, an increase of 6 million.

What we as a nation do with the energy, experience, and imagination of these people could affect our course and history. This bill is an attempt to provide a partial answer.

JACK HOOD VAUGHN OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the time allotted me to pay tribute to a fellow Montanan, Jack Hood Vaughn, who recently has been named Director of the Peace Corps.

Jack Vaughn has combined unusual ability with great dedication in a long-term effort to make a contribution in the foreign affairs field. In 1961, Jack came to Washington to organize the Latin American programs of the Peace Corps. Under his direction, a program of 123 volunteers grew in 3 years to 3,000. In 1964 he was sent to Panama to serve with distinction as our Ambassador there in the difficult period following the Canal crisis.

A year later Jack was called again to Washington to serve as U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress and Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. In this job, he has made important contributions toward continuing and strengthening our efforts to assist Latin America to build institutions which can reach down to help all the people of the hemisphere. He has also distinguished himself as a brilliant envoy. He speaks fluent Spanish, acquired in his early days when he lived and studied in Mexico and even for a while he was a professional boxer. In addition, he has a very special understanding of the Latin spirit, and a great ability in that always difficult task of communication between peoples. On a recent tour of the hemisphere, cheering crowds carried him on their shoulders.

Now Jack Vaughn moves on to devote his energy and his interest in people to the Peace Corps which he helped start. His achievement stands as an example of what a dedicated man can do, and I am sure we will all benefit from the service he will render in his new assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a news item accounting his service to his job and country be printed.

THE PEACE CORPS—YANKEE, DON'T GO HOME

"Sargent Shriver," said Washington wags last week, "is only a corporal now." Shriver had not exactly been demoted, since he had been pleading for 6 months to be relieved of one of his two jobs. Finally, Lyndon Johnson decided that Shriver, who had been Director of the Peace Corps since its inception in 1961, should now devote full time to the 16-month-old Office of Economic Opportunity, which he has also headed from the start.

After assigning Shriver to the war on poverty, the Great Society program nearest his own heart, Johnson named as Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn, 45, former U.S. Ambassador to Panama and, since March 1965, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Before his ambassadorial assignment, Vaughn had directed the Peace Corps' Latin American program and will now, as Johnson said it, "return to his first love."

HAD 149 VICTORIES

A slight (5 ft. 8 in., 150 lbs.), combative redhead, Vaughn was reared in Michigan, where he spent so much of his youth boxing that he did not graduate from high school until he was 20. He won the Michigan Golden Gloves as a 124-lb. featherweight, logged 149 victories in 172 amateur and professional fights—and was never knocked out (though his nose was broken three times, his jaw once).

After graduating from the University of Michigan, Vaughn enlisted in the Marine

Corps, was twice wounded on Okinawa, and was eventually discharged as a captain. He earned his master's degree at the University of Michigan in 1947, then spent 10 years in Bolivia, Costa Rica, and Panama as a U.S. Information Service officer and coordinator of U.S. aid projects. In 1961, Shriver grabbed him. Says Vaughn: "The Peace Corps idea had great appeal to me, and the people I knew who were putting this idea into effect appealed to me even more."

BEEKEEPERS AND FISH HATCHERS

Vaughn takes over the Peace Corps as it approaches its fifth birthday. Since its first year, when there were 526 volunteers in 13 countries, the Corps has grown apace, now has 10,380 volunteers at work in 46 countries from Afghanistan to Venezuela. Its annual appropriation has risen from $30 million to this year's $114.1 million. Fifty percent of the Corpsmen are teachers, the rest are involved in rural and urban-community development, health projects, agriculture, and public works.

Nonteaching volunteers wind up as beekeepers in Cameroon, accountants in Afghanistan, architects in Tunisia, fish hatchers in Togo. Two dozen men and women volunteers live in some of the world's most scabrous slums, the hillside favelas outside Rio de Janeiro, where they run medical clinics, teach and do social work. This month, when torrential rains and landslides claimed some 200 favelados' lives in Rio, the Corpsmen helped evacuate stricken families, set up emergency health stations, staffed mass vaccination centers.

FEATHER IN THE CAP

The Peace Corps today recruits 85 percent of all volunteers directly from college—and because U.S. campuses have become hotbeds of social protest, finds itself looking for a new kind of volunteer. "We don't want beatniks," says Deputy Director Warren Wiggins, "but we have nothing against beards." The "quiet activists" that Wiggins seeks "don't carry placards. They do things like tutoring Negro school kids. They work without fanfare." In Wiggins' view, the best volunteer has "a basic service motivation, a certain flexibility, a lack of racial prejudice, a certain degree of adventurousness, a sense of idealism."

Plainly, with Shriver's departure the first handcrafted era of the Peace Corps is ended. Under his guidance, says Wiggins, "we have transited from a feather in the cap of America to a large-scale operation of sufficient human resources to be of consequence in the changing nations." Now, adds Vaughn, "its character is established. My job is to help it continue to do well." But Vaughn's task may prove tougher than it looks.

INNATE ALTRUISM

Like any other 5-year-old, the Peace Corps is experiencing growing pains. It suffers from sibling rivalry with VISTA, the domestic poverty corps directed by Shriver. Despite intensive recruiting on 1,500 U.S. campuses, an advertising campaign mounted at cost (and sometime too cutely) by a major agency, a whopping 42,068 applicants—not to mention the added inducemnet of a 2-year deferment for draft-age men—the corps in 1965 fell nearly 1,000 short of its 9,500 volunteer goal. One reason is that today's college student tends increasingly to postpone any job commitment and is often able to discover foreign lands on his own.

The truth is that joining the Peace Corps no longer has quite the glamor it once had—or seemed to have. As Samuel Babbitt, a former Peace Corps staffer and now assistant dean of the Yale Graduate School, points out, the Corps no longer holds for potential volunteers the "tremendous emotional response keyed off by the hero worship of President Kennedy."

Nonetheless, the Peace Corps still appeals to the innate altruism of American youth, and virtually every country to which volunteers have been assigned has welcomed them, asked for more, and often given singular sendoffs to homebound corpsmen who have completed their tours of duty. In a remote settlement in southern India recently, a young corpsman announced that he would soon be returning to the United States to get married. Distraught villagers tried to induce him to stay by offering him anything he might want—including his pick of the local maidens.

THE PLIGHT OF MISSISSIPPI NEGROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, 2½ hours were spent yesterday in debate on the subject of Mississippi Negroes who are now living in the delta counties. Basically I pointed out that these Negroes were hungry, in some cases homeless, and that the State of Mississippi, rather than helping, was doing everything in its power to block Federal efforts to distribute food in Mississippi.

Instead of responding to the problem, the Mississippi delegation spent their time trying to lay down a smokescreen, complete with all the tired old red herrings and diversions of Communists, agitators, Federal intervention, and so forth. They questioned my political motives, my political beliefs, my judgment, and experience. But they were not content with just attacking me by reading various derogatory newspaper columns. They had to go on to attack the National Council of Churches and its delta ministry, calling it a leftwing organization, accusing it of supporting revolutionaries, and trying to discredit this outstanding organization, whose only crime that I can see is trying to help those unfortunate Negroes who have been left virtually friendless in eight delta counties. I am happy to enter into the RECORD at this time, this statement from the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., chairman of the commission on the delta ministry:

The delta ministry is an integral part of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, set up by a resolution of its general assembly. The clergy on the staff are all clergy in good standing in their own denominations, and are vouched for by their ecclesiastical authorities. The stance of the delta ministry has to do with our identification with the poor people there and our concern for their desperate needs. These needs are increasingly urgent. They have not been dealt with by the local or Federal Government. Thus, the people are trying in any way they can to call attention to their plight. I hope and trust that the local and Federal governments will respond.

The whole proceeding yesterday reminded me of the story of the dean of the law school who was instructing a new graduate. He said: "Remember, when you do not have the law, quote the facts; when you do not have the facts, quote the law; and when you have neither, just holler." And this is exactly what the gentlemen from Mississippi did yesterday. They just hollered.

They also seemed to have developed a new disease—TV phobia.

Several times during the debate, they expressed what can only be interpreted as fear of having the TV cameras turned on Mississippi. They seemed to be deathly afraid of what the TV camera and other news media might reveal about conditions in that State.

I would like to point out to these gentlemen that from the beginning of time people who have had something to hide—and who are somehow trying to cover up their actions—are the people who have avoided public exposure.

I have nothing to fear. I have nothing to hide, and neither do the Negroes of Mississippi. So we welcome public discussion. We welcome the TV cameras. We welcome the newspaper reporters.

During the course of the debate I offered to go to Greenville with these gentlemen. My offer was ignored. I also offered to arrange a conference here in Washington with the people who have the facts—Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity and Under Secretary Schnittker of the Department of Agriculture. Again, I was ignored.

I suggest respectfully to the Mississippi delegation that they should join with me in sponsoring a House resolution calling for a special or select committee made up of Members of this distinguished body to investigate the situation in Mississippi.

After all, this is what we are here for—to learn the facts and to get the truth. Now, if I am wrong, I will be very happy to stand corrected either in Greenville, Miss., or in the offices of the administration downtown, or here on the floor of the House. If I have the wrong information, I would like to know about it. They have not refuted any of my allegations. They have not refuted my statement that the Negroes are hungry in Mississippi, but instead they tried to divert our attentions by telling us about riots in Harlem and riots in Rochester and racial violence in all sorts of places.

I recall what my grandmother said, and I thought she was a wise old woman. She said that "2 wrongs never make a right; and 5 wrongs do not make a right, and 1,000 wrongs do not make a right." No matter how many stories we hear about racial violence and wrongs in Watts and in Rochester or in Detroit, this does not detract from the fact that there are people in Mississippi that are being denied food because they are Negroes.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, told a very touching story about a Negro friend of his who would not eat certain surplus commodities and brought them to the Congressman's home. One of the items that the distinguished gentleman mentioned that his good friend brought him was cheese. I tell you, Members of this House, that the only part of the cheese that Mr. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS' friend got from Department of Agriculture surplus commodities was the holes from swiss cheese. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has not, for the past couple of years, had any cheese to distribute as surplus. Mississippi Congressmen then

turned their fire on Federal intervention. During the debate yesterday I tried to put in some figures which I thought were very cogent and interesting, because there is one type of Federal intervention that the Mississippi delegation does like. As a matter of fact, they like it so much that they have been known from time to time to request more. This is Federal intervention in the Mississippi State treasury. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] took out his part of this debate, as is his privilege, but it is also my privilege to put it back in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. RESNICK. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not do that. The only part of the debate, the only thing I took out, was the colloquy about your middle initial. That is the only thing I took out of the debate.

Mr. RESNICK. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], at the time I arrived in the Chamber, was talking about Federal intervention in the State of Mississippi, and that was not in the RECORD as I read it today. If I am proven wrong, I will apologize to him.

During the debate I did my best to point out that according to the figures that I read in a Mississippi paper—and again I stand corrected if I am wrong—in the next 2 years the budget of the State of Mississippi will have $350 million raised by local taxes. I would like to point out, also, that the vast majority of these taxes will be raised by a 4½ percent sales tax. I would also like to point out that this 4½ percent sales tax is on food as well as every other item. Mississippi is one of the few States in the Nation that taxes the food people eat. I would also like to point out that a very small part of this money is raised by personal or property taxes.

The U.S. Government in its policy of Federal intervention in the State of Mississippi will make a direct contribution of $280 million for the next 2 years. This is direct contribution. It does not count any other moneys going into the States, such as OEO programs and so on.

Now, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture figures, in fiscal 1966—and this is just 1 year—$304,540,000 will go to Mississippi in Federal farm payments. This kind of intervention is fine. But when I, as a Member of this House who has to vote on these appropriations, say something is wrong down there, this is Federal intervention of the wrong kind. You cannot have it both ways. Either Mississippi wishes to be part of the federal system or not.

The question was asked by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], Where do I get my facts on the starving Negroes and whites of Mississippi? I would like to quote Mrs. Evelyn Gandy, the State welfare commissioner of the State of Mississippi. This is a quote from the Delta Democratic Times:

> Five hundred thousand people in the State of Mississippi, both white and Negro, would benefit from food distribution.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement by any leftwinger. This is not a statement by any Communist agitator. This is not a statement by a Congressman who is supposed to have ulterior political motives. This is from the State welfare commissioner of Mississippi. And she ought to know.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to castigate the State of Mississippi. I am here simply to try to get justice for people who are crying out for justice, for people who are crying out for the most basic of all things: food. I once again ask the distinguished delegation from the State of Mississippi to join with me and see that this food gets to those who need it. If the food is not needed, I am sure that it will be turned back.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy if we could discuss this problem, honestly and privately, in Mississippi, or in Washington, or anywhere else that the distinguished gentlemen from the State of Mississippi would like to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling out to America not to be indifferent to this terrible problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of an old saying: "I am not worried about my enemies, for they can only kill me. I am not worried about my friends because they can only betray me. But I am concerned about the indifferent, for it is the indifferent that will permit my enemies to murder me and my friends to betray me."

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the American people and to the Members of this House, let us not be indifferent to these calls for help.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as I did during yesterday's debate I commend the gentleman from New York for having so forcefully brought to the attention of the House the conditions which exist in Mississippi. Congress and the American people must be awakened to these conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is especially appropriate today, as this is a most historic day for the House of Representatives. This is the second anniversary of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Two years ago, on the 10th day of February 1964, when the distinguished gentleman, who now presides over the House, was then presiding as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the debate came to a conclusion. By a vote of 290 to 130 the House of Representatives passed that historic bill.

Mr. Speaker, that vote represented the culmination of years of effort on the part of those of us who were determined that the House recognize its responsibilities in the field of civil rights. Nevertheless, that bill did not deal with other questions which remained unanswered, such as the disenfranchisement of Negroes in the South. In the following year we passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Again, this year, the House of Representatives must pass effective legislation to deal with violence and murder directed at those who are exercising their constitutional rights or assisting others to do so. And southern justice must be rendered colorblind. Legislation must be enacted to eliminate discrimination in the selection of juries in the South.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many things yet to be done to achieve full equality for all Americans. But I believe today we should recall the historic step which was taken in this body 2 years ago and commend all Members of the House who voted for that most forward step in civil rights.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in the course of the debate yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] wanted the figures as to what the State of New York received and how the State of New York fared in this Federal situation.

New York State, this coming year, will have a budget of $3.98 billion. We raise this money ourselves. In addition, we will receive only $800 million in direct Federal aid.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this represents a far cry, percentagewise, from what the State of Mississippi receives in Federal funds.

I would also like to point out that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] stated that the city of Greenville has the biggest heart of any city in the South, and if for 1 minute the Negroes were really starving and homeless, the city of Greenville would have made accommodations available to them in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, from all I can see, this is one of the longest minutes in the history of creation, because over 100 homeless Negroes, who were evicted from farms, and who have no source of income whatsoever, have been living in tents right outside the city of Greenville since last October.

Mr. Speaker, the good people of the city of Greenville must be pretty myopic if they could not see this right under their noses.

I should also like to state that another gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. PRENTISS WALKER, pointed out that a good many Negroes in Harlem and other places in the North are anxious to go back to the South because the South took such good care of them.

Let it be noted here and now that the South has taken such good care of its Negro citizens, that 650,000 of them have fled the South in the last 5 years alone. This figure is provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. This is, of course, what I believe to be the policy of the State of Mississippi. They wish that the Negroes today in the State of Mississippi and especially those in the delta counties who have become obsolete—there is no more need for them in the fields—to leave the State. They do not want them voting in the elections.

I would like to conclude by saying—justice must be done for the hungry and homeless. I invite all my colleagues, particularly those from Mississippi to join me in a supreme effort to help the needy in this time of emergency.

KOSCIUSKO DAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we honor our great American hero, Abraham Lincoln, this Saturday, it is a great coincidence that we also join on that day with Americans of Polish descent to pay honor to the memory of a celebrated hero of our American Revolution and of Poland's fight against oppressors. Today the loyal Polish-American citizens commemorate the 220th anniversary of the birth of Tadeusz Kosciusko, that great Polish soldier and patriot who gave so freely of his military genius to help George Washington develop our raw and untrained army into a telling military force.

From his earliest years, Kosciusko demonstrated a passion for independence along with unusual talents of leadership. Bereft of his beloved father at the age of 13, the boy prepared for admission and obtained a scholarship to the famous military academy in Mezieres, France. His record here was so impressive he was graduated with the rank of captain of engineering and artillery.

In the year 1776, while in Paris, Kosciusko heard much of the struggle of the American colonists for independence. He became so passionately concerned with this struggle for liberty, that he borrowed money to sail to America. Immediately after disembarking at Philadelphia in August, he applied and was accepted for military service with the American forces.

As a result of the outstanding plans which he drew for the fortification of the Delaware River, Kosciusko was commissioned a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army and subsequently to the Northern Army where he accomplished a magnificent fortification of West Point.

Later he was to see action in the battle of Charleston, S.C., where he again distinguished himself with both courage and valor as well as superior military ability.

In October of 1783 he was promoted to brigadier general and prepared to devote himself to the military needs of this new Nation. However, his concern for his own people and their struggle for a measure of independence caused him to return to his homeland. In Poland he was made a major general and led the Polish patriots in a bitter but hopeless fight.

Overwhelmed by the military and manpower of the enemy, Kosciusko fell wounded on the historic battlefield of Maciejowice. He was imprisoned in Russia. Later this brilliant military strategist and planner died of a broken heart while living in exile in Switzerland.

In spite of General Kosciusko's failures and disappointments in his later life, Americans can never forget what he did to bolster our military defenses when our own Continental Army was so close to starvation and defeat. The young Polish officer's enthusiasm, his impressive military training, and his brilliant mind gave our officers and men a much needed lift in their morale which in turn helped greatly to turn the tide of one defeat after another into a succession of victories.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our great Polish-American organizations and all our citizens of Polish origin for keeping alive the memory of Tadeusz Kosciusko so that all Americans can be reminded of the contribution of this great patriot.

By remembering Kosciusko's magnificent deeds and the accomplishments of the other great Poles who so valiantly helped this Nation to gain its independence, we find ourselves drawn closer to all our fellow Americans who so rightfully glory in their Polish heritage. It is with great pride and in the spirit of true brotherhood that we join them in saluting and lauding the memorable deeds of such an American and Polish patriot as Tadeusz Kosciusko.

MILK FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today the President has sent to the Congress his message on food for freedom. It is a challenging message in which the President said, and I quote him:

> I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

I applaud the President's purpose to make our agricultural abundance available to fight hunger and starvation in the developing world.

At the time of this bold approach abroad, it is anomalous and disappointing that at home the administration intends to cut back on both the school lunch program and the special milk program.

Through the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Government has subsidized a school lunch program since 1949 and a program of milk to school youngsters since 1955.

According to the budget submitted for the fiscal year 1967, which the President sent to the Congress on January 24, the special milk program appropriation will be cut from the current $100 to $21 million. The school lunch program will be trimmed from the $202 million figure for the fiscal year 1966 to $183 million for the fiscal year 1967.

Now the Department of Agriculture states that in the case of the special milk program, that is the program under which children buy milk during the recess period as distinguished from the milk that they get under the school lunch program itself, the cutback is an attempt to "reorient and redirect" the program so that only the needy children will get free milk while other children "pay as they drink."

The Department contends that under the program contemplated, needy children will be better taken care of.

This desire to do more for needy children is commendable, but it seems to me that this kind of distinction should not be drawn.

For the amount of money spent on either the special milk program or the school lunch program, we ought to continue to pursue a nondiscriminatory policy that provides milk and lunches to all children. Making a distinction between needy children who are eligible for free milk and those children who have to pay for their milk creates the obvious risk of stigmatizing those children who are not able to pay.

There will be needy youngsters and nonneedy youngsters attending the same schools. This is false economy. We gain so little and yet would cause irreparable harm to many youngsters.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the imposition of a means test on these programs. These programs are admirable. They have been most effective since their inception. I see no compelling reason why the programs should be cut back. If we are not doing enough for needy children now, then we should provide more money for the special milk program and not take milk from other children.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the war in Vietnam should not deprive American schoolchildren of milk and lunches.

A national economy, which the administration says can support both guns and butter, certainly can support both missiles and milk.

LEGISLATION TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN THE LAW GOVERNING COOPERATIVE HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation which is clearly needed to correct inequities in the law governing cooperative housing. In 1961, I introduced a bill to authorize a reduction in premium rates for management-type cooperatives, and this measure was enacted. Last year, I sponsored legislation to provide mutuality for cooperative housing, and this was incorporated in the Housing and Urban Devlopment Act. Yet, the premiums have never been reduced, and the new mutual fund has not been fully put into effect.

The legislation I have introduced today will make the premium reduction mandatory, and will settle the confusion and hesitation which exists in some quarters with respect to the mutuality program, thus paving the way for its effective and expeditious implementation. If ever there has been good mortgage experience, it has been with cooperative housing owners. They have contributed over $18 million to the FHA housing fund with losses amounting to less than $34,000. They deserve a break; their superlative record justifies meaningful relief.

Since the inception of their mortgage experience in 1950, owners of management-type co-ops have demonstrated their ability and determination to meet their mortgage commitments. Over the years, they have been paying the standard premium rate for FHA mortgage insurance—one-half of 1 percent—and

have thus contributed over $18 million. The ratio of premiums to losses is an amazing 568 to 1. Ordinarily, of course, good insurance experience brings about direct reduction in premiums, so 5 years ago, we authorized the FHA to reduce this premium to one-fourth of 1 percent. In August of 1964, Congressman Rains, then chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, stated that it was the expectation of the Senate-House conferees on the housing bill of 1964, that this authority would be exercised before the next housing bill was considered. Well, this time has come and gone, Mr. Speaker, and the authority has never been exercised; the premium still stands at one-half of 1 percent. I am tired of waiting for this discretionary authority to be exercised. I have, therefore, introduced a bill to require the reduction of the premium rate charged to management-type cooperatives to one-fourth of 1 percent. This fund is sound beyond doubt, and the annual savings to these families of upwards of $30, is clearly warranted.

Because of the superb record which the owners of co-ops have established, the Congress, last year, established a separate mutual fund for the cooperatives. It was our intention at that time—and I am speaking as one of the sponsors of this legislation—to create a special management fund for all management-type cooperatives, so that their premium payments, administrative costs and any losses, would be segregated from the general fund. We provided that when this management fund was sufficiently strong, the FHA would distribute shares or rebates to the co-op owners whose premiums had provided this strength. In fairness, we also stipulated that no such disbursements may be paid out until any funds which might be transferred to the management fund from the general fund, had been reimbursed.

Since that time, the question arose as to whether this reimbursement requirement applied to initial transfers to the management fund, or only to any loans which might be made to that fund by the general fund. The obvious answer is that it applies only to subsequent loans, and the FHA apparently understands this to be the case. However, lest there be any possibility of misconstruing congressional intent on this point, I introduced a bill today to make this absolutely clear. In addition, the bill provides that the Commissioner of the FHA will transfer to the new management fund, an amount equal to the premiums already paid by the co-ops which will come under that fund, minus the administrative expenses theretofore incurred. In this way, the management fund will reflect the full strength of the co-op program, right from the start.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have drafted is designed to overcome a key obstacle to the implementation of the mutuality provision we enacted last year. At that time, we amended section 213(m) of the National Housing Act to authorize the transfer of funds from the general insurance fund to the management fund, and we provided that before this transfer could be effected, the mortgagee or lender would have to consent to the transfer. There is no legal basis for requiring this consent, for it was not required in the case of other funds which were consolidated into the general fund. In any event, mortgagees have disapproved the transfer of at least 69 cooperative funds, thus thwarting the primary aim of those of us who fought for mutuality. Their disapproval of these transfers is based upon a restriction on the use of FHA debentures, which appears to me to have been a result unintended by the drafters of that provision. I therefore introduced perfecting legislation to remove this restriction. With the restriction removed, the requirement of consent is no longer appropriate and accordingly is also removed. Thus, all accounts of management-type cooperatives will be transferred into the management fund, which we established for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the sole objective of the legislation I have introduced today is to provide equitable treatment for owners of management-type cooperatives. Where a class of property holders has demonstrated over the year its determination and ability to meet its obligations, they should not be called upon to bear the brunt of the defaults of other classes of property holders less heedful of their responsibilities. Outstanding performance must be recognized and rewarded. This has been my steady purpose over the past years, and this is my purpose today. I shall exert every effort to secure the early enactment of this necessary legislation, and I invite all my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

COLD WAR GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted with the Senate acceptance of the so-called cold war GI bill of rights. This is a testament to the hard work and dedication of two men: OLIN TEAGUE, the able and beloved chairman of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, and Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the respected and learned gentleman who chairs the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs in the other body.

Chairman TEAGUE, the author of the Korean war GI bill, initiated both the interest and the legislative action on this issue 8 years ago, and I think he is truly deserving of our heartiest compliments. I know how gratified he must be to see his long years of work come to fruition, and I commend him for his steady and inspiring leadership. It has been a privilege to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee under his wise and skilled leadership.

Senator YARBOROUGH has labored long and hard for this noble objective. His leadership in the other body, and the public support he inspired, was vital to the realization of this goal. It was a privilege to witness the Senator's testimony before our committee last August. It was a remarkable presentation and clarified many aspects of this subject, contributing greatly to its success.

I think that the veterans of this country, and we in the Congress, can count ourselves fortunate that we have leaders of the caliber of these two gentleman from the Lone Star State of Texas. For without their high purpose and tenacious perseverance, this historic legislative achievement would not have been possible.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight Saturday to file reports on several bills, including H.R. 12264, 12265, 10431, 10674, 1784, and H.J. Res. 343.

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

There was no objection.

THE WORK OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, to our ornithological galaxy about Vietnam—the hawks and the doves—we now add the cuckoos.

Since Columnist Walter Lippmann is the creator of this aviary, I suggest he identify the new species by reading that lulu, the Declaration of Honolulu.

In this, without consultation with them, the American taxpayer and public pledge themselves to "the work of social revolution" in Vietnam and "to the attack on hunger, ignorance and disease" there.

These aims are laudable. I only wish we could carry them out at home. I was, however, apparently under a grand delusion: I thought we were fighting with arms to defeat Communist armed intervention in South Vietnam.

With due respect to all concerned, I can only say that this compulsion by the administration to support the whole world is a real bird.

BUTTER AS WELL AS GUNS TO THE VIETNAMESE FIGHTING THE COMMUNIST INVADERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Honolulu is a true lulu.

The American taxpayer is now pledged to give butter as well as guns to the Vietnamese fighting the Communist invaders. We are pledged to "social revolution" in Vietnam at the same time the administration has cut the school milk program for needy American boys and girls for fiscal 1967 from $30 million way down to $21 million. This is declared to be an austerity move in connection with Vietnam. This is what we used to call playing up to a neighbor while starving your own family.

This is the first practical step by which, through the Federal Government, the American taxpayers are going to raise the standard of living of the whole world. Let us hope this does not end up as such efforts usually do in lowering the standard of living in our own country.

The administration took what its spokesmen concede, is a calculated gamble in trying to produce both Federal guns and Federal butter here at home. Apparently someone forgot our kids would have to give up the milk to make the butter.

I suggest this financial irresponsibility, this making the taxpayer, without asking him, finance a world "revolution," is opposed to everything usually regarded as American.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS COMMITTED THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER TO FINANCING A SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, now that the administration has committed the American taxpayer to financing a social revolution in Vietnam, I wonder how they are going to make sure our social aid of millions or billions does not help the Vietcong.

If there are any true experts on Vietnam, the results to date there do not show it. But I have read in various publications, and in statements by our military, that one of the problems in South Vietnam is that the Vietcong are shooting at our American men one day and peacefully hoeing the primitive fields the next after burying for the time their weapons.

Do our Far Eastern wizards have some way of making sure that most of our taxpayers' money will not reach these farmers so peaceful one day and killing Americans and the innocent in Vietnam the next?

It has been noted that we have been pouring $600 million down the social rathole in Vietnam and the Vietcong still fight.

Anyway, I thought it was the Soviet Union that fostered world revolution, not the United States. Are our taxpayers to be treated like serfs and called upon to pay and pay and pay to help foreigners to a revolution without being consulted, let alone having a chance to vote?

BIG MEETING OF THE BRASS IN HONOLULU

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, we had a big meeting of the brass in Honolulu to deal with the rice paddy branch of the Great Society. A joint pledge was made for a "revolution"—a "social revolution"—which we are to finance.

This is the first practical demonstration we have had of committing the American taxpayer to pay for raising living standards through Government aid in all parts of the world. Outside of the fact that this could well break even this rich country, I find the idea of our conducting "social revolutions" and financing them abroad rather frightening.

I should like to point out that the administration has been pouring $600 million of your money and mine into social reform in Vietnam and, as far as I can learn, the Vietcongs have not even been driven from the south of Vietnam yet.

Maybe if we pour in more of what the administration clearly regards as our unlimited resources, the Communists will not just hold their own but will win in Vietnam. The loser so far, anyway, is the American taxpayer who is tapped daily for some new giveaway.

ADEQUACY OF U.S. SHIPPING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the first 3 days of House Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings on the adequacy of U.S. shipping in respect to Vietnam have been informative and enlightening. I am confident that these hearings ordered by the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], will focus attention on the broader question of the sufficiency of the American merchant marine in relation to its ability to carry our ocean-borne commerce and assume the burden of military logistical support when called upon.

The U.S. public must take a greater interest in our merchant marine. More people must seek answers to why American-flag ships carry less than 9 percent of our goods today and why we rank 12th among shipbuilding nations of the world.

I must, in all candor, say that I was amazed at the budget request for appropriations for only 11 to 13 ships for fiscal year 1967 under the Federal ship construction program. In view of the possibility of a long drawn-out conflict in southeast Asia and other U.S. commitments throughout the world, this meager budget request seems incomprehensible. In 1959 the Maritime Administration recommended a level of 20 ships per year. Surely our needs today are not less. In 1961, 31 contracts for ships were awarded; by 1965 this figure had dropped to 14 ships.

There are few if any members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who agree with the recommendations of the Interagency Maritime Task Force—comprised of representatives of nine Federal agencies—calling for a drastic curtailment of the ship construction program and for building of American ships in foreign shipyards. In my opinion such a policy would be self-defeating and neither in the interests of our maritime industry nor our country.

Mr. Thomas Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was a witness today at the Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings. Mr. Gleason has visited Vietnam on at least two occasions at the request of our Government. He testified that new ships can be unloaded 100 percent quicker than the old Victory ships and at 100 percent less cost to U.S. taxpayers. In reply to a question I addressed to him regarding the cut in ship construction funds that would allow no more than 13 new ships for fiscal 1967, Mr. Gleason commented:

> The Egyptians build more than 13 ships per year.

The distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], a member of the subcommittee, has spoken of the reserve fleet as a "pile of iron" that "cannot be activated fast enough."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot consider one phase of the plight of our U.S. merchant marine without considering the total picture. There must be speedy and drastic action to preserve the American merchant marine, to strengthen it, and to improve upon its quality. Certainly we have some of the most modern and up-to-date ships afloat, but we must look at the entire fleet and act accordingly. It has been my personal opinion for many years that the so-called runaway flag device should be curbed and many more cargo vessels should be built each year in U.S. shipyards with help from the U.S. Government.

The President of the United States in his 1965 state of the Union message pledged that he would recommend a new policy for our merchant marine. I sincerely hope that the Chief Executive will now consider it timely to introduce a bold new program calling for more U.S.-built ships of the highest quality, equipped with the most up-to-date equipment.

END U.S. DISCRIMINATION ABROAD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the President to end the religious discrimination practiced in the assignment of U.S. employees to some overseas posts. This outrageous practice is preventing assignment of qualified Jewish employees to U.S. posts in Arab bloc countries.

For several months I have been investigating this matter and my inquiries have now produced an admission of the administration's discriminatory practice in a letter which I have received from the Department of State.

By its demonstrated willingness to go along with the anti-Semitism practiced by these Arab bloc countries when assigning U.S. personnel abroad, the administration is guilty of following a double standard, properly outlawing discrimination by private employers at home but improperly discriminating in assigning its own employees abroad.

The Department of State informs me that:

> While the United States does not normally take into account the religion of its employees in assigning them for duty abroad, this is regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control however much we disagree with them. The United States tries not to assign any employee to a country where he will be unacceptable to the host government.

U.S. military and civilian employees are required to state their religion when applying for a visa to enter Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic. The State Department advises me that "a person of the Jewish faith might not be allowed to enter these countries."

The administration defends its discriminatory practice by pointing out that any government can refuse to accept an employee officially assigned by another government through the simple expediency of declaring him persona non grata.

The deplorable discrimination practiced by the administration in the assignment of U.S. employees to Arab bloc countries is a national disgrace. The people of this Nation can be justifiably outraged to learn that this administration has been practicing religious discrimination in the assignment of Government employees.

I have asked the President today to immediately advise all Government departments and agencies that no religious tests or distinctions will be tolerated in the travel or overseas assignment of Government employees.

A much-needed change of attitude by the administration might do a great deal to curb the effect of these anti-Semitic travel sanctions on U.S. citizens and employees.

The United States should refuse to respect the discriminatory restrictions which these nations seek to impose, not honor them. U.S. leadership in this matter might well attract widespread support from other nations.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in requesting most vigorously that President Johnson stop this discrimination at once.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point to insert an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer relating the disturbing case of a constituent, Edward P. Hunt, of Bala-Cynwyd, Pa. Mr. Hunt was fired from his job with the U.S. Army-Air Force Exchange Service last year when he refused to sign an anti-Israeli visa sought by the Libyan Government. He was reinstated with full back pay after I protested the firing to Defense Secretary McNamara.

PENTAGON BOWS ON BIAS PROTEST—AREA MAN WINS VISA CASE

WASHINGTON, November 13.—Congressional protests have won reinstatement and back pay for a graduate of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia who was fired from his civilian job with a Pentagon agency for refusing to sign a visa declaration requested by the Libyan Government.

Edward P. Hunt, 31, would not sign because he regarded the declaration as anti-Jewish. "I just feel that discrimination against any religious group is wrong," he said.

TAUGHT TOLERANCE

Hunt is a Roman Catholic, one of 11 children of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Hunt, of 138 Union Avenue, Bala, Lower Merion Township. From his earliest years, he said, his parents taught him to respect the religious beliefs of others, even though they differed from his own.

Adherence to this teaching received perhaps its most severe test for Hunt last spring when he arrived at Nuremberg, Germany, on his way to Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya as a food management specialist of the Army-Air Force Exchange Service.

As related by Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who helped him win ultimate vindication, Hunt was asked in Nuremberg to sign a Libyan visa application containing the following statement:

"And I know that in case of obtaining any Israeli visa my visa to Libya will be considered invalid."

REFUSES TO SIGN

He refused, on the grounds that signing would make him party to the antireligious conviction of the Libyan Government toward Israel. Libya is a predominantly Moslem country.

SCHWEIKER said Hunt was warned he would be fired if he refused to sign the application. Citing his religious beliefs, Hunt withheld his signature and asked for a hearing. He got, instead, formal notice of his discharge from Brig. Gen. John D. Hintes, commanding general of the European Exchange System.

Returning to the United States at his own expense, Hunt told his story to SCHWEIKER at his office here on May 20. The Congressman wrote a letter of protest to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. Senators HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, also protested.

As a result, Hunt was notified in July he had been reinstated and was reimbursed his 2 months of lost pay, his travel expenses and the cost of shipping his car home from Libya. His point made, Hunt resigned and is now working for Automatic Retailers of America-Slater as manager for food and beverage service at the Davos Ranch Resort at Woodridge, N.Y.

EXPLAINS STAND

Interviewed by telephone at Woodridge, Hunt explained why he refused to sign the application.

"I just feel that discrimination against any religious group is wrong," he said. "I feel a particular affinity for the Hebrew faith because of its similarities to my own faith, the faith in which I was brought up."

Hunt said he has "great respect" for the Moslem faith as well, but believes its practitioners should neither persecute nor be persecuted.

"This goes back to when I was 7 or 8 years old," Hunt said. "During Lent my mother would tell me to stop in at church and say a prayer. Often I would stop at a Hebrew synagogue instead.

"I didn't see any difference then and I don't see the difference now."

COUSIN IS CHAPLAIN

Hunt's father operates an electrical contracting business. He has several cousins in the religious life, including Commander John O'Connor, a Navy chaplain recently decorated for his service in Vietnam.

Hunt was graduated from St. Joseph's College in 1956 with a major in political science, and had 8 years in the restaurant industry in this country before signing on with the Army-Air Force Exchange Service in September 1964.

The service operates post exchanges at U.S. military bases.

Hunt was assigned to Fort Knox, Ky., until January of this year, when he was transferred to Fort Belvoir, Va., for training before his assignment overseas.

A bachelor, Hunt said he signed on with the exchange service out of a desire to travel and also to broaden his professional experience.

There were times, he admitted, when he wondered whether he had made the wisest of choices. Particularly when he found himself several thousand miles from home—jobless at the command of an Army general.

PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE JOB CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I addressed this House with reference to problems in the administration of the Job Corps, as illustrated especially by a case in Mountain Home, Idaho. Although two of our colleagues, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman COMPTON WHITE, and the gentleman from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, have adroitly answered with a smoke screen, both of these gentlemen and the Job Corps have admitted the truth of the important facts we presented. I regret that they chose to conceal these admissions amidst a rain of ill-conceived and unfounded charges that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I are misrepresenting an isolated case to undermine the Job Corps. I will not reply in kind because I have great respect for my colleagues. Let me simply say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I were proposing the Job Corps concept before either of these worthy gentlemen were in Congress and we have consistently advocated the merits of a sensible Job Corps program.

NOT AN ISOLATED CASE

I shall recount later in my remarks the specific admissions camouflaged by these gentlemen, but let me first deal with their charge that the Mountain Home incident

is an isolated case. Far from it. I shall cite today only a few of the large number of cases from all over the country.

CAMP GARY, TEX.

Last July, three Job Corps enrollees in Camp Gary, were charged with shooting two Air Force policemen. Having been booked for assault with intent to murder, they were returned to regular duty in the camp. Job Corps officials hired three separate lawyers to defend the enrollees and the case has not yet come to trial due to delays and "absence of key witnesses."

CAMP BRECKENRIDGE

In August last year a Job Corpsman on leave in Billings, Mont., was charged with shooting at a policeman and wounding a woman in a Billings bar. Job Corps officials not only posted a $2,500 bond and are paying for an attorney, they have flown the enrollee and a security guard back and forth from Camp Breckenridge, Ky., to Billings at least twice and perhaps more. The case has still not come to trial and the corpsman remains an enrollee in Camp Breckenridge. The apparent estimate of cost in this case is a minimum of $1,000 to the taxpayers and perhaps a great deal more. Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, was quoted as saying:

> The idea of the Job Corps in my opinion is a great idea, but this incident is wrong and really burns me up.

The Senator continues:

> These dropouts and malcontents are being coddled and complimented for their derogatory behavior.

KINGSPORT, TENN.

In December a warrant was issued in Kingsport, Tenn., against two young men for allegedly bludgeoning two victims with a lead pipe. They left the town that morning for two Illinois Job Corps camps before the warrant could be served.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on with examples of this nature. Job Corps camps are, and should be, for hard core youngsters, many of whom have had brushes with the law. They need sympathetic understanding. They also need to learn discipline and social values such as respect for law and order. The present policy of Job Corps officials too often undermines this whole purpose.

MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO

In the Mountain Home case, my two colleagues and the Job Corps have now openly admitted the following devastating facts:

First. An enrollee named Paul Dennis Jones did attack a fellow corpsman with a deadly weapon in a Job Corps dormitory.

Second. Jones was a three-time felony loser, including conviction for attempted murder.

Third. Job Corps screening procedures are so haphazard that they had no idea of Jones' previous record when they took him in the Job Corps.

Fourth. Jones was in a capacity of leadership in the Mountain Home Camp, serving as dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader.

Fifth. The Job Corps does not deny that the victim of the assault was drummed out of the Job Corps by friends of Jones.

Sixth. The Job Corps did pay for an attorney and apparently for psychiatric treatment. A maximum of $50 of this cost may be deducted from the enrollee's readjustment allowance, the rest to be paid from Job Corps funds.

Seventh. Job Corps officials from Washington did telegraph the court that they would accept Jones back in the Job Corps. This was done at the time of sentencing by the court, when the full probation report showing his previous convictions was certainly available. Job Corps officials blithely claim that even at that time, when they agreed to accept Jones back, they knew nothing of his previous felony record.

Eighth. The Job Corps still has no procedure for screening applicants with felony records so that they can conform to parole and probation requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the latter point raises one of the silliest of the answers apparently given to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], by Job Corps officials. I quote my colleague:

> There is no national file of parolees or juvenile offenders; and there is no way, except for a prohibitively costly security check, in which every facet of an applicant's life can be checked.

I would inform my colleague and the Job Corps that every State maintains records of parolees and probationers in a bureau of identification. In addition, if applicants were fingerprinted, as every inductee in the military service is fingerprinted, felony records could be checked overnight with the FBI. This is done constantly by sheriffs and police officials in our smallest communities around the country.

Mr. Speaker, when the Job Corps takes an applicant who has a felony record, they should know about it. The Job Corps has a direct responsibility to work out provisions so that they are not a party to removing parolees and probationers from States, thereby violating State law. I am informed that the Council of State Governments has been unsuccessfully trying to work out this matter with the Job Corps. It should be done immediately. The cases the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I have cited are but a few of the many that have occurred in the Job Corps. They are not isolated instances. They are established policy of the Job Corps.

I am aggrieved that our two colleagues chose to slash back blindly and personally when we brought the Mountain Home case to the attention of the House. Our statements were based solidly on facts compiled by the attorney general of Idaho, Mr. Allan Shepard, and a large number of other officials in Idaho, including the prosecuting attorney, Mr. Fred Kennedy, who told me he had reviewed the attorney general's memo and approved it. As I stated to the House on Tuesday, the prosecuting attorney wanted it made clear that Job Corps officials cooperated with him fully after he refused to return Jones to the Mountain Home Camp for administrative action.

I include at this point in the RECORD the full memorandum of facts given to us by Idaho officials, along with an excerpt from Bulletin No. 66-40 of the Job Corps, relating to legal services for corpsmen in Job Corps conservation centers:

DECEMBER 31, 1965.

This memorandum is written at the combined suggestions of certain persons who attended a meeting recently in the office of Mr. Sylvan Jeppesen, U.S. attorney. In attendance were Mr. Fred Kennedy, prosecuting attorney for Elmore County, Mr. L. E. Clapp, warden of the Idaho State Penitentiary, Mr. Mark Maxwell, vice chairman of the board of corrections, Mr. Al Roard, parole and probation officer, Mr. Bill Lesh, of the Employment Security Agency, Mr. Allen G. Shepard, attorney general of the State of Idaho and his two assistants.

Mr. Jeppesen stated that he had been requested by Senator CHURCH to attend said meeting, which was called primarily at the instance of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Clapp.

The discussion involved a recent criminal incident at the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho. It was the consensus of those present at the meeting that the entire congressional delegation should be informed both as to the circumstances and the thinking of the group regarding corrective action which should be taken.

On or about November 15, 1965, a vicious fight took place in one of the dormitories of the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home. Said assault allegedly took place as a result of Truley Tillman, a corpsman, playing a radio in a manner disturbing to the other occupants of the dormitory. The dormitory leader, one Paul Dennis Jones, brutally beat Truley Tillman about the head and face. While sitting astride the prone body of Tillman, Jones produced a knife and slashed Tillman about the face and hands, and then plunged the knife into the abdomen of Tillman inflicting a wound of approximately 2½ inches in depth.

The matter was reported almost immediately to Mr. Kennedy as county prosecutor. Because of the question of Federal enclave, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been called. An FBI investigator was dispatched to the scene that night, interrogated Jones and obtained from him a statement admitting participation in the assault. Mr. Kennedy was approached that night by officials of the Job Corps, who attempted to convince Mr. Kennedy that there should be no criminal proceedings filed against Jones and he should be released to the Corps for administrative action. No person in the Job Corps camp, either corpsmen or official, would sign the criminal complaint against Jones for assault with a deadly weapon, and Mr. Kennedy was, therefore, required to sign the complaint himself.

It was necessary to issue subpenas and require attendance of Job Corps witnesses in court. The Job Corps officials, through their Washington, D.C., office, hired Mr. Robert Rowett, an attorney at Mountain Home, to represent the accused at Federal expense.

At the hearing held therein, Jones entered a plea of guilty to assault with a deadly weapon, and as is usual in such cases, the district judge deferred imposing sentence pending presentence investigation.

At the hearing for sentencing, officials from the Job Corps camp were present. A telegram from the Job Corps headquarters in Washington, D.C., was submitted to the court, which requested that the judge place Jones on probation and affirmatively stated that if said Jones were placed on probation by the court he would be accepted by the Job Corps and returned to the Job Corps camp.

In the course of the presentence investigation, it was determined that Jones is a three-time loser on felony charges, having been

convicted and served sentences in California State correctional institutions. The criminal record of Jones can be summarized as follows: At the age of 16, he attempted to kill two persons by firing nine shots from a revolver. He was admitted to the California Fort Springs Boy's Camp. In 1962 he was convicted of auto theft and received a jail sentence and 3 years probation. Later in 1962, he was convicted of auto theft and sentenced to an additional 2 years probation. In 1963, he was adjudged a parole violator, convicted of another auto theft and sentenced to the Soledad Correctional Institution. In 1964, he was paroled and on September 8, 1965, was arrested for driving with a revoked or suspended driver's license, and served a total of 25 days in jail.

At the time of his induction into the Job Corps, he was, and still remains a parolee of California correctional system. Idaho, as are all States, is a member of the Interstate Compact on Parole and Probations. Under the terms of said compact, each State agrees that it will not permit one of its parolees or probationers to move to another State's jurisdiction without, in advance, informing the receiving State of such desire and making arrangements for the supervision of such parolee or probationer by the receiving State during the balance of parolee or probationer's time. No such notification was received by the State of Idaho, or its board of corrections from either the State of California or the Job Corps. We were informed that said Jones, while at the Job Corps camp, was made a supervisor of other corpsmen in three capacities: Dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader which would indicate he had rather close supervision of other corpsmen.

Mr. Kennedy has further stated that he has received practically no cooperation from fellow job corpsmen witnesses in investigating or processing the defendant for what is obviously a serious crime in the felony category. This, in spite of the fact that the defendant was a three-time convicted felon and but for extremely fortunate circumstances, his latest victim would have died.

One of the eyewitnesses to the assault, another corpsman, called by Mr. Kennedy to testify under oath, refused to state that he had seen the assault with the knife, although standing within 3 feet of the scene. Mr. Kennedy states that he is convinced that this witness is guilty of outright perjury. The victim of the assault was so mistreated and threatened by friends of Jones that he has now resigned from the Job Corps and has left the State of Idaho.

Jones was recently brought before the Third District Court in Boise for sentencing, at which time Job Corps officials and his lawyer, Mr. Rowett, also appeared. The district judge, Hon. J. Ray Durtschi, withheld sentence on Jones and placed him on probation for 2 years, with the condition that he serve 4 months in jail, and then return to the Job Corps. A further condition was that he receive psychiatric treatment.

I am sure I reflect the consensus of the group in stating that the concept of the Job Corps and the philosophy which led to its establishment is laudable in every respect. Such provides an opportunity for underprivileged youth to be trained for work and obtain necessary education. We think it is obvious that a group of young people in the 16 to 21 age bracket, most of whom are lacking in education and in the opportunity to compete in our society, are perhaps the most highly impressionable group of persons who could be assembled. Many of them have already had minor brushes with the law. I cannot think of a greater tragedy than having such a group of young people exposed to what is obviously a vicious and mentally disturbed person. To compound the problem, such a person was placed in a position of authority and responsibility over these same highly impressionable corpsmen.

We feel from this incident can be drawn the obvious conclusion that the screening process of the Job Corps is at times, at least, a complete failure. We are informed that the officials at the local Job Corps camp are unable to, or have not determined how many, if any, of their corpsmen are on a present active status of parole or probation from other States. The State board of corrections is reasonably positive that such situations exist and in conformance with the interstate compact, are desirous of being informed of the existence of parolees and probationers from other States who are presently residing within Idaho. We feel this is particularly necessary since we are informed that the Job Corps has no interest in the supervision of parolees or probationers.

We also feel it pertinent to point out that the officials of the State of Idaho concerned with supervising probationers and parolees have had very fine cooperation with the armed services regarding such supervisory problems.

It is also the consensus of the group that the basic concept of a Job Corps, as announced to the public at large, was not to provide rehabilitation institutions for criminals. The public acceptance of the Job Corps locations was, we felt, based on the asserted purpose of the Job Corps as providing training and education for underprivileged young people who deserved an opportunity.

From my own personal standpoint, and while I may not reflect the concensus of the group, I must state that I am highly shocked and indignant at the use of Federal moneys to furnish legal counsel, bail, psychiatric evaluation and treatment, etc., to an accused, regardless of whether he be a Federal employee, State employee or whatever.

As you know, our system of criminal justice in the State of Idaho for many years has required the appointment of legal counsel for indigent defendants and the reports of our supreme court are replete with opinions stating that the failure to fully and fairly advise an accused of his right to legal counsel, and to furnish such counsel, constitutes the deprival of constitutional rights. I seriously question the existence of any statutory authorization for such expenditure of Federal funds. Such certainly has never been the case in regard to armed services personnel and I can see no difference between the furnishing of counsel to a job corpsman, Federal employee, and the furnishing of legal counsel to a mailman, a U.S. attorney, an elevator operator in a post office building or a U.S. Senator, any one of whom could be charged with murder or an attempted murder.

We sincerely believe that these matters demand your attention and investigation, if the Job Corps is to continue to have the public confidence and carry out the very laudable program for which it was designed.

I should add that Mr. Kennedy some time ago, wrote to the Director of the program, Mr. Sargent Shriver, relative to the problems discussed herein, and has not, as yet, received the courtesy of a reply.

ALLAN G. SHEPARD,
Attorney General,
State of Idaho.

EXCERPTS FROM THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BULLETIN NO. 66-40

It is Job Corps policy to provide legal services to corpsmen faced with criminal proceedings. The Job Corps is intensely interested in protection of the rights of corpsmen at all times from the moment they are enroute to Job Corps conservation centers for initial assignments until they are discharged.

Attorney's fees shall be deducted from the corpsman's readjustment allowance at a rate of $5 per hour for time expended in a judicial proceeding and $3 per hour for time expended in office consultation and preparation. The total amount thus deducted from the corpsman's readjustment allowance shall not exceed $50 in any case. The difference between the corpsman's contribution to his legal defense payments and the actual fees of the attorney will be paid by Job Corps up to the limits of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964. Reasonably necessary expenses incurred by the attorney in handling the case will be reimbursed by the Job Corps, but will not be charged to the corpsman.

When a corpsman is faced with criminal proceedings, the center director should retain an attorney to represent him.

* * * * *

Provide the corpsman with the opportunity to select an attorney of his choice, and inform the corpsman that fees will be deducted from his readjustment allowance at the rate of $5 per hour for time expended in a judicial proceeding and $3 per hour for time expended in office consultation and preparation, up to the $50 limit. If the corpsman refuses an attorney on this basis, the center director should attempt to have an attorney supplied by a local legal service organization or appointed by the court. In any case where a corpsman is faced with criminal proceedings, the center director should immediately notify Job Corps Operations Center by teletype.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Is it not true that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], were not basically opposed to the principle of fighting poverty? I know that the gentlemen are interested in the battle against poverty. Their opposition, therefore, is not on the basis of principle but on the basis of the administration of the program, the way it is put together, and the manner in which it was pushed through the Congress, as well as the manner in which the administration was attempting to rush this through—partially for political gain. Is that a good summation?

Mr. GOODELL. It certainly is. I thank the gentleman for that observation; and I would document this with the fact that both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I, proposed a residential skills center on an experimental basis as early as 1961. We proposed it then as an amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Act.

I have long believed that there is a place for this kind of training center, for youngsters requiring a change of environment in order to respond to education and training. We wanted it done at that time, in 1961, on an experimental basis, and then to extend this experience into a broader national program.

We were opposed in that effort by the administration and by the leadership of the committee at that time. Subsequently, in 1963, we were able to get a residential skills center as an amendment to the Vocational Education Act, which was landmark legislation in 1963. It would have provided for a major installation here in the District of Columbia and in several other metropolitan areas.

Once again, however, the administration did not fund this program, so that it never got off the ground.

In 1964 the poverty program started mass production of Job Corps camps,

without the benefit of the experience that would have prevented many of these problems.

I will say to the gentleman that I strongly favor the Job Corps concept, and I think Mr. QUIE and I have proven this by our record.

We also proposed preschool and early school training as early as 1961. This was before it derived its name from our gracious first lady of Headstart, when it was put in as a part of the poverty program in 1964.

From 1961 through 1963 we were trying to get such a program funded federally through our States and our educational system. I believe this has been essentially a successful program despite some administrative problems with it, but we could not get it until 1964 in the Poverty Act when it was put in as a part of the community action program. Unfortunately, because it was put in there, they are not getting enough funds and we will not be able to fund anywhere near all of the applications for Headstart in the coming year. There are something like $650 million in applications for Headstart pending. In the President's new budget he has put $260 million for this, which will fund about half of these programs out of the poverty program.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Is it not also true, aside from the point you have mentioned, that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], were instrumental in developing many amendments that were opposed during the writing of this bill, which were automatically defeated by the other side of the aisle for reasons that are difficult to understand, due to the fact that not enough time was given to a study of these amendments? Was it the feeling of the gentleman from New York, that this was true?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from California is too modest. He served on the same committee. He also prepared and offered a great many amendments in the committee and on the floor with reference to the poverty program when it was originally proposed and debated in 1964. The gentleman is absolutely correct. At that time there was a feeling prevailing in this Congress that we could not change the poverty program at all. They had to take what the President offered us without constructive change of any nature. Democrats and Republicans had amendments turned down in the committee on this basis. Subsequently. in 1965, when many of us were concerned about the problems that had developed, and which incidentally we had been warning of in the original debate, we were still unable to get constructive amendments properly considered in the committee or on the floor. They were voted down almost automatically.

Mr. BELL. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not true there were some amendments proposed, and the one that comes to mind is the one referred to as the "three-legged stool," under which certain members of the poverty areas would be represented on the various committees?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

Mr. BELL. These proposals were made, but were defeated in committee. They were the very proposals that would have precluded the controversy over representation of the poor. As I recall it, it was proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. Mr. QUIE offered a specific amendment in committee and offered it again on the floor of the House. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], offered one on the floor, also, to require participation of the poor at the policy-making level. Mr. QUIE's amendment was to require at least one-third of the representatives on the community action board to be selected by, and representative of, the poor themselves. This amendment was turned down by the other side of the aisle with the words that it was not necessary. I think the history of the poverty program since those amendments were offered proves how necessary they were. We could have avoided a great deal of difficulty, and the waste of human resources and monetary resources which occurred, if we had taken that amendment at that time.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. I take it that the gentleman is offering constructive criticism of Job Corps operations.

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly am. I want it taken in that spirit. I think that the original speech that Mr. QUIE and I made on Monday was constructive in this respect. We pointed out how much we believe in the Job Corps concept if it is done properly. We are very concerned at the philosophy which we think now permeates the administration of the Job Corps in this respect.

Mr. TODD. Would the gentleman agree, with a massive need such as we have in terms of education of the boys who need help, that we need a massive program? And, of course, to develop a massive program we realize that we need new concepts of education and that we require patience, understanding, and a degree of imagination? We have to try this, and if this does not succeed, we have to try that. Really, time is going to be the test of whether this is the most successful and most economical and most helpful way for the boys to become productive and responsible members of society. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree very wholeheartedly with the concept of experimentation and demonstration. I agree that the Job Corps offers a very significant opportunity here to help youngsters who need help in helping themselves. I strongly support this concept. As I said in my earlier remarks, I wish that in 1961, when Mr. QUIE and I were proposing this on an experimental basis, we had been able to get the votes and the support of the administration. Then we could have had experience in some of these camps before we launched into mass production of camps. But the point of my remarks and those of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] on Monday is that we should get this back on the track now. There are demonstrated mistakes being made by the Job Corps officials in their training and in their selection of enrollees. One of the worst things that is happening is the haphazard screening process when they take these enrollees. As the gentleman is perhaps aware, I was the author of the Manpower Development and Training Act that was substituted here on the floor of the House in 1962. We have many facets of that program that are available to young people 16 to 22.

Then, we expanded it the following year on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, there should be an evalution of each youngster in order to see if he can best perform some of this kind of work in his home environment under manpower or other programs, or if he should be transferred to a Job Corps camp elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps policy is to send these boys a long way from their home. There should be a very careful evaluation to determine if this is the best thing for a particular youngster. That kind of careful evaluation, coordinated with other programs, is not being followed today. It is a very haphazard operation.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. Is it my understanding that the Job Corps does have such an evaluation program underway, and that they do hope to make some determinations in order to determine whether it is advisable to send boys as far away as they do at the present time? In my consideration this is still an open question, and it is difficult to resolve, I believe, because of the very nature of the program. We cannot say whether or not this or that is a correct answer as to the course we may have to follow within the next year or two. We would like to have more reliable figures and other data on which to act in order to come to that judgment.

Mr. GOODELL. I will concede that in any large program of this nature one could expect some mistakes to be made in any event in the screening and the assignment of these boys. But in this instance there is really no good, acceptable screening procedure being followed by the Job Corps.

This case that I cited of the three-time felony loser who was taken to the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho, is a case well in point. This boy was put into a position of leadership over other boys. This represents a good example of what I am talking about, because the Job Corps officials, when we pointed this out to them on the floor of the House on Monday, responded that they had no idea that he was on parole. We said "Why can you not check this kind of thing? You certainly can find out if a man has been convicted three

times as a felon. We have all of the fingerprint records in the FBI to which you can go." The Job Corps said that they do not fingerprint these boys. But we do fingerprint all of the inductees who are taken into the military service. I do not feel that these young men who are taken into the Job Corps are any better than the average boy who serves his country in the military service. I do believe that it is a very simple procedure to determine an applicant's criminal record. I do not say that they should automatically bar people who have a felony record from the Job Corps camps. However, I believe they ought to know about that record. Proper experts ought to assess this problem fully before they induct a man into the Job Corps. Their haphazard kind of screening is very well illustrated by the Mountain Home case. However, we obviously have many, many other examples of this kind of thing, not quite as extreme as the case at Mountain Home. The Job Corps by their selection procedures cannot even tell how many fugitives from justice they have in their camps, perhaps leading the other enrollees with official authority.

The Job Corps officials finally responded by saying:

> We were referred this man Jones from the California Employment Security Office, and they never told us that he had a felony record.

This clearly illustrates the fact that the Job Corps officials do not have a screening procedure themselves. They apparently just said to the office in California "Send us some young men that you think will work out in a Job Corps program," and the employment service did so. It is not the obligation of the employment service to find out if a man has a felony record, but it should be the responsibility of the Job Corps.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. I would like to comment to the effect that I, too, believe that we should offer constructive criticism to the operations of the Job Corps. I feel that this has been one of my responsibilities. I have tried to offer my suggestions in a constructive manner. I am well aware of some of the administrative problems which they have had. I think these problems have been most difficult in some cases. I think they could have solved them more rapidly and with a much better effect on the community involved.

But at the present time I am inclined to believe that these problems—at least, those with which I am familiar—are well on their way to being behind us. I believe that in the last year the Job Corps with which I am familiar has made great progress, and that there is a reasonable expectation that it will fulfill its important duties.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Michigan, and I wish I were as optimistic as he is about this. However, I see no indication at this point, from the highest level of the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Job Corps, that they are going to change the present policy of handling situations such as that described at Mountain Home, where this assault occurred. They are defending it. They are not admitting any mistakes, except one: "We did not know he had three felony convictions on his record." However, they took Jones into the Job Corps and when this situation came to light they threw up their arms and said: "How are we to know? How could we possibly know?"

Mr. Speaker, any village police chief of this country could tell them how to find out about felony records, and if they do not know how to do this, they are not competent to be in charge of the Job Corps in this country.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for the study which he has made of the poverty program in the last 2 years. I also commend him for his efforts throughout the country to bring out the difficult problems that this program faces as a result of poor administration and the poor wording of the bill in its conception.

I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of his efforts, we may bring some changes in this legislation through sound amendments.

Then perhaps we may all share some of the optimism of the gentleman on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made to the House of Representatives with respect to this situation. To me it is incredible that there should be, especially in any Job Corps camp, a leader of young men who is a three-time loser on felony convictions. This is unpardonable. It is inexcusable to put that kind of a leader over young men who have clean records. I am unable to understand why the administration of the Job Corps is so lax that this sort of thing can possibly happen.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. Let me say that the stock answer that has been given to that is that we are harping on an isolated case. Unfortunately, the tragic thing about it is that it is not an isolated case. The Job Corps by its own admission has said they could have hundreds of felony violators in the Job Corps camps because they do not know whether the Job Corps enrollees have felony records or not. They do not know whether they are on probation or on parole in a State. The obligation under parole or probation is to remain in a State under supervision.

The Job Corps goes in and solicits young men and takes them out to a Job Corps camp somewhere else, where they are in violation of parole. The Job Corps officials then come back, and my two colleagues come back, and say that the Job Corps did not violate the interstate compact on parole and probation. The Federal Government is not a party to these compacts, they say. The States make these compacts. The Federal Government is not bound by it. What kind of a technical evasion is that? The Federal Government put these boys in the Job Corps camp, having taken them out of the States where they are supposed to remain under supervision.

This kind of thing is going on elsewhere as you know. The Job Corps officials refuse to say that they will change this policy. They should call such slipshod practices to an abrupt halt.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying once again—I am a very strong advocate of a poverty war—I believe this country has been waging an effective war on poverty throughout its history. We were spending in 1964, when we passed the poverty act, $100 billion total from State, Federal, and local and private sources to fight poverty. This fact was cited in a social security bulletin from the administration itself. We urgently need to do more. The right kind of war on poverty can win this important war in the future—in the foreseeable future.

But the kind of war that we are waging today will not do that. It wastes money and wastes human resources and worst of all, it plants the seeds of even greater frustration and cynicism in the poor who have had their expectations raised so high by the great fanfare attached to the war on poverty.

CURB NUCLEAR WEAPONS SPREAD

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gravest threat to mankind today—graver even than the war in Vietnam and starvation in the subcontinent—arises from the rapid spread of nuclear weapons. It is essential that we find some means to curtail further proliferation.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for stepped-up U.S. efforts on this most serious problem.

I should like now to express my strongly held view that all present nuclear powers, including France and Red China, should be invited to the World Disarmament Conference recently proposed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

While I recognize that any treaty that may be negotiated with other nations in this field would be referred to the U.S. Senate, the limitations of nations having independent nuclear weapon capability is of such importance to the whole world that an indication of the consensus of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate is desirable.

ENACT A FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING LAW NOW

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a fair packaging and labeling bill, similar to S. 985 introduced by my esteemed colleague, Senator HART, of Michigan, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is frequently said that there is nothing new under the sun. Whether this statement is true or not, the concept of legislation to enforce truthful packaging and labeling is certainly not new.

This year, 1966, marks the 60th anniversary of the original pure food and drugs law, enacted in 1906. This act forbade adulteration and misbranding of foods and drugs sold in interstate commerce.

The 1906 law was a milestone in the history of pure food and drugs and truth-in-packaging legislation.

The next substantial amendment to the basic law occurred 32 years later when the Copeland Act or the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, passed.

Without going into details at this time, let me just state that this new act strengthened earlier definitions of adulteration and misbranding. Essentially, the act requires that foods, drugs, and cosmetics sold in interstate commerce must meet certain minimum requirements of purity, safety, and labeling.

During the hearings held as early as 1933 on proposed amendments to the 1906 law, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, chaired by Senator Royal S. Copeland, of New York, many ingenious arguments were cited in opposition. For example, the proposed bill was deemed a "further attempt to extend Government control over business."

Furthermore, one witness declared:

> If we are to meet adjustments proposed by the bill, then you are going to have thousands, yes, millions of dollars lost.

These costs would, of course, necessarily be passed on to the consumer.

Then again, another witness declared that existing laws are adequate; the need is for more vigorous enforcement of these laws. This witness could see nothing wrong with the cumbersome existing procedure of enforcement by which the Government must prove violation of the law on an individual case by case basis.

Eventually those who favored additional legislation won the day in 1938.

In a nutshell, their point of view was this: "The 1906 law has been effective in controlling adulterated and misbranded foods and drugs; it has served to correct many of the abuses that existed at the time of its enactment. But present-day conditions in the food and drug industries are very different from what they were more than a quarter century ago."

And now here we are in the 1960's and again there is much agitation for further truth-in-packaging legislation.

Let me mention briefly some of the most common deceptive practices which have made necessary new legislation to close the gaps in existing law.

First. Lack of standardization of sizes of products and proliferation of fractional amounts.

Because of the widespread use of fractional measures, it is frequently impossible for shoppers to compare prices of goods.

For example, which is the better buy? Two 6¾-ounce cans of tunafish for 63 cents, or one 9¼-ounce can for 43 cents?

In today's market, the plain ordinary pound has frequently shrunk to 15½ ounces, the half-pound is 7¾ or 7½ ounces.

One Federal weights-and-measures official tells us that potato chip packages come in 74 different sizes all under 3 pounds.

Second. Use of deceptive sizes, shapes, and proportions to exaggerate the quantity inside.

For example, plastic jars of hair pomade often look as if they would hold 2 ounces but thanks to hollow sides and a hollow bottom actually held only 1 ounce.

Third. Use of deceptive descriptive adjectives, such as "jumbo quart," "giant" size, and so forth.

When introducing a State truth-in-packaging bill, a Wisconsin State legislator cited the following example of confusion in the marketplace: Among three sizes of soap powder sold by the same manufacturer, there was the "king size" package, containing 5 pounds, 11 ounces, and costing $1.33; the "giant size," containing 3 pounds, 5½ ounces, and costing 79 cents; and the regular size, containing 1 pound, 6 ounces, at a cost of 32 cents. It is difficult to tell at a glance or even to figure with pencil and paper which is the best buy. However, "king size" and "giant size" suggest a bargain. Long division will show in this case that the best buy was the regular size package.

Fourth. "Cents off" promotions. Cents-off labels do not provide the meaningful price information they appear to. They are not price guides at all. They are promotional devices designed to make the buyer believe he is being offered a bargain, and they are deceptive because bargains cannot be determined without price comparisons.

Fifth. Labels with very fine print, obscure location of information, and lack of contrasting colors. For instance, Consumers Union received the following letter:

> BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
> *March 8, 1965.*
>
> DEAR CONSUMERS UNION: ———'s stores have large signs in their windows: "Almond bark, $1.08." It doesn't say per pound or per box or what weight—it says nothing else.
>
> My question to the saleslady produced the following reply: "It is 12 ounces." Upon my query: "Does it say so on the box?" she replied, "I'll try to find it for you. They want people to think it is 1 pound." I enclose the "12 ounces net weight" marking she found on the box; print about 3/32-inch high in a color blending into the color of the box.
>
> This proves again how necessary legislation is as to size and contrasting color of print concerning contents.
>
> Should there already be a regulation by the department of markets of New York City or by some other Government agency, I request that you call their attention to this.
>
> B. G. F.

Sixth. Advertisement of misleading servings. Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, stated in his testimony on the proposed 1965 fair packaging and labeling measure:

> Another interesting phenomenon may be witnessed in advertisements which boldly proclaim "four servings" or "six servings." These may be true if we are serving small children who have been nibbling all day long, but if the product is intended to be served to adults, then these ads are grossly misleading.

Seven. Slack fill. One of the most common complaints of consumers is "slack fill." This refers especially to the detergent industry.

As one pamphlet on packaging practices stated:

> There's nothing like air to fill a package. The practice of letting air occupy a significant part of the container is known as "slack fill." Manufacturers usually excuse slack fill by claims that the product settles in the box. Slack fill goes beyond normal settling and is a prevalent practice.

My bill could correct these abuses by:

First. Requiring the net quantity of contents to be stated on either the front panel of packages or labels affixed thereto.

Second. Establishing minimum standards with respect to the prominence of net quantity statements.

Third. Prohibiting the addition to such statements of qualifying words.

Fourth. Specifying exceptions to the foregoing which may be required because of the nature of the particular commodity.

Fifth. Prohibiting the placement upon such packages by persons other than retailers of data relating to possible retail price savings through the purchase of the commodity.

Sixth. Preventing the use of deceptive illustrative matter on packages.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate regulations, and additional regulations as needed, to preserve fair competition among competing products by enabling consumers to make rational comparisons and to prevent deception.

Such regulations would:

First. Establish reasonable weights or quantities in which the commodity would be distributed for retail sale, provided that no weight established is less than 2 ounces.

Second. Prevent distribution of packages likely to deceive retail purchasers as to net quantity with exceptions for certain packages of distinctive appearance.

Third. Establish standards relating to package size which may be used to characterize quantitatively the contents of packages.

Fourth. Define the net quantity of a commodity which constitutes a serving if such commodity bears a representation as to the number of servings contained.

Fifth. Define standards for the quantitative designation of package contents if such cannot be described in terms of weight, measure, or count.

Sixth. Require the ingredients and composition of commodities to be placed in a prominent position.

Jurisdiction over food, drugs, and cosmetics would be assigned to the Food and Drug Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while all other consumer commodities would be under the authority of the Federal Trade Commission.

Let me now review briefly what I consider to be the main arguments in favor of my bill.

First. Informed demand by consumers for goods and services is, theoretically at least, the force which directs production into appropriate channels. However, it is very difficult to make rational choices based on quality, quantity, and price, in view of the many different sizes and shapes of packages, cans, and bottles of food products and other merchandise.

Second. If a fair packaging and labeling bill were enacted into law, most of the abuses which I discussed a moment ago would become illegal.

Third. Cheating resulting from questionable packaging techniques is blatant dishonesty.

Fraud and cheating are commonly practiced in our prepackaged foods—

Charged Arch W. Troelstrup, chairman of the Consumer Education Department of Stephens College. Some sources claim that the American consumer is done out of almost $20 million in grain products alone by these tactics.

Fourth. The ethical businessman is penalized by unfair marketing methods. The honest dealer is severely handicapped by trickery involved in misleading labeling and packaging.

Mr. George P. Larrick, the former Commissioner of Food and Drugs, said in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee in April 1965, that although most businessmen endeavored to label and package their products legally, a minority indulge in "dishonest and undesirable practices and that this forces the honest competitor to adopt such practices to remain in business."

Mr. Larrick reported further that his agency, the Food and Drug Administration, receives as many complaints about unfair packaging from businessmen as from customers—even more.

Fifth. Protective powers under existing legislation are inadequate for today's conditions.

The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act are the basic laws concerned with the commodities and practices covered by the bill. In part, they respectively prohibit labeling that "is false or misleading in any particular" or the use of containers "so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading," and "unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce."

However, the conventional weapons in present legislation were not designed to deal with the complexities of the modern marketplace. Instead, they were designed to deal with the occasional deception which was not a great problem when the relatively few products then available were sold across the counter in the neighborhood store.

Essentially, present law fails for lack of any enforcible authority at all, or for lack of authority to establish generally applicable standards of interpretation. Where authority does not technically exist, each case must nonetheless be fought out individually with no general ground rules for reference. It is no wonder that enforcement is inadequate.

For example, the Food and Drug Administration had one case—concerning packaging of thin mints—in the courts for 3 years and finally lost it. So this requires the Food and Drug Administration to proceed on a case by case without general ground rules to which it can refer and which it can enforce on the manufacturers subject to its jurisdiction.

Of course there is opposition to this bill. It is opposition very much akin to the opposition to the Food and Drug Act 60 years ago. As then, opponents of this measure claim that it is antibusiness, that it involves an unwarranted additional extension of Government into the affairs of business, that it is enough to enforce the laws now on the statute books. In hearings on truth in packaging last spring, we heard such statements as:

The bill would restrict price reducing competition, be costly to enforce, and hurt free enterprise.

And—

It will immeasurably increase the cost to the consumer and will not give the consumer any benefits not already provided by existing law.

But just as the fears to the woeful impact of the food and drug laws have proved to be an unwarranted myth, so we need not take too seriously the forebodings of the present opponents of truth in packaging.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the midst of our grave concern over world developments, especially our commitments in southeast Asia, let us not forget the homefront and abandon the goals of the Great Society. To protect the American consumer against abuses in packaging and labeling and to protect the American businessman against unfair methods of competition, we must delay no longer in passing a fair packaging and labeling law. Therefore I urge favorable action by this legislative body on my bill, H.R. 12759.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Tuesday, February 15, to file a report on H.R. 12752.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for February 10 through February 28, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 16; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GROSS), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. GROSS), for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RESNICK during his special order today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. TUNNEY.

Mr. PERKINS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TODD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. SATTERFIELD.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. SAYLOR.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. TODD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUOT.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives,

the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: WALTER B. JONES, First District, North Carolina.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2025. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2026. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of audit of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2027. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the disposal of certain foreign excess property, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 398, 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2028. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2029. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 232, *The Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2030. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 337, *Absentee Delaware Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2031. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 138, *The Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Oklahoma, et al., Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, et al., the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2032. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-206; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2033. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of final evaluations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to the provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12752. A bill to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 12753. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12754. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against the individual income tax for contributions made to National and State political committees or to certain other political organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 12756. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that the President's annual report to Congress shall be submitted on or before March 31 of each year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12757. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 12758. A bill to amend section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 12759. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12761. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12762. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 12763. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12764. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12765. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to reduce the premiums charged for the insurance of certain cooperative housing mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12766. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit the more effective operation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12767. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 12768. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12769. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12770. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12771. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12772. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12773. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12774. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12775. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain activities in time of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12776. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant leaves of absence with pay to personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in certain instances if he determines that it will serve the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12777. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12778. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that certain activities shall be prohibited during a period of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all foreign aid be suspended to countries maintaining diplomatic or trade relations with North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 587. Concurrent resolution officially recognizing Waterloo, N.Y., as the birthplace of Memorial Day and authorizing the President to issue an appropriate proclamation relating to the centennial anniversary of the first celebration of Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Res. 727. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 728. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. Res. 729. Resolution in support of President Johnson's efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 12779. A bill for the relief of Calogero Palermo and Adelina Turco Palermo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12780. A bill for the relief of Antonio Balsamo and Maria Balsamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12781. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Estevez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 12782. A bill for the relief of Domenico Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 12783. A bill for the relief of Dr. Byung Du Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Remey L. Clem, rector, St. John's Military School, Salina, Kans., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, Our Heavenly Father, Thou whose infinite power created the unfathomable reaches of time and space yet who willest to live in the hearts of men, we thank Thee for all the blessings of life, and more especially, for Thy manifold gifts to our Nation. They are more than we could desire or pray for. Grant us an increasing awareness of Thy presence among us. Enlighten, we beseech Thee, those who sit in council, give purity of purpose to those who lead, and so transform the hearts of all men that they may place devotion to Thy purposes above personal gain. Bless our country that we may be a constant stronghold of righteousness and a champion of worthy causes. These things we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 379)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966. If there is no objection, the message will be considered as read and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of community relations functions in the area of civil rights.

After a careful review of the activities of the Federal agencies involved in the field of civil rights, it became clear that the elimination of duplication and undesirable overlap required the consolidation of certain functions.

As a first step, I issued Executive Orders No. 11246 and No. 11247 on September 24, 1965.

Executive Order No. 11246 simplified and clarified executive branch assignments of responsibility for enforcing civil rights policies and placed responsibility for the Government-wide coordination of the enforcement activities of executive agencies in the Secretary of Labor with respect to employment by Federal contractors and in the Civil Service Commission with respect to employment by Federal agencies.

Executive Order No. 11247 directed the Attorney General to assist Federal agencies in coordinating their enforcement activities with respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs.

As a further step for strengthening the operation and coordination of our civil rights programs, I now recommend transfer of the functions of the Community Relations Service, established in the Department of Commerce under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to the Attorney General and transfer of the Service, including the office of Director, to the Department of Justice.

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress on the assumption that a primary need would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. That decision was appropriate on the basis of information available at that time. The need for conciliation in this area has not been as great as anticipated because of the voluntary progress that has been made by businessmen and business organizations.

To be effective, assistance to communities in the identification and conciliation of disputes should be closely and tightly coordinated. Thus, in any particular situation that arises within a community, representatives of Federal agencies whose programs are involved should coordinate their efforts through a single agency. In recent years, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has played such a coordinating role in many situations, and has done so with great effectiveness.

Placing the Community Relations Service within the Justice Department will enhance the ability of the Justice Department to mediate and conciliate and will insure that the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist.

In this, as in other areas of Federal operations, we will move more surely and rapidly toward our objectives if we improve Federal organization and the arrangements for interagency coordination. The accompanying reorganization plan has that purpose.

The present distribution of Federal civil rights responsibilities clearly indicates that the activities of the Community Relations Service will fit most appropriately in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters and deep and broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes. Congress has assigned it a

major role in the implementation of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Department of Justice performs related functions under other acts of Congress. Most of these responsibilities require not only litigation, but also efforts at persuasion, negotiation, and explanation, especially with local governments and law-enforcement authorities. In addition, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act the Department will be supporting local programs in the area of police-community relations.

The test of the effectiveness of an enforcement agency is not how many legal actions are initiated and won, but whether there is compliance with the law. Thus, every such agency necessarily engages in extensive efforts to obtain compliance with the law and the avoidance of disputes. In fact, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires each agency concerned to attempt to obtain compliance by voluntary means before taking further action.

Among the heads of Cabinet departments the President looks principally to the Attorney General for advice and judgment on civil rights issues. The latter is expected to be familiar with civil rights problems in all parts of the Nation and to make recommendations for executive and legislative action.

The Attorney General already has responsibility with respect to a major portion of Federal conciliation efforts in the civil rights field. Under Executive Order No. 11247, he coordinates the Government-wide enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relies heavily on the achievement of compliance through persuasion and negotiation.

In the light of these facts, the accompanying reorganization plan would transfer the functions of the Community Relations Service and of its Director to the Attorney General. In so providing, the plan, of course, follows the established pattern of Federal organization by vesting all the transferred powers in the head of the department. The Attorney General will provide for the organization of the Community Relations Service as a separate unit within the Department of Justice.

The functions transferred by the reorganization plan would be carried out with full regard for the provisions of section 1003 of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relating to (1) cooperation with appropriate State or local, public or private agencies; (2) the confidentiality of information acquired with the understanding that it would be so held; and (3) the limitation on the performance of investigative or prosecutive functions by personnel of the Service.

This transfer will benefit both the Department of Justice and the Community Relations Service in the fulfillment of their existing functions.

The Attorney General will benefit in his role as the President's adviser by obtaining an opportunity to anticipate and meet problems before the need for legal action arises.

The Community Relations Service, brought into closer relationship with the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, will gain by becoming a primary resource in a coordinated effort in civil rights under the leadership of the Attorney General. The Community Relations Service will have direct access to the extensive information, experience, staff, and facilities within the Department and in other Federal agencies.

Finally, the responsibility for coordinating major Government activities under the Civil Rights Act aimed at voluntary and peaceful resolution of discriminatory practices will be centered in one department. Thus, the reorganization will permit the most efficient and effective utilization of resources in this field. Together the Service and the Department will have a larger capacity for accomplishment than they do apart.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will permit a fuller and more effective utilization of manpower and will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

WAR AGAINST HUNGER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 378)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad, and ill housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A WAR ON HUNGER

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A PROGRAM FOR MANKIND

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman, or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are underway.

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the "surplus" concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of millions of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis of nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

AMERICA'S PAST EFFORTS

This program keeps faith with policies this Nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the four freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction, and development.

This great effort—the Marshall plan—was followed by President Truman's point 4, President Eisenhower's act of Bogotá and its successor, President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition, and famine have been averted.

Schools and hospitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

A BALANCE IS REQUIRED

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death

rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

IMPROVING LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of those who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside of the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

THE NEED FOR SELF-HELP

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Economic incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon United States food increased.

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two—but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

BETTER NUTRITION

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is 30 times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during preschool years leave indelible scars.

Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life—physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can—and must—be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this Nation to search out new ways to:

Develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world.

Improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops.

Apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR OUR ABUNDANCE

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided—

For American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes.

For American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high quality food at fair prices.

For American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today—because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U.S. agriculture—our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for:

1. domestic needs,

2. commercial exports,

3. food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves,

4. reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by 10 percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the worldwide war on hunger.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will:

Make self-help an integral part of our food aid program.

Eliminate the "surplus" requirement for food aid.

Emphasize the development of markets for American farm products.

Authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate.

Emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of 5 years.

Continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.

Continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs.

Provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements food for freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

The productive genius of our farmers.

The potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within 12 to 18 months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

Under the two acts I recommend today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books—and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended—we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

A UNIFIED EFFORT

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilaterial lending organizations, and of the United Nations development program should be expanded—particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as worldwide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating less developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society—where every person can hope for life's essentials—and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the interdependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths:

That agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

That an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

That hunger and want—anywhere—are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep freemen free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Commerce and the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 924 and that it and the following three measures be considered in sequence. I assume this time will be charged to my side.

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

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES WITH RESPECT TO THE BASIC COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN TEACHERS IN THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6845) to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, on page 2, after line 12, to strike out:

(c) (1) Section 5 of such Act (73 Stat. 214; Public Law 86-91; 5 U.S.C. 2353) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) A teacher shall not be eligible to hold any teaching position or positions for any period in excess of five consecutive years, except that—

"(1) a teacher who has performed service in any teaching position or positions and has returned to the United States for a period of not less than one year shall be eligible to hold a teaching position or positions for an additional period of not to exceed five consecutive years, and

"(2) the secretary of each military department is authorized, when he deems it necessary in the public interest in individual cases, to provide, in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed and issued by the Secretary of Defense, for the extension of any such period of five consecutive years to not more than eight consecutive years."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply only to teachers appointed after the date of enactment of this subsection to teaching positions for any school year but shall not apply to teachers holding a teaching position on the

date of enactment of this subsection who are transferred without a break in service after such date.

On page 2, line 14, after the word "by", to strike out "subsections (a) and (b) of"; in line 15, after the word "effective", to insert "on the first day of the first pay period"; in line 16, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "as of the beginning of the first school year"; and, in line 18, after the word "Act", to strike out "or which is in progress on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 951), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

H.R. 6845 would require that the Department of Defense establish and maintain salaries for teachers in the overseas dependent school system at rates comparable to those paid teachers in school jurisdictions of 100,000 population or more in the United States.

AMENDMENT

Subsection 1(c) of the bill as referred, which would have required the periodic rotation of teachers after 5 consecutive years of service overseas, has been eliminated. The committee believes that a rotation system, such as is in effect in certain areas of military employment of civilian personnel in overseas areas, is not suitable for the overseas dependent school system. The U.S. Government does not operate a public school system in this country. The overseas educational program is unique, and the Government is unable to offer suitable employment opportunities for teachers returning to the United States after 5 years' service. The only domestic market for teachers is in individual State school systems, and it would be difficult, to say the least, for a Federal employee teaching overseas to secure an appointment in a school district in the United States during the spring or summer months (when most appointments are made) while the employee is physically located in Germany, Okinawa, Great Britain, or any other foreign country. A significant number of these teachers remain abroad, teaching American children, for a number of years. Evidence developed in public hearings by the Civil Service Subcommittee indicated that most if not all of these teachers are loyal and dedicated public servants doing an outstanding job in circumstances that are usually difficult. The committee sees no point in adding to the problems of operating an American school program overseas by advising any prospective teacher that at the end of 5 years' service they will have to return to the United States and look for a job.

The committee has revised the effective date of the bill to make it take effect on the first day of the first pay period after enactment. As referred, the bill would have taken effect as of the beginning of the present school year—September 1965. Teachers received an increase in salary at the beginning of this school year by administrative action of the Department of Defense. At the time the bill was referred to the committee, August 4, 1965, it was not intended to have retroactive effect, particularly for a period of several months. Retroactivity always involves considerable administrative problems; in this instance the committee believes it is justifiable to amend the bill to make it effective prospectively.

THE INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 63) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12–21, 1966, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 63

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition, to be held at Tulsa, Oklahoma, from May 12 to May 21, 1966, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting machinery, equipment, supplies, and other products used in the production and marketing of oil and gas, and bringing together buyers and sellers for the promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in such products.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 954), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 63 is summarized in its title. It involves no expenditure of Federal funds. The purpose of the exposition is the exhibiting of machinery, equipment, supplies, and other products used in the production and marketing of oil and gas, and the bringing together of buyers and sellers for the promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in these products.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Senate Joint Resolution 63 was introduced on March 15, 1965, by Senator MONRONEY, for himself and Senator HARRIS, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee agreed, on January 25, 1966, to report the joint resolution favorably to the Senate without amendments. Similar action has been taken frequently in the past with respect to industrial expositions and trade fairs without involving official U.S. Government participation in them. The committee therefore recommends that the courtesy embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 63 be extended to the International Petroleum Exposition in Oklahoma.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHARTERING OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby pays tribute to the Boy Scouts of America on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the granting by Act of Congress of the charter of the Boy Scouts of America, and expresses its recognition of and appreciation for the public service performed by this organization through its contributions to the lives of the Nation's youth.

The preamble was agreed to.

WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY, 1969

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 403) authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 955), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

1. PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

House Joint Resolution 403 authorizes the appropriation of an amount not to exceed $500,000 to defray the expenses for a meeting of the 22d World Health Assembly in the United States.

House Joint Resolution 403 recommends Boston, Mass., as the site of the 1969 meeting of the World Health Assembly in connection with the centennial celebration of the Massachusetts Department of Health, the first State health department to be established in the United States.

2. BACKGROUND

The World Health Organization usually designates Geneva, Switzerland, as the site of its annual Assembly meeting. In 1958, however, after congressional action similar to that suggested here, the 11th World Health Assembly was held in Minneapolis, Minn.

A similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 80, to authorize appropriations to defray the costs of organizing and holding the 20th Annual World Health Assembly in the United States, was sponsored by Senators KENNEDY of New York and JAVITS.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lisle C. Carter, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Army placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED—CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if any Senator wishes to ask me for time to speak on the cloture motion, I am available. Mr. President, we suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my relations with the press have always been very cordial and very affable. Seldom do I complain. However, my attention was directed to a column published in the Washington Daily News, dated February 8, 1966, which calls for a bit of response from me.

The column was written by Mr. John Herling. I presume that he is a regular columnist for the Scripps-Howard chain. I do not know Mr. Herling. He called me once, long distance. Frankly, I do not know whether he is possessed of a bias or a prejudice. That I cannot say, but his column is styled, 'No Deal'. It is in single quotes, for reasons that I do not know.

I read the first paragraph:

> Organized labor could have made a deal with Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader, by which he would have backed away from his filibuster against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. But AFL-CIO President George Meany considered the price too high. He balanced the narrow benefits which would accrue to more stable labor-management relations against the larger good affecting the State and National welfare, and said, "No deal."

Mr. President, I do not know how they come by this. I know of no one in our whole entourage who has ever suggested or been approached about any kind of deal.

Mr. President, I do not deal on principle. When we do, it is no longer a principle.

Little squibs have been published in the press since the first of January to the effect that I, or someone, had been approached on this matter. I have no idea who it was, but evidently it was taken out of a quote made by Mr. Meany. I read further from the column:

> So, says Mr. Meany, "The issue of 14(b) repeal and the issue of reapportionment in particular and progress in general are solidly and inescapably intertwined. There is no illusion about that either in our minds or in the mind of the Senate minority leader."

The article states further:

> "I hope the Nation understands that this filibuster is a punitive and coercive tactic."

Then Mr. Meany says, according to this column:

> Mr. Meany says. "It is a cynical invitation to a deal. It is the crafty politician's way of saying: 'Come around to the back door. Give up your opposition to the reapportionment amendment and you can have 14(b) repeal.' "

Mr. President, I would not cross Mr. Meany's doorstep. I do not have to. Nor do I have to take this kind of thing without a proper response.

I know Mr. Meany. I have a proper regard for him. I know Mrs. Meany. I have a high regard for her.

I have wondered how these little squibs which are so euphemistic and so involved ever see the light of day; but I have to say for Mr. Herling, the columnist, that he is extremely careless; and I might use a harsher term. The record, however, will have to show that he made the statement here that I could have had a deal, when there is not a scintilla of fact or truth in the whole matter.

So, before the record closes, that must be said.

I am not a dealer. I know my mind. I know my convictions. I have some devotion to principle, and that is all I need for guidelines. I need no dealing with Mr. Meany or anyone else. I am sure that Mr. Meany would be the first to say that EVERETT DIRKSEN never approached him or any of his associates about a deal.

I wish to clarify the record on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the column written by John Herling printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 8, 1966]

NO DEAL

(By John Herling)

Organized labor could have made a deal with Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, the Republican minority leader, by which he would have backed away from his filibuster against repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. But AFL–CIO President George Meany considered the price too high. He balanced the narrow benefits which would accrue to more stable labor-management relations against the larger good affecting the State and National welfare, and said, "No deal."

Specifically, Senator DIRKSEN's main legislative target is the attempt to wash out the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision by which the reapportionment of State legislatures must comport to the clearly enunciated rule which eliminates the rotten borough system of choosing State legislatures.

This decision—which was handed down in a Tennessee suit after an intensive educational campaign to which organized labor gave considerable support—marks the ending of rural domination of State legislatures. For more than 30 years, social, labor, and welfare legislation has often been blocked by the opposition of such legislatures. Their opposition did not arise always from a clear clash of interests between country and city folks. Quite frequently, the opposition was exacerbated by business groups which sought to intercept liberal legislation by escalating the suspicions of country versus city.

Like King Canute, Senator DIRKSEN has undertaken to turn back the tide of change. With the aid of a heavily financed public relations campaign and through legislation already introduced in the Congress and through actions in process in various States, Mr. DIRKSEN seeks to manipulate the Senate into approval of a constitutional amendment to set aside the one-man, one-vote reapportionment procedure set in motion by the Supreme Court.

"That, in the last analysis," said Mr. Meany, "is what the filibuster in the U.S. Senate is really all about. The Senate minority leader is conducting a bitter rearguard action against the relentless advance of the 20th century, to preserve intact the strongholds of political and economic reaction in America, and to prevent or delay the kind of progress that is necessary to meet the new problems and challenges of modern society."

So, says Mr. Meany, "The issue of 14(b) repeal and the issue of reapportionment in particular and progress in general are solidly and inescapably intertwined. There is no illusion about that either in our minds or in the mind of the Senate minority leader."

Mr. Meany reinforces the union movement's determined support of the one-man, one-vote principle.

"I hope the Nation understands that this filibuster is a punitive and coercive tactic," Mr. Meany says. "It is a cynical invitation to a deal. It is the crafty politician's way of saying: 'Come around to the back door. Give up your opposition to the reapportionment amendment and you can have 14(b) repeal.'

"Well, as badly as we in the labor movement want 14(b) repealed, we do not want it that badly. And the Senate minority leader and all his antilabor stooges can filibuster until hell freezes over before I will agree to sell the people short for that kind of a deal."

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED—CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the pending question, which is the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the debate on legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, I received letters from many people in Arkansas as well as almost every State in the Union. Some were for repeal, others were against—most were from working people, many of whom were union members. I have made every effort to inform my constituents and others who have written me why I oppose repeal of this section of the Taft-Hartley Act.

One of the letters I received came from a prominent labor leader in my State, Mr. J. Bill Becker, president, Arkansas State AFL–CIO. Mr. Becker urged me to support repeal. He also submitted a resolution adopted by the general executive board of the Arkansas State AFL–CIO urging all Members of the Senate and particularly my colleague, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and me to vote for repeal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Becker's letter, dated January 14, 1966, together with the resolution adopted by his organization's executive board, and my response to him dated February 9, 1966.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the right-to-work amendment to the Arkansas constitution, which was adopted in 1944 by ballot at a general election, and also a copy of the State statute passed pursuant to that amendment, and a copy of a resolution adopted by the Arkansas State Senate just last year, urging the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States to oppose repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

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

ARKANSAS STATE AFL–CIO,
Little Rock, Ark., January 14, 1966.

Hon. JOHN McCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: Enclosed please find a copy of a resolution that was adopted by the general executive board of this organization last Saturday. Approximately 125 members of the board were present at the meeting.

We sincerely hope that you will look favorably upon our request to vote for repeal of section 14(b). If, however, you cannot do so, we would very much appreciate your using your influence to bring this issue to a vote.

In many ways the right of the Senate to decide controversies goes to the heart of basic democratic government, and is of greater importance than H.R. 77 itself. Certainly a filibuster is contrary to accepted democratic procedures and no small group should be able to block the will of the majority.

Thank you for your consideration.

Always with a good wish, I remain

Respectfully yours,

J. BILL BECKER,
President.

RESOLUTION URGING 14(b) REPEAL

Whereas since 1944 the State of Arkansas has been afflicted with a so-called right-to-work law, forbidding unions and employers to negotiate union shop agreements; and

Whereas this law restricts free collective bargaining and freedom of contract, weakens trade unions, thus slowing the economic progress of workers, and promotes distrust and disharmony between labor and management; and

Whereas the inevitable result of these handicaps has been to retard the progress of our State and to curtail the prosperity of the people as a whole; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws are made possible by section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, a Federal statute; and

Whereas section 14(b) is the only provision in Federal law which cedes authority to the States in a field otherwise preempted by Congress for the Federal Government, and therefore singles out the labor movement for unique and unfavorable treatment; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has taken favorable action on the repeal of 14(b) by passage of H.R. 77, which has been prevented Senate consideration by filibuster: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Executive Board of the Arkansas State AFL–CIO hereby calls upon the Members of the Senate to take every action possible to halt any filibuster of this measure and bring the issue of repeal of 14(b) to a vote, and be it finally

Resolved, That we call upon our Senators to vote for the repeal of section 14(b) in order to restore free collective bargaining, improve the lot of wage-earners and enhance the prosperity of all the people in Arkansas.

FEBRUARY 9, 1966.

Mr. J. BILL BECKER,
President, Arkansas State AFL–CIO,
Little Rock, Ark.

DEAR MR. BECKER: I apologize for not having acknowledged sooner your letter of January 14, with which you enclosed copy of a resolution adopted by the general executive board of the Arkansas State AFL–CIO, calling upon Senator FULBRIGHT and me to vote for the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. During the past few weeks, my mail has been unduly heavy, and I have been unable to keep current with correspondence.

As I recall, you were among a group of labor officials from Arkansas who visited me in my Washington office in January of last year at which time we discussed this repeal proposal. I advised you then that I could not vote for repeal and stated a number of reasons why I could not do so.

First of all, I do not believe in compulsory unionism or compulsory membership in any organization. I do not believe a workingman should be compelled to join a union in order to work or to retain a job; nor do I believe a worker should be denied a job or discharged from his employment because he is a member of a labor union. My concept of freedom is to permit the individual worker to make the choice—to decide for himself whether he wishes to join a union—and to be free from coercion or compulsion on the part of either the union or his employer in making that decision.

The constitutional amendment which the people of Arkansas adopted by ballot in 1944 guarantees those rights to the worker. The enabling statute which was later adopted, in effect, carries out the will of the people as expressed in that constitutional amendment. The resolution and those of your members who have written me requesting that I vote for repeal would have me vote to nullify the Arkansas constitutional provisions which our

people adopted by ballot in a free election. I cannot do that. I do not think that I should be asked to do it.

You and others who oppose the provisions of this State constitutional amendment and want to have it repealed can initiate a referendum and have the issue again submitted to the source of its adoption, to the people of Arkansas who can repeal it, if they choose to do so, by the same process—by the ballot in an election.

I regret, therefore, that I cannot comply with your request in this instance, but I simply cannot vote to deny to the workers—to the citizens of my State—their inalienable right to choose.

With very kindest regards, I am.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 TO THE ARKANSAS CONSTITUTION ADOPTED ON NOVEMBER 7, 1944, IN A GENERAL ELECTION

SECTION 1. Discrimination for or against union labor prohibited.—No person shall be denied employment because of membership in or affiliation with or resignation from a labor union, or because of refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any corporation or individual or association of any kind enter into any contract, written, or oral, to exclude from employment members of a labor union or persons who refuse to join a labor union, or because of resignation from a labor union, nor shall any person against his will be compelled to pay dues to any labor organization as a prerequisite to or condition of employment.

Pursuant to amendment No. 34, the following statute was enacted (Ark. Stat. 81-202): "No person shall be denied employment because of membership in, or affiliation with, a labor union; nor shall any person be denied employment because of failure or refusal to join or affiliate with a labor union; nor shall any person, unless he shall voluntarily consent in writing to do so, be compelled to pay dues, or any other monetary consideration to any labor organization as a prerequisite to, or condition of, or continuance of employment."

ARKANSAS SENATE RESOLUTION 3

Senate resolution requesting the Arkansas congressional delegation to oppose the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act

Whereas the people of this State adopted amendment No. 34 to the constitution of the State of Arkansas which establishes the rights of labor and prohibits discrimination for or against labor unions; and

Whereas section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act recognizes the right of each State to enact provisions comparable to amendment No. 34, thereby leaving to each State the right to determine whether the closed shop shall be permitted; and

Whereas the President of the United States has announced his support of legislation which would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, thereby nullifying amendment No. 34 to the constitution of the State of Arkansas and denying rights of labor guaranteed under the constitution of the State of Arkansas; and

Whereas it is the consensus of the General Assembly that the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States should exert their full efforts to oppose the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the first extraordinary session of the 65th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Arkansas General Assembly respectfully requests the Arkansas delegation in the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation now under consideration which would repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; be it

Resolved, That upon adoption hereof a copy of this resolution shall be furnished by the secretary of the senate to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, now I should like to read from the letter which I wrote Mr. Becker. I read excerpts from it. I wrote:

As I recall, you were among a group of labor officials from Arkansas who visited me in my Washington office in January of last year at which time we discussed this repeal proposal. I advised you then that I could not vote for repeal and stated a number of reasons why I could not do so.

First of all, I do not believe in compulsory unionism or compulsory membership in any organization. I do not believe a workingman should be compelled to join a union in order to work or to retain a job; nor do I believe a worker should be denied a job or discharged from his employment because he is a member of a labor union. My concept of freedom is to permit the individual worker to make the choice—to decide for himself whether he wishes to join a union—and to be free from coercion or compulsion on the part of either the union or his employer in making that decision.

The constitutional amendment which the people of Arkansas adopted by ballot in 1944 guarantees those rights to the worker. The enabling statute which was later adopted, in effect, carries out the will of the people as expressed in that constitutional amendment. The resolution and those of your members who have written me requesting that I vote for repeal would have me vote to nullify the Arkansas constitutional provisions which our people adopted by ballot in a free election. I cannot do that. I do not think that I should be asked to do it.

In my letter to Mr. Becker, from which I have read excerpts, I stated succinctly the reasons and principles upon which I base my opposition to this proposal. There are many other reasons and factors that entered into my considerations, but those stated in my letter to Mr. Becker are wholly compelling and sufficient to sustain my position.

I thank the distinguished minority leader for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in respect of the President's reorganization plan of the Community Relations Organization, I am today introducing a resolution of disapproval and will seek hearings by the Committee on Government Operations.

I consider it wrong to transfer this agency to the Department of Justice, the prosecuting arm. It ought to go to an agency of the executive where mediation and conciliation can be practiced. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I shall seek early hearings on this proposal.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED—CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

There appeared in the Miami Herald on February 7, 1966, a very short editorial which bears the title "A Principle Goes to Jail." It reads as follows:

A PRINCIPLE GOES TO JAIL

The Senate debate on repealing the right-to-work provision of the Taft-Hartley Act has little significance for Levi Mews, a Milwaukee businessman. Wisconsin already has exercised its option and made the union shop compulsory.

But Mr. Mews can testify what it means when the right to work is lost.

One of his longtime workers refused on principle to join the union and Mr. Mews said he would respect the decision. The court said otherwise.

Because he didn't fire his employee forthwith, Mr. Mews was sentenced to jail for 30 days. The Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld the verdict last week.

While Mr. Mews worries about who will mind his store while he serves his term, Senators debate putting all American employers under the same threat of prison if they insist on the right to work without paying tribute to a union. We hope Mr. Mews' plight will help them decide to preserve a basic freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the repeal of section 14(b) would erode the already restricted authority of the citizens of the States to legislate according to their expressed desires in this field.

It would represent the diminution of powers enjoyed by the States.

Not only would repeal nullify right-to-work laws which are now a part of the constitutional or statutory law of 19 States, but it would also deprive all of the 50 States of their regulatory power in this important area of labor-management relations. This would be particularly unwise at a time when we keep weakening and taking away the police powers of the States.

Adoption of repeal would mean that citizens could not legislate specific guarantees of economic and political freedom in the constitutions or statutes of their States.

The reservation of this right to the people of each State is in keeping with the principles of federalism set forth in our Constitution and proven by the passage of time.

One of the reasons why our constitutional system has survived so long, and one of the reasons why ours is the oldest written Constitution in force and effect in this world is because of the wisdom of the founders in devising this organic law, and because of the flexibility that is given to it by the dissemination of certain governmental powers among the States.

The economy of my State of Texas has fared extremely well in recent years under our right-to-work law, as compared with non-right-to-work States, as Texas has gained a great deal under its present system of permitting freedom of choice about union membership.

Labor and management have benefited in Texas. The economy of my State has expanded at a greater rate than the average of non-right-to-work States, and in an atmosphere of labor-management harmony.

By virtually every index of economic growth it can be shown that not only my State, but all right-to-work States, have fared better than non-right-to-work States.

Growth of union membership in right-to-work States has demonstrated that compulsory membership is not necessary for the continued good health of labor unions.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor and other nationally recognized reports show that right-to-work States lead the Nation in the rate of new jobs created in business and industry.

In the first quarter of 1965, the unions in Texas, a right-to-work State, won 43 of 56 National Labor Relations Board conducted representation elections for a win figure of 76 percent. This compares with a win figure of approximately 60 percent for the 2 previous years in Texas, and 57 percent over the entire Nation.

It can be seen that in our right-to-work State the unions have had greater success in organizing shops than they have in the non-right-to-work States.

Productivity and capital investment in an atmosphere of voluntarism create the most dynamic employment opportunities. Restrictions, whether by labor or Government policy, cause the employment opportunities to go elsewhere, as indeed they are doing these days.

Repeal of 14(b) would inevitably lead to heightened tensions and conflict throughout the land. Repealing a law strongly supported by a clear majority of the American people would create discord, not stability.

If we were to proceed with the consideration of H.R. 77 and to enact it into law we would create the most powerful monopoly that this country has ever seen. We would create a tremendous force acting with little restraint to influence the course of public affairs, and to influence the economy of this country. Should we create such a monopoly it would not be by popular demand of the people of the United States. It would be the result of the concerted political activity of the great union organizations of this country.

It would be only a manifestation of the tremendous political influence exercised by trade unions, an influence out of all proportion to its numbers, and an influence that sometimes flouts the popular will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. It is inconceivable to me that a man should be required to pay a tribute for the privilege of earning his bread. It is inconceivable to me that the unions would be so preoccupied with the goal of compulsory unionism that they would resort to the use of political threats, such as they have done.

I have received notification from union leaders, not of my State, I may hasten to add, but without my State, threatening me with political extinction if I continue to oppose repeal of section 14(b).

Perhaps they do have the power to extinguish me politically, but if I should lose my seat in this august body because of my position on this issue, it is well worth it, because I believe that those of us who oppose repeal will prevail, and regardless of what happens to us in the future, I believe generations of Americans yet to come will thank us for preserving one last vestige of freedom in the United States, and that is the right of a man to seek employment to better himself, and to sustain his family regardless of whether or not he belongs to any organization, regardless of whether or not it is in his conscience not to belong to such an organization.

Therefore, Mr. President, I trust the Senate, in its good judgment, will vote against cloture.

WHAT GENERAL GAVIN REALLY SAID ABOUT VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield not to exceed 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Harper's magazine for February 1966, in its department termed "The Easy Chair," has published an article entitled "A Communication on Vietnam," written by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, retired.

Inserted prior to this article, and signed "The Editors," is a statement which starts as follows:

In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva.

As the result of this testimony, in a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Tuesday, February 8, I asked General Gavin if it was true that he urged the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam. He said that that assertion was not true.

I then asked General Gavin if it was true that he recommended a halt in the escalation of the ground war. He said that it was not true.

I then asked the general if it was true that he recommended a withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast. He said that that was not true.

Because of this extraordinary development in the discussions about Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that the covering letter in this magazine, signed "The Editors," be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

In the following letter General Gavin presents the first basic criticism of the administration's policy in Vietnam by a major military figure. As an alternative, he urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam, a halt in the escalation of the ground war, withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnam coast, and renewed efforts "to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

General Gavin argues for such a change in policy on purely military grounds. His views on the Vietnam war cannot be taken lightly, since he has established a reputation during the last 30 years as one of America's leading strategic thinkers. At the time of the French defeat in Vietnam, he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Department of the Army, and his advice is generally believed to be largely responsible for the United States refusal to enter the southeast Asian conflict on a large scale at that time. He enlisted in the Army as a private in 1924 and rose to the rank of lieutenant general before his retirement in 1958; he had a distinguished combat career as a paratroop commander in World War II; and he served for a time as Chief of Research and Development for the Army. After retirement he was Ambassador to France, and is now chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Arthur D. Little, Inc., an industrial research firm in Cambridge, Mass.

He left the Pentagon because of disagreements on what was, in 1958, the basic military policy of the Eisenhower administration. His reasons for such disagreements were set forth in his book, "War and Peace in the Space Age," published by Harper & Row; as he indicates in the following letter, most of the changes he then urged have since been carried out.

The editors hope that General Gavin's communication may stimulate a searching reexamination of American military and foreign policies by other public figures who are especially qualified by experience and training to discuss them. In the coming months Harper's hopes to publish further contributions to such a reappraisal.

THE EDITORS.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a colloquy between General Gavin and myself on this subject.

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

Senator SYMINGTON. General, it is always a privilege to see you, sir. The reason you are here is because of a letter you wrote to Harper's magazine. Did you discuss the letter with the editors at the time you sent it in?

General GAVIN. No, I did not, Senator SYMINGTON.

Senator SYMINGTON. I will make my questions as short as possible and would appreciate your answers being as short as possible, because of the 10-minute time limit.

I would run through the letter with you, if I may.

General GAVIN. Surely.

Senator SYMINGTON. The editors say, "He urges the stopping of our bombing of North Vietnam"; is that true?

General GAVIN. No, it is not true.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then they say you want "a halt in the escalation of the ground war." Is that true?

General GAVIN. No, it is not true.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then they say you recommend "withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast"; is that true?

General GAVIN. Not true.

Senator SYMINGTON. I wonder why the editors deceived as to what your thoughts were?

General GAVIN. I do not know. I suggest you bring the editor in here and talk to him.

Senator SYMINGTON. That might be a good idea because, based on what the general says, this statement by the editors who published this article is false, and is one of the reasons why there has been so much misunderstanding.

General GAVIN. Yes, I agree with you.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, later on in this hearing the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] again brought up this matter, asking for clarification. General Gavin took the same position with the Senator from South Dakota that he did with me. Then he volunteered that a Harper's magazine advertisement in last Sunday's issue of the New York Times magazine which said that he, Gavin, was challenging "Johnson's strategy in Vietnam" was wrong; and that he had written Harper's as follows:

"I was shocked to see the advertisement in yesterday's book review section of the New York Times," and I was, because it misrepresents entirely my point of view.

In order that the truth as to what General Gavin actually did say be reported accurately, not only to the Senate, but also to Congress and the people, I ask unanimous consent that this part of the dialog between the Senator from South Dakota and General Gavin be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

Senator MUNDT. I think maybe part of the problem which has confused the public may come from what the editors of Harper's said about your use of the word "enclave."

Of course the general public is hopefully looking for any way, as we all are, to avoid the war from getting any greater, and the grasp on this phrase. The editor said:

"In the following letter General Gavin points out some basic criticisms of the administration's policies in Vietnam."

Then he says "as an alternative he urges the stopping of our bombing in North Vietnam."

I think you have clearly made it obvious that that is not your point, even though the editor reads that into your article.

"A halt in the escalation of the ground war," but no definitive procedure for getting that done has been worked out.

"Withdrawal of American troops to defend a limited number of enclaves along the South Vietnamese coast," this is what he says. After reading your article, the average layman is likely to read into this exactly what the editor of Harper's read.

We get a lot of letters. I get a lot of letters from friends around the world saying, "General Gavin has got a very fine way of handling this thing without loss of life, sort of an operation fortress they call it or a holding operation."

Now I take it that that is not what you meant to say.

General GAVIN. That is absolutely——

Senator MUNDT. The editor of Harper's read it wrong. Is that right?

General GAVIN. Senator, this is not what I meant whatsoever. Senator SYMINGTON asked me about these points earlier. I might say furthermore in the Sunday issue of the New York Times magazine Harper's advertised, in this current issue of their magazine, with a lead, what appeared to be an article by Gen. James M. Gavin versus Johnson's strategy in Vietnam, and I wrote to them Monday, and I have the letter in front of me, and I said:

"I was shocked to see the advertisement in yesterday's book review section of the New York Times," and I was, because it misrepresents entirely my point of view.

I do not know how one controls that, but I would suggest that you bring the editor in here.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Gavin's letter to Harper's be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From Harper's magazine, February 1966]

A COMMUNICATION ON VIETNAM FROM GEN. JAMES M. GAVIN

Last November our Secretary of Defense, while in Vietnam, finally gave battlefield approval to the concept of Sky Cavalry. Harper's should take some pride in the fact that it published my article, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in 1954. That was the genesis of the idea for this new form of mobility for our ground forces. It was too revolutionary for acceptance in the Pentagon then, and Harper's performed a public service in helping advance the idea.

I would like to comment about the Vietnam situation further. I should emphasize at the outset that I am writing solely from a military-technical point of view. I was Chief of Plans and Operations in the Department of the Army when Dienbienphu brought the French endeavors in Vietnam to an end. The Chief of Staff, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi Delta. As I recall, we were talking about the possibility of sending 8 divisions plus 35 engineer battalions and other auxiliary units. We had one or two old China hands on the staff at the time and the more we studied the situation the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh. If we would be, in fact fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage. Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity. There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all.

I should emphasize at the outset that there are philosophical and moral aspects of the war in southeast Asia that are understandably disturbing to every thoughtful person. My comments, however, are based entirely upon a tactical evaluation of our efforts there. At the time of the French defeat, it seemed to us military planners that if an effort were made by the United States to secure Vietnam from Chinese military exploitation, and that if force on the scale that we were talking about were to be employed, then the Chinese would very likely reopen the fighting in Korea.

At the time, General Ridgway thought it prudent to bring this situation directly to the attention of President Eisenhower, pointing out that we should be prepared for a large-scale war if we were to make the initial large-scale commitment to the Hanoi Delta that we were thinking about. I thought at the time that it took great moral courage for General Ridgway to take this action, but he has never been a man to lack such courage. The President decided not to make the commitment and in his book, "Mandate for Change," he commented that to have gone to war under those conditions would have been "like hitting the tail of the snake rather than the head," which is a good analogy.

Today we have sufficient force in South Vietnam to hold several enclaves on the coast, where sea and air power can be made fully effective. By enclaves I suggest Camranh Bay, Danang, and similar areas where American bases are being established. However, we are stretching these resources beyond reason in our endeavors to secure the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong penetration. This situation, of course, is caused by the growing Vietcong strength.

The time has come, therefore, when we simply have to make up our mind what we want to do and then provide the resources necessary to do it. If our objective is to secure all of South Vietnam, then forces should be deployed on the 17th parallel and along the Cambodian border adequate to do this. In view of the nature of the terrain, it might be necessary to extend our defenses on the 17th parallel to the Mekong River, and across part of Thailand. Such a course would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam.

To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south. Also if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese "volunteers" and the reopening of the Korean front. This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on.

On the other hand, if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks in North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva, we could very likely do so with the forces now available. Maintaining such enclaves while an effort is being made to solve the internal situation in Vietnam, and in the face of the terroristic war that would be waged against them, poses some serious problems, and the retention of some of the enclaves may prove to be unwise; but the problems that we would then have to deal with would be far less serious than those associated with an expansion of the conflict.

I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki. The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand. But we should be realistic about the dangers of the course that we are now on. A straightforward escalation of our land power in southeast Asia to meet every land-based challenge, while at the same time we leave China and Cambodia immune from attack, poses some very forbidding prospects. I realize that our Secretary of State was recently quoted in the press as having said that "the idea of sanctuary is out." However, the initiative is not ours and there is

an abundance of evidence now that both China and Cambodia are sanctuaries for Communist military strength that is used to support the Vietcong.

To get to the heart of the problem, I doubt that world opinion would tolerate the bombing and seizure of Manchuria. If the Chinese Communists continue on their present course of aggression and, at the same time continue to develop more devastating weapons—and I refer to nuclear weapons—the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet. In the meantime, we must do the best we can with the forces we have deployed to Vietnam, keeping in mind the true meaning of strategy in global affairs. Economics, science and technology, and world opinion will, in the long run, serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly. Since the advent of the Space Age, there has been a revolution in the nature of war and global conflict. The confrontation in Vietnam is the first test of our understanding of such change, or our lack of it. The measures that we now take in southeast Asia must stem from sagacity and thoughtfulness, and an awareness of the nature of strategy in this rapidly shrinking world.

Referring again to the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam, it is the kind of innovation that is generally unpopular in a conservative society, and in the military establishment of such a society. But many more innovations, both technical and in management methods, must be found if we are to continue to survive as a free people. Merely making bigger bombs or using more of them is not the answer. So I hope that Harper's will continue to support innovative methods when they are suggested, as you did when you first published the idea of sky cavalry in 1954.

When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be. I think it is that kind of an Army now, and I would be happy to serve in it in any grade in Vietnam or anywhere else. It is doing a splendid job in Vietnam and needs the support of all of our people.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relating to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act be accepted and printed in the RECORD as if fully given by me.

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

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, there have been few public debates infected with more political emotionalism than the one over whether section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. In such emotionally charged debates, basic issues are often obscured and relevant consequences are often distorted. The debate over 14(b) is no exception. All of us who have taken part in this debate have been guilty, at one time or another, of making sweeping generalizations and predications as to the effects of State right-to-work laws which are authorized by 14(b), and about the consequences that would be incurred with the repeal of 14(b).

Without attempting to present myself as a wholly detached and neutral observer I would like to review, as dispassionately as possible, the significant facts of the matter as I see them—the facts which I have drawn upon in deciding what position to take on the question of whether or not 14(b) should be repealed.

First it is absolutely necessary to get firmly in mind the legal meaning of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, what it does and does not do, and what its repeal would or would not mean.

Section 14(b) was included in the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 because Congress wanted to specifically spell out the fact that the individual States had the right to enact laws declaring that the right of persons to accept employment, if offered, shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union. In short, Congress wanted to make it very clear that the States could, if they so chose through their democratic majority rule processes of political debate and lawmaking, ban union security arrangements such as the union shop. In so acting Congress was not conferring upon the States a power that they did not previously possess. The historic Wagner Act of 1935, which labor leaders, with some justification, point to as the Magna Carta of the labor union movement, contained no provision aimed at precluding the States from legislating in this area. During the period from 1935 to 1947 four States did enact such laws. In 1947, seven more put right-to-work laws on their statutes. Since then, several other States have adopted such laws, some have repealed laws that they had earlier adopted, leaving 19 States in which right-to-work laws are currently in effect.

The State laws which declare the union shop to be illegal are generally called right-to-work laws. This designation is taken from the fact that where such laws are in force no worker can be denied the opportunity to work because he refuses to join a union. Because it is not commonly understood it needs to be pointed out that all right-to-work laws are impartial in their wording, protecting the rights of both union and nonunion employees. That is, they not only specify that workers shall not be denied a job because he prefers not to belong to a union, they also prohibit employers from denying employment to a worker simply because he belongs to a union. Right-to-work laws, of course, do not guarantee any worker a job. In that sense the terms is misleading.

On the other hand, the absence of right-to-work laws does not mean that all wage earners must belong to a union—a simple point, but one that is often overlooked in the heat of debate. It must be kept in mind that a union can be established only after a majority of the workers of a particular plant or business agree to establish a union. The elected representatives of the union can then bargain with management for a union security arrangement. A union shop is legally put into effect only after both labor and management have so agreed.

By the same token, the existence of right-to-work laws does not preclude the possibility that all workers in a particular plant or business will belong to a union. Right-to-work laws are in no way aimed at preventing any worker who wishes to join a union from doing so. They are aimed only at preventing union membership as a condition of employment. It is also necessary to note here that the existence of a right-to-work law does not in actual practice necessarily eliminate compulsory unionism. The promulgation of a law and its practical enforcement are two different things. Students of labor-management relations have long agreed that the Taft-Hartley Act's legal ban on the closed shop did not in fact eliminate such arrangements. The closed shop has been driven underground, but not out of existence. The same parallel often exists in regards to State laws banning the union shop and lesser forms of union security contracts.

It should also be kept in mind that national labor-management relations laws apply only to those business enterprises found to be in the flow of interstate commerce. Thus, repeal of 14(b) would in no way affect the status of right-to-work laws applicable to those enterprises of a purely intrastate nature, that is, the smaller and localized business concerns.

A great number of political observers have pictured the debate over 14(b) as a sociopolitical struggle involving the question of the acceptability of unions, their role in society and the political power they exercise.

Without question this element is involved. Most labor leaders see right-to-work laws as being antiunion both in intent and in effect. Of the individuals and groups who have campaigned for right-to-work laws and who oppose repeal of 14(b) there are those who implicitly agree with this view. They believe that unions have become, or are threatening to become, so economically and politically powerful as to endanger the public interest.

Due to the very nature of conflicting economic interest and the inevitable variations in ideological outlook, certain tensions between union interests and nonunion interests will always exist. These tensions have affected the debate over whether or not 14(b) should be repealed.

But, Mr. President, it is my sincere belief that this aspect of the debate has been blown out of all reasonable proportion, and in the process many of the significant factors and issues in this great question have been ignored, obscured, and distorted. Another result of this situation is that it has become increasingly difficult for any individual to

participate in the debate without being categorized as either a rabid partisan or foe of labor. This is most unfortunate. Against the background of labor-management legislation of the past three decades and in the context of present social, economic, and political climate of this country there are few citizens and fewer political and public opinion leaders who are seriously opposed to unions as such. Thus, it is a considerable injustice to see the 14(b) debate as simply one of prounion against antiunion forces.

This is the age of big business, and regardless of where one's economic or ideological interests may lie, fairminded judgment recognizes that big labor is perhaps an inevitable, and on the whole, a proper counterdevelopment.

But precisely because of the existence of big labor and big business it is necessary at times for Government to intervene to the extent of establishing ground rules within which labor and business are to compete with each other so as to assure that this natural and inevitable struggle of economic interests be carried out in such a way as not to endanger the public interest.

Independent observers note that prior to the 1930's Government intervention in disputes between business and labor more often than not worked to the advantage of business. This situation was dramatically changed by the enactment of a series of national laws during the 1930's. Under the climate of New Deal legislation the power of organized labor was widely and dramatically expanded.

Since the end of World War II the Government has steered a more neutral course. Although this has varied somewhat between the various administrations and Congresses, the dominating theme of labor-management legislation in the postwar era has been the development of ground rules designed to assure the fair treatment of both business and labor, and particularly to protect and promote the overall public interest.

The Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 is symbolic of this approach. Whereas the Wagner Act of 1935 had spoken only of the rights of labor, the Taft-Hartley Act spelled out the rights of business and the obligations of labor, and also gave the National Government greater power to intervene in stalemated labor disputes where a work stoppage would be clearly against the national interest.

The establishment of labor-management ground rules by Congress always involves two types of questions. First, what types of ground rules shall be developed. Second, shall the ground rules be applied with national uniformity. Both of these questions always involve issues of much broader concern than the particular economic interests which are directly affected. They inevitably involve the larger questions of individual rights and freedoms, and the question of the basic governmental structure of this Nation and the nature of the political process by which public policy is made.

In many aspects of labor-management relations Congress quite properly had judged that in the best interests of labor, business, and the public as a whole, national uniformity is necessary and desirable. In the matter of union security arrangements, however, Congress, in the past, has judged that national uniformity is not necessary. Thus Congress has clearly expressed its intent that the individual States had the right to legislate in this area in accordance with the State's own particular economic, social, and political situation.

President Johnson has now asked that Congress remove this authority from States by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Although the President had voted for the Taft-Hartley Act—including the 14(b) provision—in 1947, and against repeal of 14(b) in 1948, and had voted for amending the Railway Labor Act in 1950 to include a provision similar to 14(b), he said in his state of the Union message of 1965 that repeal of 14(b) was needed so as to "reduce conflicts in our national labor policy that for several years have divided Americans in several States." In his message of 1966 he repeated his request for repeal so as "to make the labor laws in all our States equal to the laws of 31 States which do not have right-to-work measures."

The President, then, has said that national uniformity in this area of labor legislation is now necessary and desirable.

In attempting to decide whether or not such national uniformity is now necessary or desirable several basic questions of fact must be asked. One of the first, and one that no individual, regardless of his attitudes toward labor unions can avoid, is whether or not right-to-work laws have, in fact, acted to restrict labor union membership.

The more vigorous advocates of repeal of 14(b) argue that right-to-work laws do indeed adversely affect labor union membership; that membership, and therefore overall union strength, would be significantly greater in those States which have right-to-work laws than is now the case. Labor groups have produced statistical arguments supposedly "proving" this point.

On the other hand, right-to-work advocates have, with equal facility, produced a myriad of statistical analyses refuting this argument and, indeed, often "proving" that more often than not union membership has grown faster in right-to-work States than in non-right-to-work States.

Such statistical wars are common to political debates of this type. The adage that statistics can be used to prove any point of view is a sound one. Usually, however, independent analysis can prove which point of view is the more reasonable. In this particular case the hard, reliable evidence proves neither point of view.

As James R. Wason, specialist in labor relations for the Library of Congress, concluded in his study:

SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT AND STATE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS; AN INQUIRY INTO THEIR EFFECTS

Union membership both rose and fell in both right-to-work and non-right-to-work States.

The overall changes in right-to-work States as a whole were as follows:

	1958	1960	1962
Total AFL-CIO membership	13,881,000	13,872,800	13,375,500
Membership in right-to-work States	2,147,300	2,118,000	2,048,000
Percent of total in right-to-work States	15.5	15.3	15.3

These differences are not statistically significant. The changes of union membership follow more closely the changes in industrial employment than any other factor. * * * We have not been able to isolate a trend in union membership in right-to-work States as opposed to States without such laws. The supposed direct effects of right-to-work laws in causing members of unions to drop their membership does not appear. * * * These findings would appear to be consistent with the observation of other students of right-to-work laws.

Approaching this matter from another direction one needs to ask: Do right-to-work laws have a beneficial impact on the State's economy? Again it is extremely difficult to isolate the impact of right-to-work laws, or their absence, from basic regional economic growth patterns that have been underway over the past several decades. Using such indicators as trends in personal income, employment, industries, Mr. Wason concluded that while there was some data suggesting that such laws were a factor in fostering economic growth, the evidence simply was not conclusive either way.

Labor spokesmen invariably argue, and many sincerely believe, that right-to-work laws are rooted in antiunionism. This is a gross exaggeration. It does a great disservice to those who defend the right of States to enact right-to-work laws for reasons quite unrelated to the attitude toward labor. Such a sweeping indictment speaks poorly for the judgment of those who promote this argument.

While deploring the recklessness with which this indictment is made I would not attempt to argue that the charge, in some instances, is not without basis in fact. But the significant question is not whether such and such an individual or group is antiunion in outlook and motivation, but whether or not right-to-work laws do in fact have a significant adverse impact on the membership of unions and their overall economic and political strength.

After careful study of independent analyses such as Mr. Wason's I cannot but conclude that right-to-work laws do not, in fact, have this adverse effect.

Labor leaders have made repeal of 14(b) a symbol. They have declared that it weakens unions. It does not. But because they have so pictured it, repeal has become a symbolic test of their political strength. Unfortunately it has also become, for many, a symbolic whipping boy for the ills that plague the labor movement.

Against this background we can now turn directly to the question of whether or not the national uniformity that President Johnson has asked for in this area of labor-management relations is

necessary or desirable. Is Congress in 1966 justified in taking from the States those powers which Congress expressly declared to be their rightful prerogative in 1947?

If it could be conclusively established that right-to-work laws definitely undermine labor union strength, or conversely that they act as a positive asset in a State's efforts to attract new industry and, therefore, to improve its overall economic position, then one's economic ties and ideological predisposition would be a major factor in his decision. But the hard, reliable evidence on these points simply does not prove a significant pattern in either direction on either of these points.

Because of this the other issues involved in the proposal to repeal 14(b) take on even greater importance, and in fact, become the most meaningful and most important factors which Congress must consider in deciding this question.

The first, and I believe the most important, of these is the persistent and absolutely fundamental issue of the proper relationship between the States and the National Government. The Federal system of government has been the source spring of many of this country's greatest political strengths.

The Founding Fathers did not intend that the Federal system in all its particulars be rigid and unflexible. If it had been so designed it would have long since been abandoned, for changing conditions demand changes in process and procedures of politics and government. Thus, great changes have occurred, but the basic principles of federalism remain intact. There are none among us who would seriously argue that the Federal system has not served us well in the past, and only a rare few who would argue that it cannot continue to serve us well in the future.

Thus, there is no likelihood that Americans will purposely choose to formally discard the Federal system. But, of course, the Federal system in any meaningful sense, can be effectively destroyed without changing the letter of the Constitution. Many observers have argued that the changing relationship between the National Government and the States over the past several decades foretells just such a development. I do not share the more alarmist of these views.

However, I firmly believe that we must be constantly vigilant not to render the delicate web of National-State relations. Diligence is necessary not so much because of the existence of those who would purposefully destroy the Federal system. Those who are motivated by this desire are few in number and weak in power. Rather, diligence is necessary because the delicate and interlocking web of federalism can be sundered just as easily by default as by intent. In fact, the danger of default and negligence is by far the greater.

I am not arguing the extreme position that the repeal of 14(b) will constitute the straw that will break the backbone of federalism. I am arguing, however, that to repeal 14(b) is to cut yet another strand of the Federal web. And while most of those who argue for repeal do not intend it, the end result would be a further weakening of the federal system.

Mr. President, this is not a constitutional issue. I have little doubt but that the Supreme Court would uphold congressional action to repeal 14(b). And I agree that Congress, if it so chooses, has the authority to act in this area. But the important question here is whether it is necessary or desirable that Congress exercise this authority. I believe that the answer is no. To exercise this authority is both unnecessary and undesirable.

The struggle over 14(b) has been intense and often bitter not because it has significantly and directly affected the relative balance of strength between labor and business, but because it has become, for too many on both sides of the question, a symbolic political issue. In such a climate the repeal of 14(b) would invariably be widely interpreted as a victory for the cause of organized labor, defeat of the effort to repeal would, by the same token, be interpreted of a victory for antiunion forces. The position of many participants in the debate has been largely dictated by this factor.

This is most unfortunate, for candor forces the conclusion that in terms of hard concrete results the direct effect of repealing section 14(b) would be slight. This is so because the direct effects of 14(b) have been slight.

I am not arguing that political symbols are unimportant. Images sometimes become extremely important aspects of our reality. But these political symbols must be kept in proper balance so that in the heat of emotional commitment we do not make those decisions which, while they have little meaningful impact on the concrete problems at hand, do unintended damage in other areas. I believe that to repeal 14(b) would constitute just such a mistake.

Diversity is the hallmark of federalism. This diversity is at the same time its greatest liability and its greatest asset. At times, this diversity, born of the independent sovereignty of the 50 States, can constitute a barrier to the promotion and protection of the overall national interest. Therefore, the National Government has, from time to time, been obligated to enact legislative programs to be uniformly applied in all States.

Diversity is also the Federal system's greatest asset. I wholeheartedly agree with my honorable colleague, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, when he said:

> I have never thought uniformity, as a doctrine or principle, a desirable goal of a society striving for greatness.

Each State differs in its cultural background, its political and social outlook, its economic structure, its labor and business climate. A major reason why this Union, so diverse in its peoples and regions, has endured is the fact that the Federal system is ingeniously designed to accommodate these differences. Because of these differences the political processes and the public policies of each State differ in style and content from the processes and policies of every other State.

How can we justify depriving the citizens of the States to legislate in this area of labor-management relations according to their own particular situation and their democratically expressed desires?

The President has said that this is necessary to eliminate conflict that has divided Americans. In reality, repeal of 14(b) would magnify conflict, not eliminate it. The fact that the citizens of 31 States have implicitly or explicitly decided not to enact right-to-work laws in no sense justifies the demand that all States regardless of their political and economic backgrounds must follow suit.

To ask Congress to remove this authority from the States is not to ask Congress to endorse an existing consensus, but to violate it. To repeal 14(b) would not be to fulfill the consensus of the American people on this issue but to pervert it and to corrupt it.

Any discussion of this question must address itself to the issue of individual rights and freedom. Some have argued that the single greatest issue involved in this debate is that of individual freedom of choice versus the demands of compulsory unionism.

This states the case too simply. I certainly accept the general principle that a worker should be free to decide whether or not to join a union. But lofty ideals do not always fit hard realities. However regrettable it may be, the extreme complexity and interdependence of our modern society means that individual freedom is often restricted. Economic employment is no exception.

If the freedom-of-choice argument is followed to its logical conclusion one would have to demand a national right-to-work law. But such a law would violate the right of the citizens of the individual States to decide this question according to their own desires in the same sense that repeal of 14(b) would nullify the right of each State to decide this question.

In some types of economic environments, restrictions on individual freedom, such as occur in union security arrangements, may actually be desirable. But this is a matter that must be left to citizens of the individual States to decide.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield as much time to the Senator from Alabama as he may desire.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, for the last 6 years interparliamentary meetings have been held each year between Mexico and the United States, the meetings alternating between the two countries. This year it is the good fortune of the United States to be the host to this interparliamentary conference. We have with us today, in the Senate Chamber, the parliamentarians representing the great country of Mexico.

We have just started the conference and have concluded our opening plenary session. Immediately following the vote which is to take place shortly, we shall return to our session and divide into committees for the purpose of discussing various problems and issues of common interest to the two countries.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to present the Mexican delegation. First, I wish to introduce Senator Moreno, who is the chairman of the Mexican delegation. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, since our guests are standing, I am pleased to present the entire Mexican delegation to the Sixth Interparliamentary Conference between our two countries. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the privilege to point out that the pending vote on cloture is not the only noteworthy event to occur in the Senate this morning. I refer to the presence on the Senate floor of a number of our distinguished guests from the Congress of the United Mexican States.

Every year at this time the parliamentarians of Mexico and the United States meet together to discuss problems of mutual interest to our countries in an atmosphere of warm understanding, mutual tolerance, and respect, and good fellowship. This year, the Sixth Annual Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Conference convenes at a time when the spirit of friendship is particularly strong and the atmosphere is unclouded by divisive issues. The year just ended was a notable one in Mexican-United States relations marked by great strides toward the solution of the Colorado River salinity problem. And so it is that problems which have long stood between our two countries have been ameliorated, proving beyond doubt that neighbors can live together, side by side, in an atmosphere of cooperative friendship and good will.

To those distinguished delegates we already know, we extend the special greetings reserved to good friends of long standing. To the new members of the delegation of Mexico who have come here to participate in these meetings for the first time, we wish you a hearty welcome in the hope that this will mark the beginning of a long and lasting friendship which we hope will grow even closer with the passage of time.

The success of these conferences which alternate each year between Mexico and the United States is truly a reflection of the wisdom and hard work of the distinguished chairmen of the respective delegations. Our own distinguished colleague, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama, an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has served as chairman of the U.S. delegation ever since the first Conference in 1961. The continued success of the U.S. participation in these conferences is largely due to the fine service that Senator SPARKMAN has performed each year, and, I might add, to the leadership of Representative ROBERT NIX, of Philadelphia, on the House of Representatives side.

Senator Manuel M. Moreno, senator from the State of Guanajuato and chairman of the Mexican delegation this year, has a long and distinguished career in the Mexican Government and is a friend and delegate to these conferences of long standing. Senator Don Manuel Tello, from the State of Zacatecas, a former Foreign Minister of the Republic of Mexico, a former distinguished Ambassador to the United States and last year's Chairman, is with us once again, as is Deputy Jorge De La Vega Dominguez, of Chiapas, who is the coordinator of the delegation from the Chamber of Deputies. Each of these eminent and simpatico gentlemen have made great contributions to the fine record of accomplishment that these Interparliamentary Conferences have made in their short but notable history.

To all of you I extend a hearty welcome along with my hopes that this Conference will again prove to be the great success that it has been in the past. Welcome, friends. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Illinois, the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Senor Moreno and all other members of the delegation, in the City of Chicago we have a very substantial Mexican population who have contributed to the community life in the city and State. It has been my privilege to be their guest on many an occasion.

Today I should like to say to you in the language of a song that was very popular years ago, and sung everywhere in America, "Hi, Neighbor; Hi, Neighbor."

Today, with pleasure, may I say to all of you, "Hi, neighbor. We are delighted to have you." [Applause.]

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, representing the State of Texas, which has a common land boundary with our sister Republic of Mexico extending for more than 1,000 miles, I extend greetings to the members of the Interparliamentary Conference.

The State of Texas has had long and fine neighbor relations with the states in the northern part of the Republic of Mexico.

I join in extending a warm welcome on behalf of a State whose people contain approximately 1½ million people with Spanish names, most of whom speak the Spanish language.

Texas has a closer contact with Mexico than Mexico does with any other part of the United States, and Texas probably has closer contact with Mexico than all other parts of the United States put together.

We welcome these distinguished members from our sister Republic. I hope that you can stop in Texas on your way home.

We are glad to have you here. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I doubt that in the history of the people of Mexico and the people of the United States there has ever been a time to equal the present time with its fidelity and strength of fellowship between our two countries. One by one over the past many years, problems which have plagued us have been solved.

As one who has been privileged to serve on several of these Mexico-American Interparliamentary Conferences, it is my view that much of the bases on which the problems have been solved has been the work of these annual conferences.

I shall dust off my Anaheim, Calif., Spanish for a moment.

(Mr. KUCHEL then greeted the delegates in Spanish.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield briefly to the distinguished President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Como Senador de Arizona les extiendo una bien venida. Gracias, Amigos. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I am indeed happy to be associated with this group representing the U.S. Congress. I am happier still that we have the distinguished parliamentarians from Mexico present this morning.

I was a part of the first team from the United States back in 1960 and have been continuously with this group.

We have noticed through the years that an affinity has been developing between the two Congresses which indeed forebodes increasingly better relations between our two countries.

As a Senator from the State of New Mexico and a neighbor to the parliamentarians, I extend a warm welcome not only on behalf of the State of New Mexico, but also on behalf of the U.S. Senate.

(Mr. MONTOYA then greeted the delegates in Spanish.) [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the delegates to the Sixth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, together with other material contained in this publication.

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

SIXTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON—PHILADELPHIA—SAN FRANCISCO, FEBRUARY 9–15, 1966

MEXICAN DELEGATION

Senators and wives

Lic. Manuel M. Moreno, Carmen Contreras de Moreno.

Don Manuel Tello Baurraud, Guadalupe Macías de Tello.

Lic. Arturo Llorente González, Bertha M. de Llorente.

Lic. María Lavalle Urbina.

Dr. Mario C. Olivera, Celia Olivera Martinez (daughter).

Lic. Arturo Moguel Esponda, Inocencia D. de Moguel.

Lic. Amado Estrada Rodriguez, Margarita C. de Estrada.

Ing. Eulalio Gutiérrez Treviño, Margarita T. de Gutiérrez.

Gral. Ignacio Bonilla Vázquez, Ma. de los Angeles V. de Bonilla.

Ing. Juan de Dios Bojórquez Leon, Carlota Bojórquez del V. (daughter).

Mayor Oswaldo Cravioto Cianeros, Consuelo H. de Cravioto.

Don Antonio Flores Mazari, Magdalena Flores (daughter).

Deputies and wives

Lic. Jorge de la Vega, Hermila G. de de la Vega.

Don Mauro Berrueto Ramón, Juana B. de Berrueto.

Lic. José Antonio Cobos, Susana Pons de Cobos.

Lic. Luis Dantón Rodríguez, Evelyn M. de Rodriguez.

Lic. Alejandro Carrillo, Aurea C. de Carrillo.

Dr. Raúl Legaspi, Elizabeth C. de Legaspi.

Lic. Abraham Aguilar Paniagua, Carlota G. de Aguilar.

Prof. Vicente Fuentes Díaz, Rosa Pintado de Fuentes.

Dr. Antonio Martínez Manaoutou, Ma. Elena S. de Martínez.

Profra. Aurora Navía Millan, Dr. Raymundo Moreno Navía (son).

Profra. Martha Andrade de del Rosal, Martha del Rosal Andrade (daughter).

Don Rubén Moheno Velasco, Gracia O. Moheno V. (daughter).

Alternates

Dr. Humberto Morales, Humberto Morales Quintero (son).

Dr. Arnulfo Treviño Garza, Ma. de la Luz C. de Treviño.

PERSONNEL ACCOMPANYING THE MEXICAN DELEGATION FROM MEXICO

Advisers and wives

Humberto Martínez R. Romero, Elva Pelayo de Martínez.

Lic. Juan Gallardo Moreno, Director General of Consular Service, Ministry for Foreign Relations; Juliana de Gallardo.

Enrique Pérez López, Chief Director, International Economic Relations, Ministry for Foreign Relations; Maria Elguézabal P.

Lic. Gonzalo Mora O., Manager of the National Bank of Foreign Commerce; Rosario B. de Mora.

Jorge Leipin Caray, Eva B. de Leipin.

Lic. Sergio González Gálvez, Chief, Dept. of U.N. and O.A.S. Affairs, Ministry for Foreign Relations.

Lic. Agustin López Munguía, Asst. Dir. General of Public Financing Studies, Ministry of Finance.

Lic. Benito Berlín, Director General of Economic Studies, Ministry of Industry and Commerce.

Press

Luis M. Farias, Coordinator of Press (Administrator of Tourism in Mexico); Maria Emilia M. de Farias.

Miss Rose Mary Mackey, Aide to Mr. Farias.

Administrative personnel and wives

Sen. Antonio García Rojas, Treasurer, Senate; Belen B. de García R.

Dip. Agustín Arroyo Damían, Treasurer, Chamber of Deputies; Bertha Legaspi de Arroyo.

Capt. David Romero Vargas, Assistant Coordinator, Senate.

Bernardo Picaso, Assistant Coordinator, Chamber of Deputies.

Documentation personnel

Lic. Juan Pérez-Abreu J., Chief.

Marcelo Aragon del Rivero.

Salvador Mercado Moreno.

Manuel Alemán.

Francisco Bravo Villarreal (Translator).

Stenographers

Joel Hernández, Jesús Sánchez Niño, Héctor Contreras, Alberto Moreno Carsolio, Lic. Francisco López Alvarez, Fernando Hidalgo.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION

Senate delegates

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama, chairman; WAYNE MORSE, Oregon; ALBERT GORE, Tennessee; MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana; ERNEST GRUENING, Alaska; DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii; GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin; JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico; GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California; PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona; GEORGE MURPHY, California.

House delegates

ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania, chairman; HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Jr., Delaware; JAMES C. WRIGHT, Jr., Texas; HAROLD T. JOHNSON, California; RONALD BROOKS CAMERON, California; JOHN M. SLACK, Jr., West Virginia; HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Texas; EDWARD R. DERWINSKI, Illinois; F. BRADFORD MORSE, Massachusetts; JAMES HARVEY, Michigan; ALPHONSO BELL, California; CHESTER L. MIZE, Kansas.

PROGRAMA

Febrero 9 (Miércoles)

3:10 p.m.: La Delegación Mexicana arriba al Aeropuerto "Dulles" a bordo de un avión de Aeronaves. Una Guardia de Honor y miembros de la Delegación de los Estados Unidos recibrían a los visitantes en "Dulles" y, después de las ceremonias de bienvenida, se dirigirán conjuntamente en autobús al Shoreham Hotel.

5:00 p.m.: Llegada al Shoreham Hotel. Recepción. (Buffet ligero) Resto de la noche libre.

Febrero 10 (Jueves)

9 a.m.: Salida del hotel (los Co-Presidentes).

9:30 a.m.: Reunión de los Co-Presidentes, Sala S-116, Capitolio.

9:15 a.m.: Salida de hotel (lo delegados y sus señoras).

10 a.m.: Apertura de la Sesión Plenaria. Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema, Capitolio de los Estados Unidos. Saludo del Secretario de Estado Dean Rusk y del Representante NIX, Presidente de la Delegación de la Cámara de Representantes. Replica del Presidente de la Delegación Mexicana. (Se invita a las esposa de los miembros de ambas delegaciones a concurrir al acto.)

10:40 a.m.: Los Delegados Mexicanos visitarán la Cámara de Senadores. (Las esposas de los delegados y el personal se hallarán en la Galería del Senado.)

11 a.m.: Reuniones de los Comités:

12:30 p.m.: Comité Político—Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema.

Comité Económico y Social—Sala H-227, Capitolio.

(Durante las reuniones de los Comités, se invita a las esposas de los delegados a un café que se servirá en la oficina del Senador MANSFIELD, Capitolio, Sala S-208 [Será anfitriona la Sra. de MANSFIELD], seguido de una gira por el Capitolio.)

1 p.m.: Comida en el Departamento de Estado, Salón Benjamin Franklin, para las Delegaciones de México y de los Estados Unidos, y respectivas exposas. (Anfitriones: Senador SPARKMAN y Representante NIX.)

3:30: Reuniones de los Comités en el Capitólio:

5 p.m.: Comité Político—Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema. Comité Económico y Social—Sala H-227.

6 p.m.: Salida del hotel (los delegados y sus señoras) con destino a la Embajada de México.

6:30-8 p.m.: Recepción en la Embajada de México.

Febrero 11 (Viernes) (Ver Programa separado para las damas)

9:15 a.m.: Salida del hotel (los delegados) con destino al Capitolio de los Estados Unidos.

10 a.m.-12 mediodía: Reuniones de los dos comités, Capitolio de los Estados Unidos: Comité Politico—Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema. Comité Económico y Social—Sala H-227.

12 mediodía. Gira por la Cámara de Representantes.

1 p.m.: Comida en el Edificio Rayburn, Sala B-369.

Anfitriones: Representante NIX y Senador SPARKMAN, Co-Presidentes de la Delegación de los Estados Unidos.

3 p.m.: Sesión Plenaria de Clausura, Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema, Capitolio. Palabras del Senador SPARKMAN y de un Miembro de la Delegación Mexicana.

7:30 p.m.: Recepción.

8:30 p.m.: Cena, Shoreham Hotel, Salón Palladian, ofrecidos por la Delegación de los Estados Unidos en honor de la Delegación Mexicana.

Febrero 12 (Sábado)

11 a.m.: Salida del Shoreham Hotel con destino al Monumento a Lincoln.

11:45 a.m.: Colocación de una ofrenda floral en el Monumento a Lincoln. Banda Musical. Lectura del Discurso de Gettysburg por el Senador JOHN SPARKMAN, Presidente de la Delegación E.E.U.U. del Senado.

12:30 p.m.: Salida del Monumento a Lincoln con destino al Cementerio Nacional de Arlington para la ceremonia de la colocación de una ofrenda floral en la tumba del Presidente John F. Kennedy.

1 p.m.: Salida del Cementerio Nacional de Arlington con destino al Shoreham Hotel.

1:30 p.m.: Llegada al Shoreham Hotel.

Por la tarde: Libre.

8 p.m.: Salida del Shoreham Hotel con destino al Coliseo de Washington (Delegaciones de México y de los Estados Unidos.)

9 p.m.: Ice Capades (Revista de Patinaje sobre Hielo), Coliseo de Washington.

Febrero 13 (Domingo)

9:15 a.m.: Salinda del Shoreham Hotel en autobús con destino a Philadelphia (Delegaciones de México y de los Estados Unidos).

12:30 p.m.: Llegada a Philadelphia.

12:45 p.m.: Recepción.

1:15 p.m.: Comida en el último piso del Edificio PSFS (Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, 12th and Market Streets).

2:30 p.m.: Salida en autobús con destino a Parque de la Independencia.

2:40 p.m.: Llegada a Parque de la Independencia. Sesión Solemne en Congress Hall. Visita a la Campana de la Libertad. Palabras del Representante NIX, Presidente de la Delegación E.E.U.U. de la Cámara de Representantes, y de un Miembro de la Delegación Mexicana.

4-5 p.m.: Gira en autobús por Fairmount Park, en ruta hacia Independencia.

5 p.m.: Gira en autobús por Fairmount Park, en ruta hacia el aeropuerto.

6 p.m.: Salida de Philadelphia con destino a San Francisco, en un avión de propulsion a chorro de los Estados Unidos para Misiones Especiales. (Ambas Delegaciones.)

9 p.m.: Llegada a San Francisco (Base Hamilton de la Fuerza Aérea) y salida con destino al Fairmont Hotel.

Febrero 14 (Lunes)

Por la mañana: Libre. Comida sin compromiso.

1:30 p.m.: Salido del Fairmont Hotel en autobús con destino a Fisherman's Wharf (Puerto de Pescadores).

2-3:15 p.m.: Gira en lancha por lo Bahía de San Francisco.

3:15-5 p.m.: Gira en autobús por la ciudad. (Si el estado del tiempo no permite la gira

en lancha, ésta será reemplazada con una gira de 3 horas en autobús.)

Por la noche: Libre. Cena sin compromiso.

Febrero 15 (Martes)

10:30 a.m.: Embarque en autobuses en el Fairmont Hotel para el viaje hacia la zona vitivinícola.

Mediodía: Llegada al establecimiento vitivinícola de Charles Krug (a unas 65 millas al Norte de San Francisco, cerca de St. Helena). Guías de habla española se unirán al grupo en Napa. Comida después de la gira.

2:45 p.m.: Salida en autobús con destino a San Francisco.

4:15 p.m.: Llegada a San Francisco, Fairmont Hotel.

7:30 p.m.: Recepción.

8:30 p.m.: Cena ofrecidas por la Cámara de Comerico de San Francisco.

Febrero 16 (Miércoles)

La Delegación Mexicana parte con destino a México. La Delegación de los Estados Unidos parte con destino a Washington, D.C. en el Avión para Misiones Especiales.

Tengan la Bondad de Llevar sus Tarjetas de identificacion.

PROGRAMA PARA LAS DAMAS

Febrero 9 (Miércoles)

3:10 p.m.: La Delegación Mexicana arriba al Aeropuerto Dulles. Los Delegados de los Estados Unidos y sus respectivas esposas recibirán a los visitantes en Dulles y se dirigirán con ellos al Shoreham Hotel para asistir a la recepción.

5 p.m.: Llegada al Shoreham Hotel. Recepción. (Buffet ligero). Resto de la noche libre.

Febrero 10 (Jueves)

9:15 a.m.: Salida de hotel (los delegados y sus señoras).

10 a.m.: Apertura de la Sesión Plenaria de la Conferencia en la Vieja Cámara de la Corte Suprema, Capitolia de los Estados Unidos.

10:40 a.m.: Ias esposas se hallarán en la Galeria del Senado cuando los Miembros de la Delegación Mexicana sean recibidos en la Cámara de Senadores.

11 a.m.: Café ofrecido en Sala S-211, Capitolio. (Será anfitriona la Sra. de MANSFIELD). Gira por el Capitolio.

1 p.m.: Comida en el Departmento de Estado, Salón Benjamin Franklin, para les Delegaciones de México y Estados Unidos, y respectivas esposas. (Anfitriones: Senador SPARKMAN y Representante NIX, Co-Presidentes de la Delagación de los Estados Unidos).

Salida con destino al hotel.

Por la trade: Libre.

6 p.m.: Salida con destino a la Embajada de Mexico.

6:30 to 8:30 p.m.: Recepción en la Embajada de México para los Delegados Mexicanos y Norteamericanos y sus respectivas esposas.

Febrero 11 (Viernes)

10:30 a.m.: Salida del hotel.

11 a.m.: Llegada al museo de Historia y Technologia Recorrido del museo.

11:45 a.m.: Recepción y comida.

2:15 p.m.: Llegada al Club de Mujures del Congreso.

2:30 p.m.: Te y exhibicion de modas.

4:30 p.m.: Salida para el hotel.

7:30 p.m.: Recepción cena, Palladian Room, Shoreham Hotel.

Del 12 al 15 de Febrero, inclusive

El mismo programa de los Delegados.

Please wear your identification badge.

SCHEDULE

February 9 (Wednesday)

3:10 p.m.: Mexican delegation arrives at Dulles Airport aboard Aeronaves Airlines jet. Honor guard and members of U.S. delegation to meet visitors at Dulles and, after welcoming ceremonies, proceed together by bus to Shoreham Hotel.

5 p.m.: Arrive Shoreham Hotel. Reception. (Light buffet.) Remainder of evening free.

February 10 (Thursday)

9 a.m.: Cochairman of Mexican delegation depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

9:15 a.m.: Delegates and wives depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

9:30 a.m.: Meeting of four cochairmen, room S-116, Capitol.

10 a.m.: Opening Plenary Session. Old Supreme Court Chamber, U.S. Capitol. Greetings by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Representative NIX, chairman of House of Representatives delegation. Response by chairman of Mexican delegation. (Wives of both delegations invited to attend.)

10:40 a.m.: Mexican Delegates visit Senate floor. (Wives of delegates and staff to be in Senate Gallery.)

11 a.m.: Meetings of committees:

12:30 p.m.: Political Committee—Old Supreme Court Chamber. Economic and Social Committee—Room H-227, Capitol.

(During Committee meetings, wives of delegates are invited to coffee in Capitol room S-211 (Mrs. Mansfield, hostess), followed by tour of Capitol.)

1 p.m.: Luncheon at Department of State, Benjamin Franklin Room, for Mexican and U.S. delegations, and wives. (Cohosts: Senator SPARKMAN and Representative NIX.)

3:30 p.m.: Meetings of committees at Capitol:

5 p.m.: Political Committee—Old Supreme Court Chamber. Economic and Social Committee—Room H-227.

6 p.m.: Delegates and wives depart Shoreham Hotel for Mexican Embassy.

6:30-8:30 p.m.: Reception at Mexican Embassy, 2829 16th Street NW.

February 11 (Friday)

(See separate schedule for ladies)

9:15 a.m.: Delegates depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

10 a.m.-12 noon: Meetings of the two committees, U.S. Capitol: Political Committee—Old Supreme Court Chamber. Economic and Social Committee—Room H -227.

12-12:30 p.m.: Tour of the House of Representatives.

1 p.m.: Lunch in Rayburn Building, room B-369. Cohosts: Representative NIX and Senator SPARKMAN, cochairmen of the U.S. delegation.

3 p.m.: Closing Plenary Session, Old Supreme Court Chamber, Capitol. Remarks by Senator SPARKMAN, and a member of the Mexican delegation.

7:30 p.m.: Reception.

8:30 p.m.: Banquet, Shoreham Hotel, Palladian Room, given by the U.S. delegation in honor of the Mexican delegation.

February 12 (Saturday)

11 a.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for Lincoln Memorial.

11:44 a.m.: Wreath laying ceremony at Lincoln Memorial. Band. Reading of Gettysburg Address by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, chairman, Senate delegation.

12:30 p.m.: Depart Lincoln Memorial for Arlington National Cemetery for wreath-laying ceremony at the grave of President John F. Kennedy.

1 p.m.: Depart Arlington National Cemetery for Shoreham Hotel.

1:30 p.m.: Arrive Shoreham Hotel.

Afternoon free.

8 p.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for Washington Coliseum (Mexican and U.S. delegations).

9 p.m.: Ice Capades, Washington Coliseum.

February 13 (Sunday)

9:15 a.m.: Leave Shoreham Hotel by bus for Philadelphia (Mexican and U.S. delegations).

12:30 p.m.: Arrive Philadelphia.

12:45 p.m.: Reception.

1:15 p.m.: Lunch on top floor of PSFS Building (Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, 12th and Market Streets).

2:30 p.m.: Depart by bus for Independence Park.

2:40 p.m.: Arrive Independence Park. Solemn session at Congress Hall. Visit Liberty Bell. Remarks by Representative NIX, chairman of House of Representatives delegation, and a member of the Mexican delegation.

4-5 p.m.: Bus tour through remainder of Independence Park.

5 p.m.: Bus tour of Fairmount Park, en route to airport.

6 p.m.: Depart Philadelphia by U.S. special mission jet for San Francisco. (Both delegations).

9 p.m.: Arrive San Francisco (Hamilton Air Force Base) and proceed to Fairmont Hotel.

February 14 (Monday)

Morning: Free. Lunch open.

1:30 p.m.: Depart Fairmont Hotel by bus for Fisherman's Wharf.

2 p.m.: Tour of San Francisco Bay by boat.

3:15 p.m.: Tour of city by bus.

5 p.m.: (If weather does not permit boat tour, a 3-hour bus tour will be substituted.)

Evening: Free.

February 15 (Tuesday)

10:30 a.m.: Board buses at Hotel Fairmont for trip to wine country.

Noon: Arrive at Charles Krug Winery (about 65 miles north of San Francisco, near St. Helena). Spanish-speaking guides will join party at Napa. Buffet lunch following tour.

2:45 p.m.: Depart by bus for San Francisco.

4:15 p.m.: Arrive San Francisco, Hotel Fairmont.

7:30 p.m.: Reception and dinner given by San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

February 16 (Wednesday)

Mexican delegation departs for Mexico. U.S. delegation departs by special mission jet aircraft for Washington, D.C.

Please wear your identification badge.

LADIES SCHEDULE

February 9 (Wednesday)

3:10 p.m.: Mexican delegation arrives Dulles Airport. U.S. delegates and wives meet visitors at Dulles and proceed with them (by bus) to Shoreham Hotel for reception.

5 p.m.: Arrive Shoreham. Reception. (Light buffet.) Remainder of evening free.

February 10 (Thursday)

9:15 a.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for U.S. Capitol.

10 a.m.: Opening plenary session of conference in Old Supreme Court Chamber, U.S. Capitol.

10:40 a.m.: Wives to be in Senate Gallery when members of Mexican delegation are received on Senate floor.

11 a.m.: Coffee in room S-211, Capitol. (Hostess: Mrs. Mansfield.) Tour of Capitol.

1 p.m.: Luncheon at Department of State, Benjamin Franklin Room, for Mexican and United States delegates and wives. (Cohosts: Senator SPARKMAN and Representative NIX, the cochairmen of the U.S. delegation.) Depart State Department for Shoreham Hotel.

Afternoon: Free.

6 p.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel for Mexican Embassy.

6:30 p.m.: Reception at Mexican Embassy for Mexican and United States delegates and wives.

February 11 (Friday)

10:30 a.m.: Depart Shoreham Hotel.

11 a.m.: Arrive Museum of History and Technology, Smithsonian Institution, Constitution Avenue between 12th and 14th Streets. Tour of museum.

11:45 a.m.: Reception and luncheon.

1:45 p.m.: Depart Smithsonian.

2:15 p.m.: Arrive Women's Congressional Club, 2001 New Hampshire Avenue.

2:30 p.m.: Fashion show and tea.

4:30 p.m.: Depart Congressional Club for Shoreham.

7:30 p.m.: Reception and dinner, Shoreham Hotel, Palladian Room.

February 12–15, inclusive: Schedule same as for delegates.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and in the meantime we may all go in the corner of the Chamber to extend our best wishes to our guests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959 and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the pending question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate shall be brought to a close on the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 77) to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 703(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959, and to amend the first proviso of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended? Under the rule, the clerk will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the rule, the time has now arrived for the Chair to ascertain a quorum of the Senate; and I suggest the absence of a quorum. This will be a live quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 33 Leg.]

Aiken	Byrd, W. Va.	Douglas
Allott	Cannon	Eastland
Anderson	Carlson	Ellender
Bartlett	Case	Ervin
Bass	Church	Fannin
Bayh	Clark	Fong
Bennett	Cooper	Fulbright
Bible	Cotton	Gore
Boggs	Curtis	Gruening
Brewster	Dirksen	Harris
Burdick	Dodd	Hart
Byrd, Va.	Dominick	Hartke
Hayden	McGovern	Ribicoff
Hickenlooper	McIntyre	Robertson
Hill	Metcalf	Russell, S.C.
Holland	Miller	Russell, Ga.
Hruska	Mondale	Saltonstall
Inouye	Monroney	Scott
Jackson	Montoya	Simpson
Javits	Morse	Smathers
Jordan, N.C.	Morton	Smith
Jordan, Idaho	Moss	Sparkman
Kennedy, Mass.	Mundt	Stennis
Kennedy, N.Y.	Murphy	Symington
Kuchel	Muskie	Talmadge
Lausche	Nelson	Thurmond
Long, Mo.	Neuberger	Tower
Long, La.	Pastore	Tydings
Magnuson	Pearson	Williams, N.J.
Mansfield	Pell	Williams, Del.
McCarthy	Prouty	Yarborough
McClellan	Proxmire	Young, N. Dak.
McGee	Randolph	Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Under rule XXII, the yeas and nays are required on the pending question, which is as follows: Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77, to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Anderson	Inouye	Moss
Bartlett	Jackson	Muskie
Bass	Javits	Nelson
Bayh	Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger
Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Burdick	Kuchel	Pell
Case	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Church	Long, La.	Randolph
Clark	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Cooper	Mansfield	Scott
Dodd	McCarthy	Smith
Douglas	McGee	Symington
Gore	McIntyre	Tydings
Gruening	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Mondale	Yarborough
Hart	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Morse	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Fong	Pearson
Allott	Fulbright	Prouty
Bennett	Hayden	Robertson
Bible	Hickenlooper	Russell, S.C.
Boggs	Hill	Russell, Ga.
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Simpson
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Sparkman
Cotton	Lausche	Stennis
Curtis	McClellan	Talmadge
Dirksen	McGovern	Thurmond
Dominick	Miller	Tower
Eastland	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Mundt	
Fannin	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—1

McNamara

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). On this vote there are 50 yeas and 49 nays. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the cloture motion is rejected.

Mr. THURMOND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement follow the vote on the motion to limit debate on whether to take up the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act today.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Today the Senate of the United States has laid to rest the issue of compulsory unionism, at least for this session of Congress. I am in hopes, however, that this victory will prove to be of much longer lasting consequence and that we have seen the last of this issue for some time to come.

It is quite apparent that union leaders need no additional powers beyond those that they already possess. It is apparent, too, that the people of this Nation consider the right to work a basic freedom and are very much in favor of the right to be free to join or not to join a union.

Today's victory is a victory for the workingman and the freedom for our people. I am happy and proud to have had a part in it.

The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is especially to be commended for his fine leadership in this matter. The able Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and many others played a vital role in preserving section 14(b). I am proud of the stand that was taken on the Republican side of the aisle on this issue. This record of solidarity on behalf of freedom is one of which I am particularly proud.

POSITION ON CLOTURE VOTE BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I voted for cloture to terminate the debate on the repeal of section 14(b).

The country is entitled to a vote on this issue. It has been an issue in numerous referendums and election campaigns over the past 18 years. It has been considered in hearings in this and other Congresses. It has been debated at great length in both sessions of this Congress. It should be settled one way or the other, so that the business of the Senate can go on.

Unfortunately, the debate in the Congress and in the country over this issue has been dominated by slogans, scare-arguments, and emotional appeals on both sides. In my judgment, this issue has been magnified out of all importance. Labor has focused its prestige and invested a large share of its political capital on an issue that many feel is of less importance to it and to the country than such other issues as minimum wage legislation. Many groups and organizations representing management and other nonlabor interests have reacted violently to the effort to repeal section 14(b) and have flooded the country with foolish propaganda that denounces labor unions in general and certain labor leaders in particular.

It is therefore important to examine closely exactly what repeal of section 14(b) does and does not mean.

Repeal of section 14(b) will not make the union shop compulsory. Rather it will allow unions and management freely to reach agreement on whether a union shop should be instituted. In the 31 States which do not have right-to-work laws a union shop cannot be created without the consent of management. Nor can a union shop be instituted without the support of a majority of the workers in a bargaining unit. Repeal should thus mean less compulsion, not more. It will permit workers and employers to agree on what degree of union security is appropriate for their establishment. Since the union, selected by majority vote, must bargain for all, and since the fruits of the bargaining are enjoyed by all, I see no reason why, if union and management agree, that the union should not be supported by all the employees.

Nor is a vote for 14(b) a vote for arbitrary power of unions or union leaders over their members. There are abuses of power, corruption, and denial of democratic processes within unions just as there are in any organization run by fallible human beings. But those abuses occur both in union shops and nonunion shops, in States with right-to-work laws and those without them. Problems of union democracy will neither be solved nor worsened by repeal of 14(b).

In those cases where collective bargaining already goes on, repeal of 14(b) will not affect the present balance of bargaining power between unions and management. The union's right to strike, the employees right to replace strikers, and mutual duty to bargain in good faith and all other rules of collective bargaining apply to union and nonunion shops alike. Section 14(b) did not prevent the transit strike which recently paralyzed New York City and its repeal will not enlarge or reduce the possibility of such strikes occurring in the future. Finally, labor relations in 31 States, covering the great majority of American workers and industry, will not be at all affected by repeal of 14(b).

There are legitimate questions to be raised about the balance of bargaining power between labor and management and about the protection of innocent third parties affected by a labor dispute. But those questions will not be solved by permitting union shops to continue in 19 States. I would welcome a broad-scale inquiry into our labor management relations policies that could lead to reforms in all areas where problems exist.

Having said this, the question is, Why should 14(b) be repealed?

The first reason is the need to return to a uniform national labor law. Uniformity is no abstract goal. It has real and immediate consequences. Our great companies operate in every State in the Union. Their manufacturing operations are often spread over many States; they buy their materials and sell their products everywhere. The unions which represent their employees are also national in scope.

Lack of uniformity in our labor laws encourages States to compete with others for industry by making union organization more difficult. Competition for industry is a natural and often a healthy thing in our economy. But that competition should not be waged at the expense of American workers, or of their rights to bargain freely on the terms and conditions of employment—including the union shop.

Another reason for the repeal of 14(b) is that it contributes to wage levels which are unacceptably low. Average weekly wages in manufacturing enterprise in States without right-to-work laws in 1963, for example, where $101.52. For comparable enterprises in States with right-to-work laws, the average weekly wage was $91.80.

Of course, wages are affected by much more than right-to-work laws. But it cannot be denied that these laws, by handicapping union organization, contribute to an imbalance of bargaining power as compared to the rest of the Nation. With one exception, for example, every State in the southeastern part of the United States is a right-to-work State. In these States, the average weekly wage in manufacturing in 1963 was $77.77. But for Louisiana, the single non-right-to-work State in the area, the average weekly wage in manufacturing was $100.62—$23 more a week than the average for the region, as much as $30 a week more than wages in some neighboring States, a wage on a par or even better than those paid in Maryland, New York, Pennsylvania, or Illinois.

When average wage levels are this low it means that many manufacturing workers in these States are working for $50 or even $40 a week—far below the line officially declared by Congress to represent poverty; and it means that workers in States like Maryland, where living costs are far higher, must forego requests for wage increases in order to keep their own wage levels competitive—so that their employers will not leave the State.

In short, no one, as a result of repeal of 14(b), will be forced to join a union—only to contribute with his dues toward the work of the union which improves his own wages and working conditions. The only States right which is at issue is the right to compete for industry with other States by hindering union organization and keeping wage levels low.

While I have supported repeal, I have done so feeling that we were debating the wrong issue at the wrong time and in the wrong way. I would have preferred the Congress consider section 14(b) in the context of a more fundamental review of our labor laws. The potential power of the Teamsters and the tragedy of the New York subway strike suggest to me that a number of changes in our labor legislation are needed.

By focusing on the relatively unimportant issue of section 14(b), the whole debate was, in my judgment, singularly unproductive. I hope that any future Congress of which I am a part will approach labor-management relations problems in a more constructive way.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent order, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 9) entitled "An Act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period," do pass with an amendment.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we cannot hear a thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 9) entitled "An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period," with certain amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendments.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I requested the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments, as follows:

On page 11 of the House-engrossed amendment, beginning with line 3, strike out all down through line 12.

On page 11 of the House-engrossed amendment, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

On page 16, line 3, of the House-engrossed amendment, strike out "veterans'" and insert in lieu thereof "veteran's".

On page 22 of the House-engrossed amendment, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) striking out in the first sentence of section 1772(a) the phrase 'under subchapter V of this chapter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'under subchapter V of chapter 35 of this title'; and striking out the phrase 'this chapter' the first two times it appears in the first sentence of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in the second, third, and fourth sentences of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in section 1772(b) and in sections 1773 and 1774, and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 34 and 35'."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I cannot hear a word. I do not know whether the Senate is in order, but I cannot hear a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May we have order? The clerk will not continue

reading until there is order, so Senators can hear what is being read.

The clerk will continue to read the amendment.

The legislative clerk resumed the reading of the amendments as follows:

On page 31, line 17, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "programs of" and insert in lieu thereof "program or".

On page 32 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 9 and 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(m) Section 1734 of such title 38 is amended by (1) striking out '33' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '34', and (2) striking out '1634' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '1684'."

SEVERAL SENATORS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The clerk will not continue to read until there is order.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A parliamentary inquiry is not in order until the clerk has read the amendments.

The legislative clerk resumed the reading of the amendments, as follows:

On page 38, line 5, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 38 of the House engrossed amendment, beginning with line 21, strike out all down through line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c)(1) Section 2001 of title 38, United States Code, clauses (3) and (5) of section 2002 of such title, and sections 2003 and 2004 of such title are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears therein.

"(2) The first sentence of section 2002 of such title 38 is amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veteran of any war'.

"(3) Clauses (1) and (4) of section 2002 of such title 38 are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955,' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears in such clauses."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask the Chair whether the words we just heard read by the clerk were amendments to a House bill or whether the House bill is an amendment of the Senate bill. No member of the committee has ever to my knowledge been consulted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the House amendment is a substitute for the Senate bill. These are amendments to the House substitute.

Mr. DOMINICK. I did not hear the Presiding Officer in his last statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. These are amendments to the House substitute. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. DOMINICK. I feel that the Senate deserves some explanation.

I should like to state another parliamentary inquiry before we proceed. Is it to be my understanding that the House bill when it came over to the Senate was intercepted before it went to the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that House amendments are not referred to committee unless a motion is made to that effect.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The yeas and nays were just ordered, but were they on the bill and amendments or on the amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were ordered on the motion of the Senator from Texas, and that is to concur in the House amendment with the other amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The motion, then, is on the amendments and not on the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is on the House amendment and the amendments thereto.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This goes back to the House of Representatives.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the practice, and I think the Senate ought to understand it, is that the bill passed by the House has come over here.

The Senator from Texas, who has been certainly the great developer and protagonist of this idea, now asks the Senate to concur in the House amendment, with amendments. The further amendments he has proposed, aside from technicalities, would allow the GI who did not complete his high school education to complete it under the bill. The bill also, of course, would allow him to complete his college education. The GI who is now getting out of the service needs that kind of assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an agreement that the matter would not be debated. There was a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that 5 minutes be set aside for debate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there are some Senators who have reservations and wish to leave.

I hope that if we agree to 5 minutes of debate we shall not have occasion to extend it beyond 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope so, too.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I think we ought to have time to understand what we are doing. We are rushing along in what we are doing. I am not going to be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time is already limited.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not understand that it was limited. I want to know what it is all about.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the situation, the Senate will proceed on the question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I agree to the 5 minutes, but I would like to know what this is all about. I do not understand it, with all the talk that is going on.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to the distinguished majority leader that we are considering a very important bill involving an enormous amount of money and many GI's. We are being asked to vote on a House amendment that has not been explained, and amendments to the House amendment which the committee has not heard of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to answer under Senator DOMINICK's reservation of objection, I would remind the Senator that this matter was debated yesterday. The amendments of the House to the Senate bill were explained in detail as well as the proposed amendment which to some extent is in the nature of a technical amendment. I was not present yesterday but did read the RECORD this morning.

With the debate and discussion completed yesterday, the unanimous consent agreement entered into certainly appeared reasonable.

In view of the questions raised here today, I hope that the short period the minority leader and I have proposed will be granted.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I would like to extend that time 5 minutes, if we may.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that we had discussed this question yesterday evening. The discussion is on page 2724 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator YARBOROUGH discussed it at considerable length.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if we had agreed to the original request, without the many reservations, the explanation would have now been completed and the vote commenced. I think we are defeating our desire to convenience Senators who have relied upon the unanimous-consent agreement.

I renew my request for a limitation of 5 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Equal time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Senator DOMINICK, who is the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, should have all of the time. I would, however, like the Senator from Texas to understand that I tried to clear it for him with the minority members of the subcommittee.

My understanding is that this bill came from the House with an amendment which the Senator will explain. Second, he is dealing with the matter of the inclusion of high school education, as the bill now only provides for college

education; third, he gives the Senate his assurance that this amendment, if sent back to the House, will be accepted in the House.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from New York, and to clarify the matter, a unanimous-consent agreement was made between the distinguished leaders of the Senate that the Senate vote immediately after the vote on cloture. That was pursuant to the request of many Senators on both sides who have reservations and desire to leave.

There was no disposition on the part of the managers of the bill to cut off debate. A number of Senators asked for accommodation. We discussed this matter yesterday, printed the House amendment in the RECORD, and explained the proposed Senate amendments, all of which is at page 2732 of the RECORD.

Since this bill was passed by the House, I have been in numerous conferences with Chairman TEAGUE. They had reached agreement on many amendments but paragraph (d) of section 1673, as it passed the House would likely prohibit servicemen from using the GI bill to finish high school.

Under the GI bill of World War II, 44 percent of the veterans had not finished high school; under the Korean GI bill 34 percent of the veterans had not finished high school.

We have reached an agreement to delete this paragraph.

Chairman TEAGUE assures me that if that is the only amendment the House will accept it. He leaves for Vietnam today, and it is hoped that this bill will be passed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD I wish to make this crystal clear. I am supposed to be the ranking minority member on the Veterans' Subcommittee. At no time has the manager of this bill consulted with me or called my office, so far as I know, about the House passed bill, or included me in any of his talks with Mr. TEAGUE or anyone else. He has not given me the courtesy of informing me that something was to be done yesterday by unanimous consent, nor has he told me at any time the substance of the amendments which he is asking for today.

I want that clear in the RECORD. I can say that although I am going along with this procedure this time, this is the last time, inasmuch as I consider the position that I have as a responsibility on me. But in the future I will not go along on this kind of slipshod method of acting on a bill which involves millions of dollars.

I wish to make my position clear. I will support this bill today. But I at least deserve the courtesy of being informed what is going on when I am the ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

Furthermore, it is my opinion that we should have had a committee meeting to study this bill and establish what position we are to take. This was not done.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am the ranking member on the committee. First I should like to say that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is acting correctly and in a most statesmanlike manner. I was persuaded—and I believe he is persuaded now—that, because of the exigencies in the situation and because of the fact that Representative TEAGUE is leaving, and the further fact that we would not be able to get the necessary quorum in committee, the matter might be delayed. Of course I do not believe anyone wishes to delay the matter. I offered to call the minority members on the subcommittee, and the Senator from Texas agreed that I should do so. Without the cooperation of the Senator from Colorado, this could not have been done. What he is doing is the perfectly proper way to proceed. It is perfectly proper to serve notice that this is not the way to do it, and that this is a one-shot proposal.

Of course, no one is charging anyone with bad faith. This is only a statement of fact for the RECORD. I believe the Senator from Colorado is acting perfectly properly in the situation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we are proceeding on a privileged matter. The Senate bill was amended in the House. I do not promise in the future to try to destroy a rule of the Senate. We are following the rule of the Senate to the letter in connection with this matter. I did tell the distinguished Senator from New York that I would try to have my staff contact the majority members on the subcommittee and that he would try to contact the minority members. The Senator from New York and I agreed to do that. The committee itself could not be polled except on the order of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I see no reason why the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should have any different rules apply to it than are applied to other committees. We have followed the rule. I resent the implication that we have tried to do something that we should not have done. We followed the rule to the letter.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall take only a minute. A part of the House amendment fell clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance. Our committee met a couple of days ago and discussed it. We decided we would not assert any jurisdiction; that we were prepared to vote on it at any time, practically, after the House amended the bill. The Senate agreed by unanimous consent to vote on the amendment if we first had a quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday two privileged matters were before the Senate—the amendment of the House to the bank merger bill and the amendment of the House to the GI bill. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] had hoped to have the amendment to the GI bill considered first. I objected on the ground that it was necessary to meet a court deadline on the bank merger bill, and that bill was disposed of yesterday. The Senator from Texas can now clear up the amendment to the GI bill at any time, because it is privileged.

I must say in his behalf that I moved heaven and earth calling Senators who knew something about the GI bill, to try to have them come to the Chamber. At long last, the Senator from Texas returned to his office, obtained his data, came back, and made an explanation of the bill on the floor of the Senate. We remained here until that was concluded toward the end of the day. But I tried to invite every Senator who was interested to come to the Chamber and participate in the discussion. So whatever is fair is fair; that must be said.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 seconds. The distinguished minority leader is exactly correct. He pressed to have this bill taken up yesterday. He called my office several times. He insisted that our explanation be made yesterday and not today, so that Members of the Senate could read it in the RECORD. It was at his insistence that this debate was opened and these amendments were explained and are now ready for approval.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. One additional fact is that the Committee on Banking and Currency voted 9 to 2 to consider the House amendment to the bank merger bill, notwithstanding that it was just as privileged as the GI bill, and that is the best practice.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I also rise to give my support to S. 9, the cold war GI bill. I continue in my endorsement of this long-overdue legislation.

It strengthens our military forces by making service more attractive and strengthens our civilian population by providing a supply of better educated GI bill veterans. Veterans educated under the World War II and Korean war GI bills continue to make important contributions to our rising standard of living.

This bill provides useful assistance to servicemen during that difficult period of readjustment to civilian life. By providing not only educational assistance but also home loans, job counseling, and Federal employment preference to the veteran this bill shortens the time period before the returning serviceman becomes a contributing member of the community. There is no question but that military service is a hardship and an inconvenience as well as a very necessary duty. Every assistance should be given to these men upon the completion of that duty.

One of the reasons I am enthusiastic in my support of this legislation is that it is a bargain. Just as with the past GI bills, this program will pay for itself twice and perhaps thrice over in additional

taxes paid by the higher earning veterans. It is a pleasure to vote for a legislative program which will repay its cost in the near future.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to support H.R. 12410, the cold war GI bill which is now before us for consideration.

The Federal Government has taken an important step in its endeavor to provide a readjustment bill for our cold war veterans who have been honorably released from the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955. No one can deny that the whole Nation has benefited enormously from the World War II and Korean conflict GI readjustment bills. It is only logical and fair to extend these benefits to the young men and women who have served their country honorably in hot spots such as Vietnam, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Berlin, Laos, Lebanon, and Taiwan-Matsu.

The bill before us will provide a just and equitable readjustment bill for those deserving young men and women who have given to the United States critical years and months of their lives. It represents an investment in the future of America and is a testimony to our recognition of those who gallantly serve our country. This bill will insure that our Nation will continue to utilize the skills and abilities of our veterans in the very best possible way.

I am proud to vote for this legislation which will give to our veterans not only a reasonable opportunity to obtain education and training, but will offer them home loan assistance, medical, and other benefits.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad to cast my vote today for S. 9, the new GI bill providing veterans' benefits for those who have served in our Armed Forces since 1955. The current war in Vietnam, with its increasing requirements and the growing number of our men called to participate, makes the passage of this bill imperative and just.

This new GI bill will provide a permanent program of educational assistance, with monthly allowances for training and for helping to support the families of those who use its benefits. The benefits for veterans will also include new provisions for both guaranteed and direct home loans, as well as for extending VA medical care on the same basis as is available to veterans who have defended our security in earlier wars. Additionally, preference in Federal employment is also extended to our veterans who have served since 1955, and provision is made for coverage of home rental payments of individuals called to military duty now.

In the past 2 months, I have had the opportunity of visiting Vietnam twice. It is a difficult war, and we hope it can soon be ended with honor. In Vietnam, I found the members serving in our Armed Forces performing, as always, with high morale and great courage. With sadness, I saw also those who had been wounded in fulfilling their duty.

We know that many of our men have already given their lives in Vietnam in the service of our country, and there are thousands more serving in danger areas around the world, with still others at home subject to the call of the Nation. In Vietnam and elsewhere, the dangers emphasize the task and the patriotism of the men whom this bill is designed to assist. These men are serving to afford security to our country and to its institutions, and I know that the unanimous support given this bill reflects the appreciation of their fellow countrymen.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, it seems incredible to me that when the Nation has an opportunity to show its gratitude to the men who now are called upon to make such sacrifices as we ask of them in Vietnam that we should be close-fisted. These men are like ourselves—they have their families and their loved ones who daily pray for their safety. Many of these are young men barely past their voting age. Their whole life course has been diverted unnaturally into the battlefield. They serve a nation which is great not only in wealth but also in its generosity of spirit.

It seems to me entirely fitting that the provisions asked for in this bill should be granted. It has had its inception in the GI bill in which I and many of you found a salvation. Many of the men I know in public life received their emancipation from a life of menial occupation through the instruments of the GI bill. It has proven its effectiveness. Therefore, it seems to me that on this basis there can be no opposition.

But there is also a second factor to this extremely crucial national effort which we undertake today. In recognizing the need to have an educated public and in its consideration of the domestic responsibilities of many people, this Nation has seen fit to exempt or to defer the services of many and fill their places with a few.

I need not point out the divisiveness of such a policy, essential and humane as it may be. Loyalty and responsibility to collective security is the first responsibility. But by what justification can we defer a man on the basis of intelligence, for instance? If his reward from the state is great, his responsibility to that state cannot be less. I am not in opposition to such deferment. I simply wish to point out that the presence of these deferments can divide our national unity, and that if we do not take quick steps to compensate those who serve their country in this most dangerous undertaking, we will separate ourselves at a time when unity should be our goal.

Finally, I should like to point out that the whole philosophy of the new society is to encourage to the fullest the development of the individual's potentialities. For this, we inaugurated the war on poverty. This is the goal of one branch of our overseas program in Vietnam. Why is it not a sound investment in American manhood? These men will return to peaceful pursuits, broadened no doubt by their experience, their appetites whetted for the better life. It seems the Nation could have no better opportunity for development than to provide the apparatus through which these motivations can be channeled into that of the richest of human resources—the human mind.

I therefore because of its precedence, its fairness, and its potentialities for good, give my wholehearted support for this measure. I would solicit the combined efforts of my colleagues to bring it to speedy passage.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I want to commend all those who assisted in the development and support of this legislation from its inception to enactment.

One of the finest investments this Nation ever made was the original GI bill of rights program following World War II. Now, the sons and daughters of those who benefited from that first program can look forward to the same helping hand from the Government they are protecting by their military service.

I am confident that this legislation to establish a permanent and equitable scheme of educational, housing and other assistance to veterans of our Armed Forces will repay incalculable benefits to the national welfare in years to come. Helping those who want to help themselves is in the finest tradition of Federal action and I am proud to have participated in the legislative consideration of this bill.

THE NEED FOR A COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to announce my full endorsement of S. 9, which has become generally known as the cold war GI bill. As a cosponsor of this measure, I believe it is a most equitable readjustment program for our veterans who have served in our Armed Forces during the induction period dating since January 31, 1955, the period that has been recognized as the cold war.

Our colleague, Senator YARBOROUGH, who is the author and chief sponsor of the legislation, and who is the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, deserves our commendation for his persistent leadership during the years in which the final outcome of the measure was in doubt.

Senator YARBOROUGH believes, as I do, that the events in Vietnam have dramatized the necessity for the enactment of the legislation. It will provide some of the same equitable and fully deserved readjustment assistance to our cold war veterans as was determined to be wise for servicemen of World War II and the Korean conflict.

Only a few days after the introduction of S. 9 in the Senate in 1965, the President presented his message to the Congress regarding the state of our defenses. At that time, he stated:

> Our soldiers, sailors, and airmen, and marines, from whom we ask so much, are the cornerstone of our military might * * *. Men and women, who have devoted their lives and their resources to the needs of their country, are entitled to help and consideration in making the transition to other pursuits.

I was wholly in accord with President Johnson then, as I am now, in this belief. During the 86th Congress, I cosponsored a cold war GI bill, S. 1138, which passed

the Senate. During the 87th Congress, I cosponsored S. 349, a bill to provide educational benefits for post-Korean conflict draftees and volunteers who served for 6 months since January 31, 1955.

During the 88th Congress, I cosponsored S. 5 to provide educational and vocational training assistance and to guarantee and direct loan assistance for the purchase of homes and farmlands by veterans.

I feel that the men and women on military duty during the period of the cold war should be given the same educational and vocational training opportunities which our Nation justly and wisely provided to World War II and Korean peace action veterans. Any serviceman, having been drafted by his local draft board and thus prohibited for a period of time from establishing himself in civil life, who might have been in Vietnam, who understandably find it hard to believe that his military service under fire in Vietnam, in defense of his country, was not equally deserving as that of earlier GI's with similar World War II and Korean war experiences.

For those who may feel that the provisions of this bill are not economically justified, I wish to point out that tremendous benefits have accrued to our Nation as a result of the enactment of the original GI bill. These benefits have elevated the economic level of our country and its citizens. The year before last, shortly after the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the original GI bill by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in June 1944, I reported to the people of my State of West Virginia that I felt the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 represented a great bargain for Uncle Sam. It is my belief that one of his best-paying investments has been the expenditures on American veterans under the provisions of this act, which permitted veterans, generally, to adjust themselves more compatibly to civilian life.

Under the GI bill, 1 out of every 5 homes built since the end of World War II has been financed by GI loans. More than 5,268,000 World War II veterans were granted home, farm, and business loans, totaling $43 billion. The approximately 5 million home loans sparked a housing boom beginning in the mid-1940's that has made America into a Nation of homeowners. The accompanying wide use of credit gave an enormous impetus to the economy through the purchase of new furniture, new appliances, new cars, and school construction. And 20 years later, more than one-third of the GI loans are already paid in full.

But particularly pertinent to the provisions of S. 9, at the peak of the original GI bill activity, under the education and training provisions, 7,800,000 veterans—nearly half of all who saw wartime service—received training. Over 2 million were in colleges at one time with another 3,500,000 in other institutions such as trade and technical schools. About 1,400,000 veterans increased their skills in on-the-job training, and 700,000 learned new agricultural techniques in on-the-farm training.

Our Nation is vastly enriched today as a result of skills acquired under the GI bill—including 450,000 engineers; 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; 360,000 schoolteachers; 150,000 scientists; 243-000 accountants; 107,000 lawyers; 36,000 clergymen; 17,000 writers; 711,000 mechanics; 383,000 construction workers; 288,000 metalworkers; 138,000 electricians; and about 700,000 who trained for business and executive careers. The total cost of this vast program of mass adult education is $14.5 billion—recouped at $1 billion per year from increased income taxes paid by better-educated, higher-earning GI bill veterans. Obviously, Uncle Sam invested wisely.

Worthy of special note in this context, the 1960 Census showed nearly 17 million families headed by war veterans. Included in this total are 184,652 such families in my own State of West Virginia. These families, on a nationwide basis, had a median income of $6,469 a year, over $800 more than the median for the total 45 million U.S. families. In West Virginia, 10 percent of the families headed by veterans had an annual income of $10,000 or more, and 32 percent had incomes ranging from $6,000 to $10,000.

During the 88th Congress, this committee's report on S. 5 carried statements to the effect that the need for legislation of this nature was clear, compelling, and urgent. It pointed out that today's cold war conditions are such that thousands of young Americans are required by the compulsory draft law to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces and that without the exigencies of the cold war the majority would remain in civil life, pursuing personal goals.

Young persons entering the service since January 31, 1955, have been called upon to make personal sacrifices but have not had even the limited benefits proposed under S. 9—for educational assistance or vocational training.

The inequity should be redressed. Such action has been too long delayed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I should like to express my full support of the new GI bill, which I am confident this body will overwhelmingly approve in the vote scheduled for today.

I am particularly pleased that a number of Texans have played important roles in achieving passage of this legislation. My distinguished senior colleague [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has long sought passage of such a bill. He has labored session after session for the bill, and he deserves the lion's share of the credit for what will occur today.

Representative OLIN TEAGUE, also of my State, and the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, has been a key figure in consideration in the other body. This occurrence today, too, is in large measure due to his noble efforts.

I was glad to have the opportunity more than a year ago to introduce the Vietnam GI bill, elements of which may be found in the bill we will vote on today.

Many Texas editors and thousands of individual Texans also have urged adoption of a new GI bill of rights.

Among the major newsapers of my State which have editorialized in support of the GI bill are these: Wichita Falls Record News, Waco Times-Herald, Austin Statesman, Houston Tribune, Denton Record-Chronicle, Kilgore News-Herald, Irving News Texan, Cuero Record, Longview Morning Journal, Waco News-Tribune, Lubbock Avalanche-Journal, Marshall News-Messenger, Austin American, Lufkin News, Wichita Falls Times, Beaumont Enterprise, Beaumont Journal, El Paso Times.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at the conclusion of my remarks selected editorials from these papers be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TOWER. Throughout our Nation's history, we have provided special benefits for the fighting men who defend our country against foreign enemies and work with our allies in maintaining a climate of freedom in this world.

The assistance this new GI bill provides will be of tremendous value to our younger veterans as they complete their Vietnam service, and their service in other aspects of the cold war. It will help them as they seek to return to an active, contributing civilian life.

We owe these men nothing less for their dedication and valor in service to us all.

General Eisenhower once said:

> To live for your country is as demanding a duty as to die for it.

I think that living for our country means searching out opportunities to serve and to strengthen it. It means being a doer in the community, accepting responsibility for improving the environment in which our children play, study and worship. It means showing respect for the flag and displaying it proudly as the symbol of the ideals and institutions we hold dear.

In addition, living for our country means living up to our responsibility to provide well in pay, equipment and benefits for those men and women who are ready to die to protect us.

I returned only a few weeks ago from a tour as an Armed Services Committee member throughout the combat areas of southeast Asia. Many of the men I saw there asked me what the chances were that America would remember them with GI bill benefits such as their fathers and older brothers received after World War II and Korea. I told those men they had no fear.

"America will remember you," I said.

And, tomorrow, with enactment of the new GI bill we will do just that.

These men who fight for us today are an amazing group. Those of us who participated in World War II know that there were fine American troops in that conflict. Certainly, the men who served us in the Korean war were topnotch soldiers, too.

But, I must in all candor say that the men who defend us today in southeast Asia, in Korea, in Europe, in Latin America and elsewhere in this Nation and overseas, are the best, most qualified and most dedicated troops America ever has been able to call upon.

I was tremendously impressed by these Americans who are helping defend the

independence of South Vietnam and, indeed, of all southeast Asia. These men are hard fighters. They do their job day in and day out. They do not gripe. They have high morale. They are doing a magnificent job for the free world.

Sometimes it seems every generation of Americans is called upon to make sacrifices in blood to preserve freedom. As I visited the field hospitals, I saw sights I will not forget. And yet, the wounded men I saw understand—just as the American people must understand—that we are making our stand in Vietnam today to preclude a fight on a much broader front at greater cost later on.

Besides fighting, our fine soldiers, sailors, and airmen are busy doing many constructive things to help the people of South Vietnam.

They are building schools, teaching local leaders how to govern, teaching about sanitation, giving out soap and food, tending sores and wounds and tropical diseases—all this in marked contrast to the terror of the Vietcong, who close schools and even force children and girls into combat situations.

Mr. President, these men deserve a new GI bill. I will support them in that need today as I have in the past. I hope the Senate will return a unanimous vote in favor of our fighting men.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News-Herald, January 1966]

NEEDED: VIETNAM GI BILL

On his return from a tour in southeast Asia last month, Texas Senator JOHN TOWER reported that scores of servicemen asked about prospects for enactment of a Vietnam GI bill.

He found many of them ready to utilize loan and education assistance if it were made available to them after their combat service.

Senator TOWER introduced a Vietnam GI bill a year ago. Later the Senate approved, with Senator TOWER's affirmative vote, the more extensive cold war GI bill authored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

Either of these bills would fill the current need, but House of Representatives action is still awaited. Representative OLIN TEAGUE is pushing for such House action, and the administration says it may present a modified bill more acceptable to budgeting problems.

Enactment of a Vietnam GI bill is a project involving many Texans, as well as thousands of others who are serving in Vietnam. There will be many more who serve, and no one knows at this time the probable length of that conflict.

These men, as did those in other wars, deserve the help and opportunities which this type of legislation can provide.

We hope that the administration and Congress will see fit to push a GI bill through as quickly as possible.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record News, Jan. 12, 1966]

IMPORTANT BILL

On returning from Vietnam recently, Senator JOHN TOWER, of Wichita Falls, reported the servicemen there had asked him about the prospects for the enactment of a Vietnam GI bill.

Early in the session of the 89th Congress last year, Senator TOWER introduced such a bill, providing the Vietnam servicemen receive exemption from income tax, and provide home loans and education provisions similar to those of the Korean GI bill.

Another bill including these provisions and extending the benefits to all cold war veterans passed the Senate, and was caught in the rush in the House and never came to a vote.

Representative OLIN TEAGUE is working this year for House action, and the Wichitan promises to start immediately for Senate action on the stalled bill. It is also understood that the administration may suggest a modified bill, suited to current budget conditions.

Whatever form such a bill takes in the current session of Congress, it deserves the fullest backing of all of us. It is a must for us to give the same protection to the men now in the firing lines as we gave other veterans.

Let your Congressmen and Senators know how you feel about this deserving proposal.

[From the Waco (Tex.) Times-Herald, Jan. 14, 1966]

GI BILL HAS BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FROM CONGRESS

Republican Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, informs us that when he was in southeast Asia last month, scores of U.S. servicemen asked about the prospects for enactment of a Vietnam GI bill. The Senator said he found them ready to utilize such loan and education assistance if it were to be made available to them after their combat service.

Senator TOWER introduced the Vietnam GI bill a year ago. Subsequently the Senator approved, with his affirmative vote, the more extensive cold war GI bill authored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

Either of these measures would satisfy the current need, Senator TOWER says, but action by the House of Representatives still is awaited. The President Wednesday night endorsed the objective of these proposals.

Representative TEAGUE is pushing for such House action and the administration says it may present a modified bill more acceptable to its budgeting problems. Thus the enactment of a Vietnam GI bill is a project involving many Texans, and Senator TOWER says he believed it would be most helpful at this time.

A chief proposal of legislation introduced by TOWER were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purpose of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

Senator TOWER believes that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped and are helping to preserve.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Jan. 11, 1966]

VIET GI BILL AWAITS ACTION

Republican Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, informs us that when he was in southeast Asia last month, scores of U.S. servicemen asked about the prospects for enactment of a Vietnam GI bill. The Senator said he found them ready to utilize such loan and education assistance if it were to be made available to them after their combat service.

Senator TOWER introduced the Vietnam GI bill a year ago. Subsequently the Senator approved, with this affirmative vote, the more extensive cold war GI bill authored by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas.

Either of these measure would satisfy the current need, Senator TOWER says, but action by the House of Representatives still is awaited.

Representative TEAGUE is pushing for such House action and the administration says it may present a modified bill more acceptable to its budgeting problems. Thus the enactment of a Vietnam GI bill is a project involving many Texans, and Senator TOWER says he believed it would be most helpful.

A chief proposal of legislation introduced by TOWER were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purpose of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home-loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

Senator TOWER believes that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped and are helping to preserve.

These newspapers also subscribe to that belief.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Morning Journal, May 16, 1965]

TASK HALF DONE

It is an anomaly of American equity and justice that while our servicemen are engaged in deadly combat for the cause of freedom in Vietnam, we here at home must wage campaigns to get our Government to give these fighting men the material benefits and protection accorded other veterans such as those who have served in Korea.

Texas' able and alert Senator JOHN G. TOWER early in the days of this session of Congress introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Among those bills were S. 459 to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for our servicemen there, and S. 458 to extend home-loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded our Korean veterans to those serving in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

The task which Senator TOWER undertook with these two bills really was the task of all of us here at home. A man of concern and compassion, he undertook the task because he knew that in all fairness it ought to be done, and because he felt the people here at home would want it done for our servicemen in Vietnam.

Senator TOWER offered one of the bills, S. 549, as an amendment to legislation pending before the Senate. The amendment failed, but the Texas Senator's efforts to bring the matter to public attention brought results. President Johnson, by executive decree, declared the area a combat zone and Senator TOWER approved his action. So do we all.

Today, with Congress in the fifth month of this session, the task undertaken by the energetic Texas Senator for the combat veterans of Vietnam remains half done. It behooves the people of Texas, who are his constituents, as well as fairminded Americans in all States, to help bring understanding and support to S. 458 which would extend home-loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in Vietnam.

We as responsible citizens must agree that those from among us who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can reasonably provide for them in the way of opportunity to share equally in the society they have helped to preserve.

The United States has some 46,500 servicemen in Vietnam, by recent official report. A naval force of carriers and supporting ships is operating from adjacent waters. Servicemen in Vietnam face the enemy on all sides, day and night, whether engaged in a battle or trying to get some rest. More than 350 have been killed or lost, and more than 2,000 have been wounded by the enemy. Vietnam is a combat zone, by any standard.

These men deserve our best attention and support here at home. For our cause of freedom and against the spread of communism, they risk their lives 24 hours a day. Some will never return, more will come home partially crippled and handicapped for life, and all will have lost valuable time and

energy needed in preparing themselves for useful and productive lives for themselves and their families.

Senator TOWER is to be commended for his foresighted and untiring efforts to secure the necessary Government action to extend to our Vietnam veterans the benefits accorded the veterans of Korea. This is just and equitable. The task is half done. Let's finish it, without further dilly-dallying.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, May 13, 1965]

RIGHT THING TO DO

If our forces in Vietnam are not engaged in combat, we wonder exactly what they are doing.

For that reason, we wish to endorse S. 458, offered in the U.S. Senate by Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, and others.

That bill would extend home loan and educational benefits to servicemen in South Vietnam.

We have some 45,000 troops in South Vietnam. The latest official tally shows some 350 American servicemen have been killed and some 2,100 wounded. Yet Vietnam is not classified as a combat zone.

It seems only too obvious that the United States is making it a combat zone more and more every day.

We think our men engaged in combat in Vietnam are entitled to the same consideration as those who have been engaged in combat elsewhere.

That is the least we can do.

[From the Cuero (Tex.) Record, May 14, 1965]

SAYS VIETNAM A COMBAT AREA—TOWER BILL WOULD REWARD SERVICEMEN

Although he was unsuccessful in securing passage of Senate bill 459 which would have provided Federal income tax exemptions for servicemen in Vietnam, Texas Senator JOHN G. TOWER is still hopeful another of his measures (S. 458) will survive in the National Congress.

Senate bill 458 would extend home loans and educational benefits, similar to those accorded our Korean veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

Senator TOWER made this hope known in a letter last week to Jack Howerton, Record publisher.

While S. 459 which was offered as an amendment to legislation before the Senate failed, Senator TOWER wrote, it did result in bringing the matter more forcibly to public attention when some of the newspapers, such as the Washington Star, treated the subject editorially. The President, by Executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone and I approve his action.

"There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in Vietnam. This is embodied in S. 458, by myself and others. I believe you will agree with me that those who face our enemies on the battlefields deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve. I do hope you will lend your editorial voice to passage of this legislation."

The Record most certainly concurs with Senator TOWER in his contention that Vietnam unquestionably is a combat zone and servicemen participating in the Vietnam conflict are entitled to the same privileges and benefits as those who have participated in previous wars.

We sincerely endorse passage of Senate bill 458 and believe we speak for at least 95 percent of the citizens of Cuero and DeWitt County in urging its passage.

According to recent tallies approximately 350 American servicemen have been killed and more than 2,000 have been wounded by the enemy in Vietnam since the beginning of 1961. We have approximately 30,000 troops on duty there, plus a naval force of carriers and supporting ships. Our planes are constantly in the air protecting our military installations and attacking Communist supply routes and bases.

Repeating a question asked by the Washington Star we ask our Senators and Congressmen in Washington concerning Vietnam:

"If it isn't a combat zone, what in heaven's name is it?"

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Journal, May 13, 1965]

AID FOR SERVICEMEN

Senator JOHN TOWER is cosponsor of a bill to extend home loan and educational benefits to U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam. The President has already, by Executive decree, declared the area a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption, which TOWER had favored doing.

The proposal has merit. Undeclared or not, we are fighting a war in South Vietnam. The serviceman there is doing precisely what other servicemen did in World War II and, later, in Korea. He is putting his life on the line at the same time he is sacrificing opportunities at home.

Senator TOWER wants to extend benefits, similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to men who serve in South Vietnam and adjacent waters. Fairness dictates that this should be done.

[From the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise, May 13, 1965]

THEY DESERVE IT

We agree with Senator JOHN TOWER that "those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

The Texas lawmaker has translated his interest into action in a number of ways. Early in the year he introduced in Congress a number of proposals on Vietnam. These included a bill to make Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for servicemen there, and one to extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those accorded Korean veterans, to those who have served in Vietnam and adjacent waters.

The proposal on tax exemption later was offered as an amendment to a bill before the Senate. Although the amendment failed, it helped to bring countrywide attention to the whole question of benefits for the southeast Asia fighters. This particular issue was cleared up when President Johnson by Executive decree, declared the Vietnam area a combat zone.

Unfortunately, the other question, that of home loan and educational benefits, has not been so happily resolved. We urge, therefore, passage of Senate bill 458, authored by TOWER and others in the upper Chamber.

It is only right that Congress approve this measure. The war in Vietnam is war in every deadly sense of the word. We cannot fail to do our duty by American men fighting for us—and for freedom—in that faraway part of the world.

[From the Marshall (Tex.) News Messenger, May 20, 1965]

COMBAT ZONE

Our advisers in South Vietnam are fighting and dying and undergoing all the ordeals of a war in a strange and terrible land. Yet they enjoy none of the tax advantages, including income tax benefits and combat or hazardous duty pay which were extended to our soldiers in Korea and in World War II.

Senator JOHN TOWER has introduced a bill in the Senate designating Vietnam as a combat zone for tax purposes. A similar bill has been offered in the House by Representative WILLIAM E. MINSHALL. Still another bill has been presented to give our men hazardous duty pay while stationed in Vietnam.

Perhaps only Congress can deal with added pay for combat duty. But an executive order designating Vietnam as a combat zone might clarify the other part of the problem.

There may be some very good legal reasons why this situation has been permitted to arise and to continue. But no one should pretend that the reasons will make much sense to the men on the scene in Vietnam.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, May 12, 1965]

A DESERVING PROPOSAL

Early in the present session of Congress Senator JOHN G. TOWER introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among his proposals, as he has declared, were one measure that would exempt the income of servicemen there from provisions of the Federal income tax, and a second that would extend home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded Korean war veterans to those who serve in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

The latter bill is still pending and Senator TOWER has expressed the hope that support can be gained for its passage. It is a proposal of merit and should be adopted.

President Johnson, by Executive decree, recently declared the area a combat zone and thus automatically provided for income tax benefits to the American military men in service there, but in all fairness and equity Congress should extend the home loan and educational benefits as Senator TOWER and other sponsors of this action have outlined.

Those who face our enemies on the firing line deserve the opportunities others of our fighting men have been presented from the society they have helped to preserve.

The bill in question is Senate bill 458 and one way of speeding it to passage is for constituents to write their Members of Congress. The Times endorses the movement for the enactment of the bill and invites public response in writing to Representatives and Senators in Washington.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, May 18, 1965]

A DESIRABLE BILL

In January of this year, during the early days of this session of Congress, Senator JOHN G. TOWER of Texas, introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among these bills were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

One of the bills, S. 459, subsequently was offered as an amendment to legislation pending before the U.S. Senate. While it failed, it did result in bringing the matter more forcefully to public attention when some newspapers treated the subject editorially.

The President, by Executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone, and Senator TOWER approved his action.

Says Senator TOWER: "There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. This is embodied in S. 458 by myself and others. I believe you will agree that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

These newspapers also subscribe to that belief, and hope Senator TOWER'S bill will meet with favor by Congress.

[From the Lufkin (Tex.) News, May 11, 1965]

SENATOR TOWER WOULD EXTEND BENEFITS TO VIETNAM TROOPS

A letter from Senator JOHN TOWER accompanies a copy of S. 458, which he and other Senators have introduced.

His letter includes the following remarks:

"In January of this year, during the early days of this session of Congress, I introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among these bills, from my point of view, were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for our servicemen there (S. 459), and a proposal (S. 458) to extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those accorded our Korean veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters."

Senator TOWER points out he offered S. 459 as an amendment to legislation pending before the Senate, and "while the amendment failed, the act did result in bringing the matter more forcefully to public attention when some newspapers, such as the Washington Star, treated the subject editorially. The President, by executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone and I approved his action."

Senator TOWER hopes to build up support for S. 458, to extend home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. He declares, "I believe you will agree with me that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

We are in full agreement, and we trust Congress will enact this bill—even if it is introduced by Texas' Republican Senator—instead of leaving it to the President to do the same job by Executive decree (and thus take credit for the Democratic administration).

W. R. BEAUMIER.

[From the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal, May 13, 1965]

TIME FOR ACTION IS NOW—VIETNAM VETERANS DUE BENEFITS

Senator JOHN G. TOWER is hoping for a "break" which would achieve the second of two principal objectives designed to benefit servicemen on duty in the Vietnamese struggle.

The first objective was reached last month, although not exactly in the manner which Senator TOWER and other sponsors of S. 459 had in mind. This bill proposed the declaring of Vietnam as a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for servicemen.

This bill was offered early in the year as an amendment to other pending Senate legislation, but it failed. Irate newspaper comment, however, was credited with bringing the idea to such extensive public attention that President Johnson used the Executive decree method to put it into effect, giving GI's tax relief on their returns for 1964.

The second objective, of even greater importance than the first, is the extension of home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. This proposal, providing the same benefits given to veterans of the Korean war, is contained in S. 458, by TOWER and eight other Senators.

Surely the vast majority of the American people would approve the move, in appreciation to servicemen who are facing the nation's enemies in battle. And the time to get it done is now, not months or years after service in South Vietnam is completed.

[From the Denton (Tex.) Record-Chronicle, May 18, 1965]

CONCERN FOR VETERANS

Senator JOHN TOWER has proven himself a friend of the fighting man. His voice is heard frequently as he tries to get reasonable, desirable benefits for the men in uniform in South Vietnam.

On the day of the income tax filing deadline—April 15—336 Americans had been listed as killed, and more than 2,000 wounded, in Vietnam. Yet, incredibly, Vietnam wasn't classified as a combat zone and the servicemen there did not get the income tax benefits normally available to our men and women who are serving in a theater of war.

Senator TOWER was one of the sponsors of a bill to remedy this deplorable situation. It was offered as an amendment to other legislation but failed. However, it focused attention on the situation. The Washington Star, for example, ran a cartoon showing an American soldier in a Vietnamese foxhole, with bullets whizzing all around him, reading a letter; it said "Dear Sir: Your deduction for combat service has been disallowed. Sincerely, IRS."

President Johnson finally declared the area a combat zone by Executive decree, and the servicemen will get their tax benefits, after all.

Senator TOWER also is a sponsor of another bill (S. 458), one which would extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those given Korean veterans, to those who have served in the Vietnamese war.

The Senator says "those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve." We couldn't agree more.

President Johnson has called for pay increases for the military. This is all to the good but, as Senator TOWER pointed out, Johnson's proposal "would still leave privates and seamen far below the level" of the untrained volunteers in the antipovery program.

Privates and seamen would get approximately $87, including the pay raise. The Job Corps or antipoverty trainees would get about $105.

The proposed pay increases for the military are "completely inadequate," Senator TOWER said.

The Senator's efforts in behalf of our servicemen deserve the support of all of us.

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News Herald, May 20, 1965]

THEY DESERVE IT

At the beginning of this year Senator JOHN TOWER, of Texas, introduced several bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Among them were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption for our servicemen there, and a plan to extend them home loan and educational benefits similar to those accorded Korean veterans.

In the meantime, President Johnson, by Executive decree, has declared southeast Asia a combat zone, thus giving servicemen involved a tax break. This is as it should be.

There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to the men in South Vietnam. Provisions to do so have been embodied in S. 458, by Senator TOWER and others.

There should be no doubt among Members of Congress or anyone else that the servicemen who have been sent to do a difficult and dangerous job, involving many hardships, in South Vietnam deserve the help and opportunities which this legislation can provide.

These men are risking their lives to hold back the tide of communism in that area. Surely we can do no less than to show the Nation's appreciation, in a small way, by passage of these proposed benefits. The legislation is pending in Congress.

The right thing to do is to pass it as soon as possible.

[From the Irving (Tex.) News Texan, May 14, 1965]

NEW GI BILL NEEDS APPROVAL

Senator JOHN TOWER and eight other colleagues have finally officially recognized that American soldiers fighting in Vietnam are engaged in a war as certainly as those men in World War II and Korea and have taken steps to assure these men an education, if they want it, after release from the Armed Forces.

A bill now pending before the Senate would reactivate the GI bill which was discontinued in 1954.

Under the Senate bill, members of the Armed Forces which have served in the Asian battle zone would be entitled to an education at Government expense for a period of time equal to 1½ times the duration of their service in the area with a limit of 36 months.

The bill is generally the same as the one which provided an education for thousands of servicemen following this country's last two major military operations.

Provisions in the bill provide for payment of the veteran's subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books and equipment. Payments for veteran's subsistence would vary from $110 per month for a full time course to $50 per month for part-time courses if the individual had no dependents. Payments would be as high as $160 per month with a veteran enrolled in a full-time course of study with more than one dependent.

The bill provides for vocational rehabilitation training and on-farm training as well as college courses.

Veterans who have served in Vietnam and other Asian areas, which will be designated by the President, will be eligible under the bill if their service has come since January 1, 1961.

The provisions of the bill will be administered in each State by an agency set up by the Governor.

There is no doubt that this bill deserves favorable consideration by Congress to aid the American soldier who daily faces death in defense of freedom.

[From the Waco (Tex.) News-Tribune, May 21, 1965]

ALL AMERICANS CAN SAY YES TO THIS PROPOSITION

In January of this year, during the early days of this session of Congress, Senator JOHN G. TOWER, of Texas, introduced a number of bills relating to the war in Vietnam. Chief among these bills were proposals to declare Vietnam a combat zone for purposes of Federal income tax exemption of U.S. servicemen there, and a proposal to extend home loan and educational benefits, similar to those accorded to Korean war veterans, to those who have served in South Vietnam and adjacent waters.

One of the bills, S. 459, subsequently was offered as an amendment to legislation pending before the U.S. Senate. While it failed, it did result in bringing the matter more forcefully to public attention when some newspapers treated the subject editorially.

The President, by Executive decree, then declared the area a combat zone, and Senator TOWER approved his action.

Says Senator TOWER: "There now remains the question of extending home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam. This is embodied in S. 458 by myself and others. I believe you will agree that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

Most Americans, we believe also subscribe to that belief, and would hope Senator TOWER's bill will meet with favor by Congress

[From the Houston (Tex.) Tribune, May 20, 1965]

OUR BOYS IN VIETNAM DESERVE WARTIME BENEFITS

Picture the U.S. soldiers bogged down in the dirty day-to-day fighting in the mud and jungles of Vietnam; battling the elements and the enemy; dodging bullets, and in some cases, catching them.

According to the latest official tally, 336 American servicemen have been killed and 2,021 wounded by the enemy in Vietnam since the beginning of 1961. Another 13 have been captured.

We have some 45,000 troops there, plus a naval force of carriers and supporting ships. Planes flown by American pilots are conducting repeated strikes at Communist supply routes and bases, at considerable hazard to themselves.

This is a picture of a combat zone. This is war.

But apparently it is not war so far as official Washington is concerned. Our boys are fighting and dying in this land halfway around the world and are not eligible for normal benefits provided for war veterans.

Those who served in our Armed Forces after the Korean war were eligible for home loan and educational benefits even though the only bullets they saw were on the rifle range.

By contrast, our men actually being shot at in Vietnam today are not eligible.

To correct this obvious discrepancy, Senator JOHN TOWER, Republican, of Texas, has introduced a bill in the Senate (S. 458) which would extend home loan and educational benefits to our servicemen in South Vietnam.

Commenting on the bill, Senator TOWER declared, "I believe that those who face our enemies on the battlefield deserve all we can provide for them in the way of opportunities to share fully in the society they have helped to preserve."

We concur.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln a century ago sounded the responsibility of the Government "to care for him who has borne the battle." This bill seeks to apply that eloquent standard to the veterans of Vietnam and to those who have stood ready to serve their Nation during these times of crisis.

However, as the distinguished sponsor of the cold war GI bill, Senator YARBOROUGH, has pointed out, this measure falls short of its promise. For example, the monthly education allowance of $100 for current veterans is less than the $110 per month allowed under the Korean GI bill despite the fact that college costs have risen, and continue to rise, at the rate of some 5 percent each year and the cost of living has risen considerably since the Korean GI bill was enacted in 1952. It is heartening to know that Senator YARBOROUGH, as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, intends to next year seek improvement of this and other shortcomings in the present bill.

There is one further matter of particular concern to me; namely, the adequacy of facilities for veterans. In the past year, there has been a diminution of the facilities providing services to veterans, hospitals, domiciliary centers and service centers. Now we are faced with upwards of 240,000 veterans annually availing themselves of the new educational benefits and many thousands more availing themselves of the hospital and other benefits for which they are now eligible. We are to be continually faced with the question of whether existing facilities are adequate to the task.

I am hopeful, therefore—and suggest to the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee—that a close and continued oversight will be conducted over these VA facilities to make certain that they are adequate to the responsibilities which they must now undertake under the new and heavier loads imposed by this bill.

One final note. This bill, as did the predecessor GI bills, permits foreign study for veterans. But there is an inconsistency with other education aid programs enacted by the Congress; similar provisions are not included. For example, despite the shortage of doctors in this Nation, young Americans studying abroad cannot avail themselves of the benefits available under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. We must, I believe, find the means to assist the foreign study of these other young Americans by making available to them, where possible, the benefits of student aid programs now available for domestic study only. It is my intention to seek to amend the pending international education proposal accordingly.

Finally, I was pleased to arrange with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who is the sponsor of the bill, for a poll of the members of the subcommittee in order to obtain a consensus on a conference bill. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has brought the House amendment up by motion and urges the adoption of the House amendment. I urge that the Senate follow that recommendation and take such action.

GREAT NEED FOR THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for S. 9, the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966.

This legislation, more commonly known as the cold war GI bill, has commanded my strong support ever since I first came to the Senate.

As a cosponsor of the measure now before us, I am delighted by the prospect of final approval.

Around the world today tens of thousands of young Americans, called from the familiar routine of family, school, and career, are guarding the lives and safety of 185 million of their fellow citizens. Many of these young men and women, who have served their country so well, face a possible handicap in their future careers. S. 9 is designed to make educational assistance and farm and home loan guarantees available to the 5 million veterans of the cold war similar to that made available to the veterans of World War II and Korea.

I am particularly pleased that the bill we are considering provides for a permament program of benefits of cold war veterans.

The total of American dead and wounded rises every day in South Vietnam. It would certainly be an injustice to the more than 200,000 American fighting men engaged in this conflict to deny them the benefits which have been accorded to the veterans of the Korean conflict. When these young men return home from southeast Asia they will face similar problems of securing education and employment. The situation is particularly severe for the soldiers of today because of the increased automation which makes finding employment that much more difficult.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to give their overwhelming approval to S. 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, all time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the House amendment to the bill (S. 9), with the amendments of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is necessarily absent.

Also I announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] would vote yea.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Aiken	Harris	Moss
Allott	Hart	Mundt
Anderson	Hartke	Murphy
Bartlett	Hayden	Muskie
Bass	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Bayh	Hill	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Hruska	Pearson
Boggs	Inouye	Pell
Brewster	Jackson	Prouty
Burdick	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Robertson
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell, S.C.
Case	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Church	Lausche	Saltonstall
Clark	Long, Mo.	Scott
Cooper	Long, La.	Simpson
Cotton	Magnuson	Smathers
Curtis	Mansfield	Smith
Dirksen	McCarthy	Sparkman
Dodd	McClellan	Stennis
Dominick	McGee	Symington
Douglas	McGovern	Talmadge
Eastland	McIntyre	Thurmond
Ellender	Metcalf	Tower
Ervin	Miller	Tydings
Fannin	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Monroney	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Montoya	Yarborough
Gore	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Gruening	Morton	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—1

McNamara

So the House amendment, with the amendments of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, during the last session when the Senate was considering the merits of S. 9, the cold war GI bill, I voiced my concern that the bill was lacking in fiscal prudence. That bill was opposed by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Veterans' Administration and had been opposed by three administrations.

The bill which we have just passed differs substantially from the previous one and is a much welcomed improvement. It broadens the coverage in many ways

and reduces the cost. These improvements are reflected in the support of both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. While the bill is still substantially in excess of the budget recommendations, it is certainly one which can be afforded by a prosperous country calling on its skilled manpower to fight in Vietnam and to defend freedom in many other areas of the world. It should serve as a warning to our enemies that Congress and the Nation intend to support our Armed Forces wherever they may be, and as a welcome sign to our young men and women in service that we recognize the problems which they face and support programs to back their efforts.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I consider the enactment of S. 9, the cold war GI bill, as one of the most significant and important bills before the Congress this session. While the bill as amended by the House does have some shortcomings, nevertheless, it will be welcomed by our men who have served this country so ably and courageously since 1955. I am particularly disappointed that the House bill did not provide for on-the-job training benefits and, of course, would have preferred the more generous educational benefits provided by the Senate bill.

Mr. President, at a time when demonstrations against this country's policies in southeast Asia seem to be all too fashionable, the enactment of this measure today will be a fitting way to demonstrate the Nation's gratitude to our men presently on the firing line and the many other veterans who have been responsible for our Nation's successfully meeting the Communist challenge in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Taiwan-Matsu, Lebanon, Berlin, and Laos.

Many men and women have benefited from earlier World War II and Korean GI bills. Of course the Nation has benefited even more for these veterans have become more productive citizens of our society and have greatly enriched our national life. A total of 8 million veterans of World War II were trained under the GI bill. Of this number over 2 million went to college, 3½ million went to other schools, nearly 1½ million attended on-the-job training, and three-fourths of a million were trained on the farms.

The Korean experience was even better, for 1 of the 3 million who took advantage of the educational benefits over half attended college. The Korean and World War II GI bills certainly helped to make us a stronger Nation and provided us with the needed skilled and professional manpower to meet the challenges of this competitive century.

I am certain, Mr. President, that the enactment of this legislation will be most beneficial to the veterans and will see this Nation reap the same benefits as it has from previous GI bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the entire Nation should applaud the Congress for the passage of S. 9. I join my colleagues in recognizing the leadership and dedication of the senior Senator from Texas. He has worked long and tirelessly to achieve the passage of this bill, and I extend to him my sincere congratulations.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 9. The investment in the skills and talents of young American men and women authorized by this bill will be repaid many times over by their increased contributions to the economic life of the Nation.

This legislation is a significant addition to the Federal educational assistance programs enacted in the first session of this Congress. I hope that all the young men and women, who are eligible for the educational benefits of S. 9, will take full advantage of their eligibility. Our people, our economy, and our society will be joint beneficiaries of their efforts.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as one of the original cosponsors of S. 9, the cold war GI bill, which has been approved in its final form by the Senate today, I would like to discuss the many fine aspects of this measure.

The need for legislation providing readjustment benefits to veterans is clear. During the years since January 31, 1955, when the Korean conflict was officially terminated, U.S. servicemen have been defending the cause of freedom in a variety of circumstances. One need only recall such familiar names as Lebanon, Berlin, the Dominican Republic, and South Vietnam to understand the broad range of activities undertaken by our servicemen. In South Vietnam, of course, our troops are fighting for liberty and the right of self-determination in the most intense manner since the Korean conflict. The men who have served in these situations have done an outstanding job for their country, and they deserve the gratitude and praise of all their fellow citizens.

Principles of justice as well as the traditions of our country demand that veterans should be properly rewarded for their service. Compensation is particularly necessary during the period immediately following an individual's term of military service, for this is the time in which he must readjust to civilian life and find his place in the economy. Quite often, readjustment is difficult because the veteran may not have a secure income or the educational benefits which many of his contemporaries have earned.

Persons who have served in American military forces deserve a maximum opportunity to rejoin American society in a constructive manner. They especially deserve educational opportunities, which they might have been able to obtain if they had not been involved in military service. Furthermore, they deserve maximum opportunities to obtain homes and jobs.

The cold war GI bill attempts to provide these opportunities by a variety of means. First, a basic monthly educational allowance is provided to veterans who have served at least 180 days, or who have been discharged because of a service-connected disability. Maximum benefits are $100 per month for single veterans, $125 for a veteran with one dependent, and $150 for a veteran with two or more dependents. Eligible veterans will qualify for 1 month's benefits for each month of service, up to a maximum of 36 months. Both full-time and part-time college level or below college level training in trade, vocational, and technical schools are included.

Second, persons still serving on active duty may receive educational aid through a program of tuition grants. These grants will be made if the serviceman has served more than 2 years, a portion of which occurred after January 31, 1955.

Third, the Veterans' Administration home loan guarantee program is extended to veterans discharged after January 31, 1955. The Government will guarantee private loans up to $7,500, and will make direct loans for homes in rural areas and small towns, up to a maximum of $17,500.

Fourth, the Labor Department's job counseling and placement service is extended to the new group of veterans.

Fifth, Veterans' Administration hospital care, which now is provided to persons with service-connected disabilities, is extended to all veterans who have served since January 31, 1955, provided that a bed is available and that the individual signs an oath saying he is unable to pay for hospital services. The presumption of a wartime service-connected disability is extended to those veterans who suffered disability from chronic and tropical diseases.

Sixth, presently existing preferential status for entrance into the Federal civil service is extended to the new veterans.

Seventh, the VA is authorized to provide a flag for the casket of a cold war veteran.

Eighth, the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act is amended to protect individuals who are renting homes when called into service. The amount of rent covered is increased from $80 to $150 per month.

This act will make a substantial contribution to the national welfare. For example, a single veteran who pursues an education during the regular 9-month school year could receive as much as $900, which would be sufficient to cover tuition fees in most publicly supported schools and more than 60 percent of the fees charged by typical private schools. Keeping in mind the other possible sources of financial assistance which Congress, the States, and private contributions have made available, it becomes clear that veterans will be eligible for many educational opportunities when they return from service.

This is the best type of investment which can be made to help develop and maintain a strong, vital nation. It is an investment which will improve the competence and skill of our people, thereby insuring greater human resources for future development of the American way of life. By providing the cold war veteran with academic vocational training, this act will more than pay for itself by helping the veteran increase his employable skills and his income.

Because this measure will bring to these worthy veterans enlarged educational, training, and housing opportunities and will be of great benefit to the Nation as a whole, I am personally proud to be a Member of the Congress in which it was enacted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I doubt if I can recall during my 30 years

in Congress a more gratifying moment than this. As the cold war GI bill, of which I am a cosponsor, approaches the final stages of enactment, I look back with pride and humility on the sacrifices and efforts of our fighting men, who so truly deserve this measure of recognition.

For nearly a decade, I have encouraged efforts to obtain these benefits for our young men who have carried our national responsibility and preserved the democracy of the free world.

In 1959, 1961, and 1963, when I testified before the subcommittee, I gave several compelling reasons for passing this bill, reasons which are even more compelling today.

Our fighting men in Vietnam and in other "hot spots" around the globe are running great risks. These risks will apparently continue. Therefore, I cannot help but feel that servicemen should be adequately rewarded for taking such risk. In view of the fact that selective military service is calling some of us to the job of insuring the peace while others of us are permitted to follow our own civilian pursuits, I feel that an incentive such as the cold war GI bill is essential.

Under this present bill to extend GI benefits, over 65,000 Alabama veterans would be eligible for benefits by June 30 of this year. Because of the open-end provision in the bill, this number would grow larger each year.

This cold war GI bill would make cold war veterans eligible for educational benefits, home and farm loans, medical care, veteran's preference, job counseling, and unemployment benefits, as well as entitlement to benefits under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, of which I was also a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to see that provisions for extending the VA direct home loan program not only to cold war veterans but also to Vietnam veterans is included in this measure. Earlier this year, the distinguished majority leader introduced for me and others a bill, S. 2732, to extend eligibility under the VA direct loan program to our Vietnam veterans. Under Senate procedure, my bill was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and subsequently to the Housing Subcommittee and it was my hope that in due course this bill would be reported to the Senate for action. Now that this provision regarding the direct loan program is contained in S. 9, it, of course, avoids the necessity of action on my measure by the Senate.

I was one of the original sponsors of the direct loan program in 1950 and since that time some 186,189 loans, totaling about $1.7 billion have been made to veterans of World War II and more than 70,000 loans, totaling over $687.7 million have been made to veterans of the Korean conflict.

I am very proud of my sponsorship of this program.

Losses under this highly successful program have amounted to less than 1 percent of the total amount of loans made. Furthermore, after repayment to the U.S. Treasury of funds used plus interest and deducting all losses, the direct loan program had a net profit of over $154 million as of June 30, 1965.

To me, this shows conclusively that the confidence we placed in our veterans of World War II and Korea when developing the direct loan program has been proven repeatedly. I am confident that the very same thing will hold true of all our veterans that we would make eligible under this bill to receive the benefits that a grateful nation can give to them.

This proposal does not constitute a handout. I think of it as part of the debt all of us should be willing to pay to those who serve their country in the military forces. As long as we continue to draft our Nation's youths, we should be willing to contribute to the well-being of these same youths.

June 22, 1966, will mark the 22d anniversary of the signing of the World War II GI bill. Since enactment, it has raised the educational level of the entire Nation through its various schooling and training provisions. A total of 7,800,000 World War II vets entered into training under this program.

In Alabama alone, nearly 231,000 out of the 346,000 Korea and World War II veterans have been educated and trained under the GI bill.

The record shows that veterans have a higher income than nonveterans. This can be attributed in part to the beneficial effects of the GI educational program. Hundreds and thousands of World War II GI's who took advantage of this program are now leaders in their communities. They are respected citizens who are earning good incomes and who bear a large measure of responsibility for their community's growth and progress. These same GI's can now assist their younger brothers as a result of their success. Because of their higher incomes and resulting higher taxes, a measure such as this cold war GI bill can now be enacted and properly financed.

The original GI bill, which I was also pleased and honored to cosponsor, stimulated an unparalleled record of homeownership. In promoting homeownership that had been stimulated from previously enacted laws, this program has resulted in well over 6 million veterans being able to buy homes.

Mr. President, the battle between democracy and communism continues, even increases daily. To my way of thinking, education is a most critical weapon in that battle. Accordingly, I believe that the so-called cold war GI bill can play an extremely significant part in this battle. I am indeed happy to have had an opportunity to help promote this legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I was most gratified today to participate in passage of the cold war GI bill.

This legislation illustrates the recognition by Congress that those men and women who have served their country during the cold war—and sometimes hot wars—since 1955 have suffered the same disruption of their lives and careers as the veterans of other wars.

Passage of the bill was long overdue and I was proud to be a cosponsor of what I know will be regarded as landmark legislation.

But the man who deserves the highest recognition and commendation for his untiring efforts is the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

He has been the leader in this endeavor since 1959, and he has never wavered in his efforts, even in the face of some years of inaction.

The Senator has performed a great service and I salute his outstanding leadership and determination in pursuing and securing passage of this outstanding legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the House has improved the educational program in two changes by making it permanent and by making provision for active duty servicemen to further their education. But I fear that the House bill weakens the education program as compared to the Korean GI program by decreasing the duration of educational benefits possible for length of service, by eliminating on-the-job, on-the-farm, and apprenticeship training—although full entitlements for institutional vocational training are preserved—and particularly by reducing the monthly allowances paid while the veteran is obtaining his education. In 1952 when the Korean GI bill was passed, the reasonably monthly allowances set by Congress to cover the veterans subsistence, tuition, and expenses were at the rates of $110 for a single veteran, $135 for a veteran with one dependent, and $160 for the veteran with two or more dependents.

Now 14 years later, after a gradual but substantial increase in the cost of living, and sharp increases in tuition charges, I see little justification for the House's action in cutting back the barely adequate Korean bill rates in the Senate-passed bill.

The House-passed rates of $100, $125, and $150 appear insufficient to accomplish the purpose of the bill, of encouraging veterans to continue their education after their period of service. I think it will not be many months before the need to improve this feature of the bill will be apparent.

One of the important features of the bill is that it carries forward provisions for the training of veterans in educational institutions other than colleges and universities. It recognizes the fact, which some educators wish to ignore, that a college degree is not the only type of education necessary in our society.

This bill also provides for education in a business school, technical institute, or similar postsecondary educational institution. I think it is most fortunate that this measure calls upon these types of postsecondary educational institutions to contribute to the readjustment education of our veterans. The business, trade, and technical schools are a very important part of our postsecondary educational system.

On the whole, this is a good bill. It follows the pattern of the Senate-passed bill and largely meets its objectives. The slight differences that are disappointing to me are yet not seriously crippling to the goal of providing a full program of educational and other readjustment benefits. I have no hesitancy in urging

the Senate to adopt the language of the House-passed bill. There is relatively little in dispute that could possibly be gained by a conference with the House as compared to the benefit to be gained by enactment of this long-awaited act of justice in the shortest possible time.

No bill of this magnitude can attain passage without the help and cooperation of a great many people. I pay tribute to the members who have served on our Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee for their support and encouragement through the many hearings and meetings we have had on this bill. The cold war veterans who will benefit by this bill owe special thanks to the chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, LISTER HILL, who never failed to meet any request aimed at furthering its enactment. The supporters and cosponsors of the bill are to numerous to name, but I ask unanimous consent to list the cosponsors of S. 9 at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. RIBICOFF.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Many dedicated staff members have devoted many hours to work on this bill; particular recognition is due to Stuart McClure and Jack Forsythe of the Labor Committee staff, Charles M. Johnston and Fred Blackwell, former counsels of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, and Hugh Evans, assistant Senate legislative counsel, and to my legislative assistant, Richard Yarborough, Alan Mandel, Gene Godley, and to many others.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I extend the heartiest congratulations to the Senator from Texas. He has waged a long and successful fight on the legislation that has just been passed.

I am particularly pleased that a provision that the Senator from Texas and I and others introduced was incorporated in the bill so as to extend the benefits of direct loans on housing to veterans.

I am delighted that provision was included in the measure.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I also commend the Senator for the fact that he was one of the coauthors and leaders in the fight for the first GI bill of 1944. The Senator has consistently supported every measure to help GI's since his original authoring of the first GI bill. No bill of this magnitude can attain passage without the cooperation of many persons.

When this bill passed the Senate last year, it had the support of all members of the subcommittee, including Senators on both sides of the aisle. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who was the ranking minority subcommittee member, supported the measure.

I extend my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has helped us through 7 long years and four different Congresses. His committee reported the bill every time under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

I pay special tribute also to the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], who is a member of the subcommittee, as is his brother, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The Senator from New York last year, by his incisive cross-examination, pointed out the weaknesses and fallacies of the opposition arguments. He tore each obstruction apart.

The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts spent more hours with me in hearings on the bill than did any other member of the committee.

I am grateful to all the supporters and coauthors of the bill, who are too numerous to mention. There are more than 40.

When the bill was reported last year, it had the support of every member of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike. I am delighted that this 7-year fight has been concluded. In the course of this fight, the Senate has been the legislative body responsible for the passage of the bill. The Senate committee always reported the bill. The Senate as a body passed the measure every time it was presented. The measure always received support from both sides of the aisle. The other part of the coequal legislative branch and the administration held the measure up for 7 years. The Senate did not do so.

I thank all Members of the Senate because the Senate, as an institution, has been the only branch of the Government to keep alive the hopes of millions of veterans. For 7 long years, we have been receiving letters asking: "Is there any hope for the passage of this measure?" We have always replied that the Senate of the United States supports the bill and that there is hope.

I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I join other Senators in commending my senior colleague for his long and successful leadership, and for his never-give-up attitude and the tremendous amount of work that he has put in on the GI bill.

The senior Senator from Texas has earned the approbation of the entire Senate and certainly of all men in the Armed Forces everywhere in the world. The senior Senator from Texas is responsible, more than any other person, for the passage of this measure. He deserves full credit for the Senate having enacted this important measure today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] upon the Senate's final action today on the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. The success was achieved through his indefatigable efforts in behalf of the veterans of this Nation in this and in many prior sessions of the Congress. His reputation as "Mr. Veteran" is richly deserved.

This action today represents a high mark in many long and arduous battles for veterans by the senior Senator from Texas. Veterans are indeed fortunate in having an advocate of his great skill and tireless devotion.

Tribute also should be accorded the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. As chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he, too, demonstrated considerable devotion and great effort in behalf of this most recent GI bill. Our thanks to both of these distinguished Americans.

Finally, the Senate salutes all of the distinguished members of the subcommittee, including the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNDEY], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. Today's final action is attributable to their splendid assistance, effort, and cooperation.

(Mr. LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT AND THE FOLLOWING WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m., Monday, February 14; and that, immediately after convening on that day, the Presiding Officer shall, without the transaction of any business or debate, declare the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, February 16.

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

VIETNAM CONSTRUCTION AND PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2791, the Vietnam construction and procurement authorization bill be made the pending business when reported today from the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no debate is anticipated on this measure today, but it will be the unfinished business at the conclusion of business today and debate thereon will commence next

Wednesday, immediately after the completion of morning business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this would automatically withdraw the motion to consider H.R. 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senate adjourns, the motion dies.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD ASKS AND ANSWERS A PERTINENT QUESTION—POLICE BRUTALITY OR PUBLIC BRUTALITY?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, many statements have been made about police brutality—whether or not it exists and, if it does, to what extent. Our colleague, Senator BYRD of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, has long been interested in this subject.

An article by Senator BYRD, entitled "Police Brutality or Public Brutality?" appears in the February edition of the Police Chief, the official publication of the International Association of the Chiefs of Police.

Senator BYRD also was the principal speaker at a recent seminar at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., on "Police Operation Versus Crimes of Robbery, Burglary, and Auto Theft," sponsored by the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia in cooperation with the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

This seminar was attended by representatives of police departments in 17 major cities in the country including New York, Boston, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, and others.

Because of the importance of this question, I believe it is well for Members of the Senate to read both the article and address by Senator BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Police Chief, February 1966]

POLICE BRUTALITY OR PUBLIC BRUTALITY?

(By Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S. Senate)

(NOTE.—U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, of Sophia, W. Va., began his political career in 1946 when he was elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates. After completing his second term in that office, he was elected to the West Virginia Senate in 1950 and to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1952, 1954, and 1956. In 1958 he was elected to the U.S. Senate and in 1964 he was reelected by the greatest vote ever accorded a West Virginia candidate. He is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Armed Services Committee, and the Committee on Rules and Administration. He earned the LL.B. cum laude from American University.)

There is a great cry that the police of this Nation must hew to the letter of the law, whereas others who do not agree with it have the right to break the law with impunity.

Law enforcement in America is in trouble.

To me, this situation reflects that our entire country is in trouble, because when our law enforcers are weakened and made impotent, then the laws which govern our Nation are in danger of collapsing.

For any number of reasons and alleged lofty causes the men and women of the law enforcement establishment are being made ineffectual. Alarmingly, a long parade of individuals with odious tactics are straining the tolerance of our Constitution to the breaking point. At the same time, this small cadre of confused idealists and irresponsible extremists are seeking to tear down respect for law and for the law enforcement officer.

The American public is more and more being subjected and exposed to every conceivable kind of outrage by hordes of ragtag beatniks, agitators, and professional troublemakers who insist upon lying down in the streets, blocking traffic, forming human walls in front of business establishments, swarming over private property, and staging noisy sit-ins and demonstrations. All of this is supposedly being done in order to dramatize grievances against our society and against the policies of the American Government at home and abroad.

This small band of demonstrators have so successfully cloaked themselves in the mantle of martyrdom that few people have dared to voice an objection for fear of being labeled "bigot." They have succeeded in mesmerizing large segments of our population to the extent that representatives of law and order have become pictured as the villains while lawless marchers and sit-downers have become the figures for compassion.

One of the unfortunate by-products of this curious public attitude is the denigration of the law enforcement officer. There is a great deal of furor these days over discrimination against Negroes and other minorities. Few stop to think, however, that a group most discriminated against today is the law enforcement officer. He is constantly the subject of usually unsubstantiated charges of police brutality. His will and his morale are being shattered because the clamor of such charges is not counteracted by support from law-abiding, decent citizens. He is being psychologically assailed and physically assaulted, and few responsible individuals have come to his aid. In 1964, 1 out of every 10 police officers was attacked as he attempted to carry out his duties. There is every reason to believe that when the figures for 1965 are compiled they will show an increase in such attacks.

It seems everyone is concerned with police brutality and yet no one is concerned over what I like to term "public brutality"; that is, the maltreatment of our officers of the law by citizens of every type. Until the American public realizes the brutality which is being inflicted upon our police officers, the law, which is the cornerstone of our Republic, will continue to be flaunted and diluted.

I am appalled at the lengths to which some charlatans are going as they take advantage of sometimes legitimate civil rights protests. Piteously, they cry of persecution by police who use what they term, of all things, "oral brutality." At the same time, however, they themselves delight in using the same type of brutality against police officers by characterizing them as gestapo, fuzz and in terms too opprobrious to be printed. It is truly amazing that as far as these insincere street marchers are concerned, there is only one side to the coin. They are the only ones persecuted; the policeman wears the uniform of authority—which, in itself, is anathema to the hoodlum element—and, as an officer, he becomes a ready target for oral abuse, vituperation, and, yes, physical assaults. To overly militant leaders, a Negro policeman should not wince when he is called an "Uncle Tom" or a "hankerchief head," because he is on the side of the law.

To the exploiters of the strife which America is enduring, the only victims are the rioters, the looters, the arsonists, the snipers, the thieves, and the murderers who commit vicious crimes while falsely wrapping themselves in the banner of the civil rights movement. I do not mean to imply that Negroes and other minorities in this country have not been discriminated against nor that they have escaped injustices at the hands of the majority. As Mr. Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, has said, however, "We are tired of the cry that because one segment of our population has been deprived for 100 years the balance of society must accept a 100 years of anarchy." The majority happens to have some rights also, and it, too, has suffered some injustices.

In the last several years, the law has been made to work quite effectively for the benefit of the downtrodden. It seems, however, that the more the workable processes of democratic justice have been applied to right grievous wrongs, the more greedy and impatient some factions in our society have become. Not satisfied with what the law has done for them, they seem bent upon destroying the only truly effective safeguard they have.

This incongruous philosophy is also apparent in the activities of those who protest the overseas policies and activities of the U.S. Government. Again, the police are the prime targets of weird individuals who have infiltrated groups sincerely concerned about our involvement in Vietnam and elsewhere. We have seen these ideologically confused individuals storm the White House, the very ramparts of our country's dignity; we have seen them, in effect, pledging allegiance to the Government of Hanoi by holding aloft Vietcong flags and promoting blood banks for the enemy; we have seen attempts in Oakland, Calif., at thwarting the movement of military goods to our fighting men in Vietnam; we have seen police officers assaulted, cursed, spat upon, and bitten by so-called nonviolent demonstrators allegedly seeking academic and political freedom on the campus of the University of California in Berkeley.

In these situations, the police have stolidly suffered the unjustified charge of "brutality" and "gestapo." To my way of thinking, the police in all of these incidents have handled their responsibilities with restraint, patience, and a gentleness which would be unknown in most any other country in the world. Meanwhile, however, pseudoliberal organizations continue to harp upon the necessity that it is the duty of the police to insure that both protesters and counterprotesters each have the opportunity to express their views. The galling aspect of this admonition is that the police are already aware of this. They are men of the law and know more about their responsibilities than many of their detractors.

I wish to reiterate that the police have done an outstanding job of protecting all factions. Of course, there have been exceptions, and there will always be. Police are supposed to be impartial; yes, but at the same time, they are not automatons. They are men of emotions who happen to be wearing uniforms. It takes a man of steel to ignore a Vietcong flag on America's streets. It takes an imperturbable man to calmly witness bearded idiots trampling the Constitution and Bill of Rights. It takes a strong man to hold his temper as he is spat upon and reviled by unwashed, scraggly haired revolutionaries and uncouth, insolent, irresponsible hoodlums.

When it is borne in mind that the police are a military-like organization, it is surprising that they are able to maintain any degree of composure in the face of such senseless rebellion. Many of them have sons and brothers in Vietnam, and a draft card burner to them is anathema—but they are not allowed to show it. Police also have a great deal of sympathy with the troops

in Vietnam because they fight a similar type of dirty war in which the enemy is forever striking from the shadows. The police know guerrilla warfare because they fight it day in and day out with criminals in America's streets. They also know that among the chief goals of communism and other un-American ideologies is that public faith in the police must be destroyed in order for the seeds of dissension to be planted.

The police also know that the campaigns against them are not reckless ones. They are well planned, and there are pamphlets written to educate militant demonstrators in ways of skirmishing with police in order to make the law enforcement officer appear to be the brutal aggressor.

The police accept this. They also accept the fact that it is their sworn duty to uphold the law and that they cannot be dissuaded from their responsibilities by the fact that they are made to look bad in the eyes of the public.

Since the beginning days of the modern sit-ins, wade-ins, and sleep-ins, the police have worked through their professional organization, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, to devise means of counteracting these despicable tactics. Of course, the simple answer would be retaliation, but the police officer of today is more professional, and, through conferences, research and study, he is getting closer to devising means of nullifying these tactics; that is, carrying out the letter of the law with as little violence as possible despite the efforts made to place him in an untenable position.

So-called civil disobedience cannot be countenanced by the law enforcement officer. Under our legal system, when there is an intent to break a law the act which follows the intent constitutes a crime and the individual should be punished. Unfortunately, those who seek martyrdom do not wish to understand this. They prefer to violate the law and then receive amnesty. Civil disobedience and lawlessness cannot be excused. We cannot allow one American to blithely burn his draft card while another bravely gives his life for the honor of his country in Vietnam.

The enigma surrounding the exhibitionists who seek martyrdom is compounded by the fact that some well-intentioned souls, understandably worried about the dangers present in an age of nuclear energy and a day when injustice to minorities still exists, will continue to demonstrate as they have in the past. To people who act in a mature and sincere manner, I say it is their constitutional right to peaceably and lawfully assemble and to petition the Government, but laws must be obeyed and police officers respected by all. With regard to those who counsel and perpetrate unlawful acts, the majority of Americans must react with vigilance, sternness, and speed in the dispensing of just and legal desserts for the offenders.

I am appalled when I hear or read statements to the effect that this gang of hirsute ragamuffins is so small and their impact so negligible that they should be ignored. That this is not so is the reason this type of lawlessness must be stopped. The morale of our troops in Vietnam is obviously affected. The North Vietnamese concept of the American will is without question a misconstruction since the Hanoi government believed such attitudes to be so widespread that it issued commemorative stamps depicting Americans picketing against the war and even went so far as to picture the grisly self-immolation by that unfortunate man on the grounds of the Pentagon as an indication of American beliefs.

Persons responsible for aiding our enemies and destroying Americans' faith in other Americans must be punished. Not the least among the reasons for this is the fact that our police who bear the first brunt of these activities must be supported by their community officials, by the press, and by the public. What does it avail a police officer, moreover, to risk life and limb in arresting rioters and unlawful protesters if they are freed and even lauded, by the courts and when our Constitution and Bill of Rights are twisted well beyond any meaning that our forefathers attempted to convey?

Recent events have emphasized that there has been a violent breach of two cardinal principles of our American society—the respect for law and order and the recourse to orderly process of law to seek redress of wrongs. There is a great cry that the police of this Nation must hew to the letter of the law, whereas others who do not agree with it have the right to break the law with impunity. The vast majority of the 300,000 men and women of the police service in this country are remaining within the framework of the law in the face of great provocation daily. When we reach the stage that the other side can break the law without punishment while the police must continue to use Marquis of Queensbury rules, then it is obvious which will be the loser. The loser will be John Q. Citizen—you and me, our wives and children, old and young, black and white, in city and hamlet all over America.

Our country cannot stand firm upon laws that are manipulated like clay. America can endure only so long as it has as its foundation solid bedrock. And, that bedrock is the law and the men and women who enforce it.

If the police of this Nation are not supported now, the law will perish, and this Republic cannot endure long thereafter.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT BYRD AT LAW ENFORCEMENT SEMINAR

I welcomed the invitation to be with you today because I know of no more important objective to be attained than that of this seminar—reversing the shameful growth of our Nation's crime rate.

Long before I became a Member of the U.S. Senate, and continually since then, this problem has been a matter of growing concern to me. This concern has led me to devote a great portion of my senatorial efforts toward solving this problem.

While the more vicious crimes receive the most editorial attention, it is my firm conviction that the very crimes you will work on during this seminar—robbery, burglary, and auto theft—form, in large part, the seedbed from which the greater ones often spring.

From our learned psychiatrists, sociologists, and others of like ilk flow a steady stream of obtuse literature explaining the sources of crime.

I am inclined to be a little more blunt about the matter, and boil most of it down to the old Biblical injunction—spare the rod and spoil the child. All too often, I believe, crime springs from lack of parental discipline. Young men "borrow" a car and go for a joy ride "just for kicks." They rob to pay for a drug habit started "just for kicks." Probably early application of the parental hand to the area usually reserved for kicks would have nipped this problem in the bud.

Unfortunately, when these undisciplined youths get into trouble with the law it is not they or their parents who are castigated—too often it is the police for taking the proper law enforcement action. Too often, in recent years, the courts turn these malcontents back on society with only a compassionate slap on the wrist.

Despite these situations, the duty of the police is clear and their trust from our citizens inviolable. You gentlemen and your colleagues must enforce the laws if society as we know it is to exist and prosper.

This calls for professional capability and integrity of the highest caliber. Today's policeman must be a professional in his capabilities and his philosophy. He must be an expert in police techniques and in understanding of the sociological and philosophical implications involved in performing his duty. Of major importance is continued professional growth.

That is why I was so heartened to hear of this seminar and delighted to attend personally.

During this week, you have had the opportunity to learn of new innovations, advanced procedures, and improved methods for adding to your professional competence. Through face-to-face communication with your peers, from our major metropolitan areas, you have had an opportunity to broaden and expand your own scope. And, it will not stop with you. The results of the progress you achieve here will be seeded throughout police agencies across the country.

And, it cannot happen too soon. Our national crime index during the first 9 months of 1965 increased 5 percent over the similar period in 1964. Burglary in cities over 25,000 rose 5 percent, robbery 5 percent, and auto theft 4 percent. These figures present a grim picture, not only to our citizens throughout the Nation, but to those of us in the Congress who make our laws.

The Congress is endeavoring to act to assist local law enforcement, and I think you gentlemen can take great heart in the passage of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 and the creation of the President's Commission on Crime and the Administration of Justice. I can report to you also that growing numbers of my colleagues in the Senate and in the House are showing great concern over the crime situation and are focusing their attention upon ways in which you can be supported in carrying out your tasks. On an increasing scale, my colleagues are taking to their feet to call for citizen respect for the law and support for their police, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects a growing number of comments and published editorials and documents echoing this vital need.

You might be interested in knowing that sometime in the very near future I intend to make a speech on the floor of the Senate in which I hope I will be able to call the attention of the American public to the plight of the police service in this country and to rally the American public to your assistance.

I have authored an article which will appear in the February issue of your magazine, the Police Chief, in which I very bluntly condemn the charlatans who are exploiting the use of civil rights demonstrations, and in which I also criticize the hordes of bearded beatniks and their comrades. I wanted to present my views in this respect because I believe it is high time that the police of this Nation be spared the insults and the physical assaults which are being inflicted by these categories of irresponsible and un-American exhibitionists. I believe it is high time also that more of our Government and industry leaders let it be known that decent, law-abiding citizens are weary of this intimidation and that our society will not continue to ignore these assaults upon our institutions.

While the Federal Government is rapidly coming to your aid, it is obvious that there is not a great deal that the Federal Government and the Congress can do. This is as it should be, since crime is a local problem, it should be handled by local authorities and there must never be a great encroachment by the Federal Government on the responsibilities of our communities and States. I will say to you, however, that within the bounds of what your elected representatives can do, I hope that the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives will exert every effort to create legislation and make available to you the wherewithal to perform your duty of protecting our society from the criminal army which now threatens the safety of every man, woman, and child in this country.

I believe there is a great deal that can be done along these lines by our Nation's business community and our industrial leaders. For instance, some $2 billion was the bill for industrial theft, embezzlement, and sabotage last year. This $2 billion, of course, represents a tremendous expenditure in police man-hours—hours that might well have been spent protecting the personal safety of your constituents and mine. One of the best deterrents to a growing crime rate, of course, is a program of prevention; that is, making the attractive fruit less available to the criminal. Throughout our land there are industries which are slipshod in their security and which use archaic methods of protection. I would call upon all industries to reexamine their methods of protecting their property in order that the task of the police service might be made easier.

While I am on this subject, I heard recently that a former prosecuting attorney stated that it is very difficult to find witnesses to a crime who are willing to take time off from their jobs to testify. As we all know, the process of justice is a long and tedious one. It sometimes requires that a worker be away from his job for several days. According to the former prosecuting attorney, he knew of numerous cases in which witnesses said that they would never again perform this duty because they were being intimidated by their superiors at the place in which they worked. In other words, their bosses resented their taking time off from their jobs for this purpose and a number of the witnesses were threatened with dismissal because of their absence from work and others had their pay deducted for days missed from work. This, of course, is appalling, and I am not so sure that State legislatures and the Congress of the United States should not look into this situation to afford some protection to workers who conscientiously attempt to serve as witnesses in local and Federal criminal cases. Of course, the most satisfactory solution would be for leaders of industry to make sure that their firms are not guilty of such civic derelictions.

Industry must take a great interest in the manner in which society is faring. While I do not wish to single out any particular industry, one of your topics here at this conference is auto theft and the ways in which it can be minimized. It has been long said by the public, by the police, by insurance people, and by automobile manufacturers themselves that motor vehicles must be made more secure and less susceptible to theft. Some automobile manufacturers have turned their attention to this problem and have made their cars more secure against tampering, but I believe that the great technological genius of the automobile industry should be devoted to the development of some safe locking measures which will prevent the ease with which cars are stolen today. Not only would the temptation to irresponsible young people be lessened, but a great contribution would be made to crime prevention. I cannot believe that such a simple matter as this is too difficult for the engineers of the automobile industry to solve. Again, the ideal solution is for the automobile manufacturers to take this action voluntarily. Otherwise, I can foresee that they will be compelled to do so by legislation.

I am pleased to say that many civic and service organizations such as the National Exchange Clubs, Optimist International, Kiwanis, U.S. Jaycees, the American Legion, Rotary and others have created or revitalized national and regional programs calling for more respect for the law and for the policemen whose duty it is to enforce the law. This is the type of citizen action which will ultimately reap great benefits, not only for you gentlemen but for the communities you serve, and I salute the men and women who are unselfishly devoting themselves to these programs. They are holding out their hands to you, and I urge each of you and your colleagues around the country to respond and work with them. A collaboration between decent citizens and the police service can build a wall which criminals will find difficult to surmount.

I need not tell you gentlemen that there are many conditions which affect the amount and type of crime which occurs from place to place. As you know, I represent the State of West Virginia, and the crime rate in our State is among the lowest in the Nation. You are also aware that my State has suffered some economic reversals in the last several years. At the same time, the people in my State are a realistic breed whose mores and whose belief that right is right and wrong is wrong are, generally speaking, extremely strong.

There have been a great number of claims in modern times that poverty is a cause of our spiraling crime rate, and there has been a great deal of compassion lavished on lawbreakers because of their so-called "lot in life." I do not subscribe to this maudlin theory. The people of West Virginia have not turned our State into anarchy because some of them are poor. Yet, in areas in which the citizens are infinitely better off, they have rioted and looted and broken the law and, at the same time, succeeded in placing the blame upon society in general and police in particular.

To my way of thinking, some Americans have cast aside their pride, their spirit of independence, and the diligence which characterized their forefathers. In the place of these attributes, they have assumed that their Government owes them a living and have turned to the dole as a way of life. When the dole does not come through, they feel that they have the right to take from their more prosperous neighbor.

Until these attitudes are reversed, crime in this country will continue to be a blight on our way of life.

It seems clear to me that our Government, organizations representing law-abiding citizens, and the great might of American industry must embark on a program of bringing back luster to our traditional beliefs in respect for law and for the police.

I happen to know that the International Association of Chiefs of Police has done a tremendously fine job in the last five years of bringing greater professionalization to the police service. With limited funds, it has become the nerve center of the local law enforcement effort in this country, disseminating knowledge and techniques, standardizing procedures, and conducting the type of research which law enforcement has sorely needed for a long time. I also happen to know that the International Association of Chiefs of Police has, in the last several years, turned to industry in this country in an effort to secure funds so that it could expand its services to the police in the country. The efforts have largely been met with apathy on the part of leading industries, and financial assistance has been almost non-existent.

It seems to me that no one has a greater stake in a safe and orderly society than does American industry. I am appalled that industrial leaders have ignored the needs of the police of this country who provide so many services for industry. The International Association of Chiefs of Police, as you know, is a nonprofit, professional, educational association. Its goals are not only laudable; they are indispensable to the security of everyone in this country. I would, therefore, suggest to every industrial leader in this country that he reexamine his obligation to the police service and reconsider what assistance can be given to you dedicated men.

This seminar here is a perfect example of what can be done with proper support.

It is most gratifying to me that the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia and our District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department have taken the initiative to cope with crime problems by means of this seminar. It is equally gratifying that your own organization, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, is cooperating in this commendable program.

Gentlemen, you truly fight in the front lines in the war against crime. Like Vietnam, the end is not in sight. As it is for your sons, relatives and friends in Vietnam, the battle is a deadly one. But, you must win—the citizens of our Nation have placed their trust in you to that end. The dedication and purpose with which you have studied gives me assurance that our trust is not misplaced. Gentlemen, I commend you for your labors.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine statement made by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] before the Mississippi Valley Association at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., on February 7, 1966.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, OF FLORIDA, BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 7, 1966

I am pleased and highly complimented that your executive vice president, Mr. Winter, invited me to be the guest speaker at this luncheon today.

Coming from the State of Florida which has been blessed with a great abundance of water, I have devoted a great deal of my time to the development of this great natural resource, not only in the State of Florida but throughout the Nation. I have served on the Senate Public Works Committee and later on the Appropriations Committee in which I have always been a member of the Public Works Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of your great Senator from Louisiana, Senator ELLENDER, one of our finest and most dedicated Senators. Therefore, I am very much aware of the excellent job your organization is doing. I know that you have assisted my State of Florida in the development of its water resources and have testified many times before committees of the Congress in support of our efforts. For this I wish to thank you—and I might add that we have with us today a delegation of some 35 to 40 from Florida, who are members of the Mississippi Valley Association which will attest to what I have said.

During my nearly 20 years that I have had the honor to represent Florida in the U.S. Senate, there have been great accomplishments in the development of our natural water resources, but we still have a long way to go to provide for our ever-expanding economy—more power for industry—improvement of our harbors—hurricane protection—beach erosion—flood control—all these are necessary as well as improvements in our inland waterway systems. Yes, we still have a tremendous job to do and together we can do it.

I will not consume time dwelling on statistics and cost figures as I am sure that all of you are well aware of the trends and have kept abreast of actions in this vital field. I

will only mention that development of our water resources has been a major factor in the transformation of our country from a wilderness to the geatest industrial nation on earth.

The development of our national commerce and its continued virile growth is due in considerable measure to the construction of navigation facilities—22,000 miles of inland and intracoastal waterways; some 500 commercial harbors and constant improvements to them to keep abreast of the ever-increasing traffic demand.

To provide for these improvements the Army Engineers, using funds appropriated by Congress and to a lesser degree by cooperating local agencies, have more than doubled expenditures nationwide in the last decade, from $503 million in 1955 to about $1.3 billion in fiscal year 1966.

The development of our river systems and the harnessing of power of our water resources have produced essential electricity for our ever-increasing industrial might.

Those are sound investments, producing lasting values, values that will benefit our Nation in the years to come. As President George Washington, an engineer who envisioned the vast inland possibilities of the United States, once expressed the fervent hope: "Would God that we may have the wisdom and courage to improve them."

We should be grateful that we have had, and continue to have such wisdom and courage.

This brings me to the first of two points I wish to emphasize as strongly as possible and if I accomplish nothing else by this talk, you will know my positions and know that I will fight vigorously for these positions since I feel very strongly that the continued development of our water resources is dependent upon the defeat of these proposals I am about to discuss.

You are all familiar with the efforts of the Corps of Engineers, and I say this in all candor as I know the Engineers must take policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget, to improve their methods of evaluating navigation benefits in carrying out the instructions issued by the Chief of Engineers under date of November 20, 1964, subject: "Waterway Improvement Studies—Navigation Benefits."

Most of you are aware of the method that has been used in the past to calculate the so-called cost-benefit ratio of a project. Under the old and proven method, a survey of the resources of an area would be made to determine the products and tonnage that would be generated to move on a waterway, and the difference in the rate between the existing freight rate and the barge rate would be the savings attributable to the project. If the total of these annual benefits exceeded the annual total costs, including amortization and operation and maintenance, the project had a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio and was considered feasible; and the higher the ratio, the more desirable the project, therefore placing the project in an excellent position for congressional approval.

Now comes the new criteria as prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget policy. In essence, the proposal would compare the barge rate with a theoretical rate that the competing modes of transportation might be compelled to adopt if a waterway were placed in operation. Of course, such a thing as this would tend to greatly reduce the benefits and frequently result in an unfavorable report.

Should the competing forms of transportation place such theoretical rates into permanent effect there could be no argument, but they are not required to do so nor do they anticipate doing so.

The new directive provides:

The traffic that would move over a considered waterway improvement will depend on the competitive rates by barge and alternative means that would likely be in effect with the waterway improvement. Therefore, estimates of waterway traffic will be prepared on the basis of projected water-compelled rates with consideration of all data and factors that are likely to modify current rates to take account of the competitive situation anticipated with the waterway in being, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media.

The benefits for the traffic (estimated as in above) that would move over an improved waterway will be computed as the difference in the projected competitive rates or charges for the movement by the alternative means that would be used in the absence of the waterway and the projected rates and charges utilizing the waterway. In developing the projected rates or charges, consideration will be given to all pertinent data and factors, including the competitive situation in the absence of the waterway, current rates, and foreseeable technological developments applicable to the several transport media. The benefits determined in this manner will be used in project justification and in the benefit-cost ratio.

In addition, reports will include an estimate of benefits obtained by applying unit savings based on the rates prevailing at the time of the study to the waterway traffic also estimated on the basis of rates prevailing at the time of the study.

Based on this criteria, which seems absurd to me, a railroad might very easily fix rates in an area of a proposed project to discourage waterway traffic and thereafter raise the rates to the original level. Therefore, if on the basis of projected water compelled rates the benefits from an otherwise justifiable navigation project can be so depressed as to result in its rejection by the Engineers, the railroads can practically control the development of our inland waterways for navigation purposes by simply projecting totally unrealistic rates.

The new directive is so ambiguous that few engineers can agree on its interpretation, and to me it seems to be a shortsighted policy to insist on criteria which would tend to perpetuate a static or no growth climate for industrial development by continuing high transportation rates that the project would materially reduce.

Incidentally, it is my understanding that no new projects have been approved under the new criteria, that is, since November 1964, and that a review of many approved projects—with which we are in complete accord as being feasible and justified—under the new criteria would find them wanting for lack of a favorable cost-benefit ratio.

I personally will continue to fight for the full development of our water resources and for reinstatement of the original criteria used by the Corps of Engineers in determining cost-benefit ratios. I am sure many of my colleagues support my position, but your help is needed and I know from experience what your organization can do when it has an objective in mind.

Now my second point is that I am vigorously opposed to the so-called Moss bill which is the "one big agency" approach to natural resource problems. If enacted, all resource development programs would be lumped into a super Department of Natural Resources.

I am not in favor of building this proposed new bureaucracy and I am not in favor of taking an organization, functioning effectively and efficiently in one agency out of that agency and establishing a separate empire. For many years the Government's only concern was improvement of waterway transportation. Then in 1917 and 1927, in the Mississippi Valley, the Federal Government took its first steps in flood control, and nationwide flood control authority was given to the Corps of Engineers in 1936. They have performed magnificently in this field as they have in the field of waterway transportation.

Senator Moss' bill, if enacted, would transfer to a new super Department of Natural Resources the Soil Conservation Service, now in the Department of Agriculture where it has been ever since it was founded and which is closely allied with farming interest; the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; the Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior; TVA; the Federal Power Commission; Water Pollution Control now in HEW; the Geological Survey; the Office of Saline Water; and the civil functions operations of the Army Engineers—what a colossal new Bureau that would be. All of these agencies, in my opinion, have performed outstandingly and their consolidation could do nothing to improve the present status or the high degree of cooperation now existing.

The greatest loss of all under the proposed bill would be the removal of the civil works program from the Corps of Engineers who were the pioneers in the public works program, a program built on 143 years of experience. To transplant or transform this activity would cause such dislocations that I do not believe any possible benefit would be gained to counterbalance them.

The Corps of Engineers, experienced in peace and war, have met most situations successfully. They are to be commended and are the logical ones to perform the civil works functions.

Further, a system of coordination has been established under the present civil works program between the Corps of Engineers, other Federal agencies, State and local governments and officials and independent groups which would take a new agency much time and effort to match.

Last year the Congress enacted the Water Resources Planning Act and personally, I do not think Congress is going to abandon the approach embodied in that act without giving it a fair trial. This act is in the main line of the American conservation movement. It offers a maximum of coordination and cooperation with a minimum of disruption while the one agency concept under the Moss bill would involve great uprooting and upheaval.

Fundamentally, the problem of overlap and conflict in our resource programs is not due to the fact that we have several agencies at work. It is due to the different laws and national policy under which those agencies' activities were established and the different purposes or aims that the American people have undertaken and assigned to those agencies from time to time. For this reason you will not solve these problems simply by reshuffling and rearranging organizational structures, but rather by the coordination of national purposes and objectives. This can be accomplished better under the Coordinating Council created at cabinet level under the Water Resources Act.

I, for one, do not see that lumping many diverse elements together under one roof would help at all, and I will vigorously oppose such action.

I find no merit in the basic concept of the one big agency approach to natural resource problems, and I cannot believe that Congress will abandon the Water Resources Act which was enacted after a half century struggle. I am committed to the wisdom of the path we have chosen and oppose any radical demolition of our experienced and capable organizations, such as the Army Corps of Engineers, and the program through which they have helped to make this the most prosperous and strongest nation in the world.

These are two of but many battles with which we are confronted, and any relaxation of our fight on the battlefront for sound water resources development makes it doubly difficult to ward off the next attack which might well be the battle of the user charge or tax which I have not discussed but with

which I know you are all thoroughly familiar. Suffice it to say, I join with you on this subject, as I do on the other subjects I have mentioned. But let me assure you constant vigilance is necessary and the problems must be met head on if we are to arrive at realistic solutions. We must work together as never before.

Again I thank you for inviting me to be with you today and I express my appreciation to you for the wonderful support your organization has given to the State of Florida in the development of its waterways.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call special attention to the discussion by Senator HOLLAND, of the criteria recently promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget, in respect to the benefit-to-cost ratio in navigation projects. Several paragraphs in his speech have to do with the so-called directive of November 20, 1964, which directive has been forced upon the Corps of Engineers against its wishes, against the wishes of Congress, and against the wishes of all our citizens who are concerned with the continued development of our Nation's waterways.

This speech calls attention to the disastrous effect of the criteria set forth in this directive upon the future development of our navigable waterways. The directive's effect is to make it almost impossible to maintain the current progress being made on our navigable streams.

In short, the new criterion which has been forced upon the corps for determining economic benefits and benefit-to-cost ratios requires the Engineers to assume a freight rate which might be put into effect by our railroads in the event the waterway under study were actually constructed.

For this purpose, implemental costs would be the floor for such an estimate of a future freight rate. Then, as I said, the Engineers are to estimate how much of the future commercial traffic would move under this "assumed" freight rate and how much would move on the waterway under consideration.

In other words, the estimates of prospective waterway commerce are twisted and distorted and the benefits are reduced to a point where the proposed project cannot be justified.

It goes without saying that the directive of November 20, 1964, contains no requirement for any railroad to adopt such an assumed rate whether or not the waterway is actually constructed.

In his speech before the Mississippi Valley Association last Monday, Senator HOLLAND correctly points out that no new major navigation projects have been approved by the Corps of Engineers under this new criterion. This is exactly the situation that I predicted when it was first brought to my attention in January 1965.

The pity is that this criterion affects not only navigation projects but it can also prevent the construction of multiple-purpose projects which depend upon navigation benefits for their justification. As I said, I think this is against the wishes of the Congress and against the best interests of our Nation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in connection with the statement of my senior colleague, I wish to state that I agree with Senator HOLLAND 100 percent. The position taken by some in the Bureau of the Budget, who have been elected to no office, is completely irresponsible, and a great disservice to this country.

For some strange reason, when a man becomes President of the United States and is separated from the people, as must necessarily be the case, and surrounded by bureaucrats, there is a tendency to listen to the logic of people who would urge false economy upon the President, in this case to the extent that we would not be able to develop our resources. As much as I would favor some of the new programs the President has recommended, I must say that if I had to choose, I would much rather dispense with some of the new programs and continue the sound, valid program of resources development which the senior Senator from Louisiana has so stanchly advocated and for which he has worked so hard.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I say to my junior colleague that since the issuance of this new directive, no new projects have been sent to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Probably not; but we ought to be continuing the full development of our water resources.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish the senior Senator from Louisiana to know that I have read the statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to the Mississippi Valley Association. I associate myself not only with the compliments paid the Senator from Florida by the knowledgeable Senator from Louisiana, but I also express my commendation of Senator HOLLAND's forthright and effective references to the new standards for evaluating navigation improvements prescribed by the Chief of Engineers in November 1964.

As the Senator now speaking pointed out at the time of debate last year on the omnibus flood control-rivers and harbors bill—popularly known as the public works authorizations—there is considerable support for the request made by several river valley associations that the Chief of Engineers review and hopefully modify the new criteria. This is a matter of serious concern to several members of the Senate Committee on Public Works. I appreciate the fact that Senator HOLLAND has brought problems created by the new navigation improvement criteria into clear focus.

The senior Senator from Florida delivered a thoroughly meaningful and informative speech in his February 7, 1966, participation in the program of the Mississippi Valley Association at Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I note that my distinguished friend and colleague, Senator ELLENDER, who has great and longstanding concern for the water resources development of our Nation, has asked that an address by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] before the Mississippi Valley Association, meeting in Washington, on February 7, 1966, be printed in the RECORD today. I have read Senator HOLLAND's remarks, particularly as they regard the new navigation improvement criteria of the Corps of Engineers. Along with other Members of the Congress, including members of the Senate Public Works Committee, on which I serve, I have been concerned that these new criteria will cause unnecessary difficulties in furthering the development of the waterways of our Nation. I would hope that the Senate Public Works Committee will give its early attention to this subject and to the use of these criteria, as I believe the points made in this discussion ought to be fully considered by the Congress, and by the responsible officials of the Federal agencies involved.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I join my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in commenting on the superb statement delivered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] before the Mississippi Valley Association on February 7, here in Washington. In commenting on Mr. HOLLAND's remarks, I would like to especially point out paragraph 6, page 2. I feel he has touched upon a subject of concern to many of my colleagues. Senator HOLLAND states, and I quote:

> You are familiar with the efforts of the Corps of Engineers, and I say this in all candor, as I know that all engineers must take policy guidance from the Bureau of the Budget, to improve their methods of evaluating navigation benefits in carrying out the instructions issued by the Chief of Engineers under date of November 20, 1964—Subject: "Waterway Improvement Studies—Navigation Benefits."

Senator HOLLAND in this statement is referring to the new criteria which the Corps of Engineers is using in determining the benefit-cost ratio of our inland navigation projects. This new criteria constitutes an attempt by the Corps of Engineers to evaluate projected freight rates on existing transportation facilities, and the effects of possible reduction in existing rates upon the amount of freight which will ultimately be transported by barge.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I feel that it is imperative that we as a committee investigate the effect which this new criteria is having on the benefit-cost ratio of our proposed new inland navigation projects. Historically, our navigation projects have far exceeded the most liberal estimate of the amount of freight which they would carry. I feel, therefore, that more weight is being given this new criteria than is justifiable, and I feel that a reexamination is in order. Second, I would like to comment on my distinguished colleague's remarks concerning the proposed user charges on our inland waterways. Again, I feel as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee that this is a proposal deserving of much consideration and evaluation. Transportation is and always will be a vital link in the continued progress of our economy. I feel that inland water transportation is destined to be the salvation of many of our previously landlocked metropolitan centers. It would be a drastic mistake at this time to curtail the continued development of our inland waterways with the imposition of a restrictive user charge. I, therefore, feel

that the Senate and House Public Works Committees should give a great deal of close scrutiny to this proposal.

Mr. President, I would like to commend my honorable colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for his excellent statement. It is gratifying for me to be able to join with him in his continuing efforts to promote the development of the water resources of America. His record on this subject is long and enviable, and I certainly look forward to working closely with him in the years ahead.

I commend both him and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for calling his remarks to our attention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

DEATHS OF SOPHIE TUCKER AND BILLY ROSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the deaths of two great Americans in show business within a few hours of each other, Sophie Tucker and Billy Rose. I had the honor of knowing both of these wonderful people as personal friends of mine of many years' standing.

SOPHIE TUCKER

Mr. President, Sophie Tucker was probably the most glittering character in American show business, "The last of the red-hot mamas," as Broadway called her. She had a career of 60 years which spanned and embraced almost all of the high spots of the rise of American vaudeville and night club entertainment.

But at this sad time, it is also interesting to remember that Sophie Tucker's career was truly an American success story. Miss Tucker, born in a Russian farmhouse 78 years ago, as her mother was traveling to join her father in the United States, started her working life by waiting on tables in her father's 25-cents-a-meal restaurant in Hartford.

She liked to tell her friends that, true to show business tradition, she "opened in Connecticut before arriving on Broadway." And arrive she did in 1906 to begin the long climb that was to make her one of the most beloved show business personalities over the years.

All this is fairly well known. But the recitation of the highlights of her career cannot capture the warmhearted humanity of this woman who was ever quick to help hundreds of friends and acquaintances—in and out of show business—throughout the years. She was never too busy to help a friend or a worthy cause, and this, too, will remain forever in the hearts of the thousands who knew her.

BILLY ROSE

Billy Rose had probably the most exciting and well-rounded career of anyone in the United States, in and out of show business. He won a championship as a shorthand expert when he was in his twenties, and went on to be Bernard Baruch's assistant when Baruch was head of the War Industries Board in 1918. He became a songwriter, and then became America's top showman. He was a remarkable, well-rounded man: art collector, humanitarian, philanthropist, stock market operator, and showman. One of his last great acts of philanthropy was the gift of an extraordinary collection of sculpture to the people of Israel, which is one of the most magnificent cultural monuments in that country or anywhere in the world.

Both have now gone to their last reward. I know that the people of our country are the richer for having had the songs, the sentiment, and the humor of Sophie Tucker and the laughs, the entertainment, and the music of Billy Rose. They left us with a song and a smile.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD obituaries on Sophie Tucker and Billy Rose.

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

SOPHIE TUCKER, 78, DIES IN HER HOME

Sophie Tucker, the indefatigable "last of the red-hot mamas," died last night at 7:35 of a chronic lung ailment and kidney failure in her apartment at 737 Park Avenue. The show business star for more than six decades was 78 years old. Her family was at her bedside.

Last October, Miss Tucker was admitted to Mount Sinai Hospital. She remained there for several weeks undergoing treatment for what her physicians described as an intestinal inflammation. She then returned to her apartment, where she was reported to be recuperating.

Miss Tucker last appeared in public at the Latin Quarter in October. Her 4-week engagement ended after 2 days, however, because of illness.

"She was a giant—10 feet tall," Abe I. Lastfogel, president of the William Morris Agency, who represented Miss Tucker since 1910, said last night at the singer's apartment. "She was unique. She was a star who stayed important through her lifetime. Her work and effort and her willingness to help those who needed help will be remembered in years to come."

For 60 years, Sophie Tucker punched out songs in her spectacular style—big, brassy, and flamboyant. She cried and laughed and sang with such zest, such vigor, that audiences were swept up in an irresistible torrent of lush sentiment.

She was always risqué and was always kidding herself, but no one really believed that Sophie could ever utter an offcolor line. In recent years, she would step out into a shimmering stage with her 192 pounds draped in a gown of 24-karat gold cloth, festooned with brilliants, a white mink coat with a golden train, and a cloth-of-gold headdress sprinkled with diamonds.

"I'm the 3-D mama with the big wide screen," she would roar, and the audience would burst into applause.

She would begin singing—maybe the voice didn't have the tremor of a Piaf or the power of a Garland, but who cared?—such songs as "There's No Business Like That Certain Business, That Certain Business Called Love," or "I May Be Getting Older Every Day (But Getting Younger Every Night)."

The audience would laugh and applaud and maybe weep, when Sophie sang "My Yiddishe Momme," and wait, finally, for the big one, the only one, "Some of These Days."

"When I step out on the floor at the beginning of each season," she remarked in 1960, "there's $50,000 riding on me—$25,000 in all new gowns and $25,000 in new material. And I give it everything I've got every night."

And Sophie gave it everything she had—even when her voice finally crackled and she found it difficult to move around. She still performed, she still made personal appearances, she still trouped with the same vigor and restlessness as in the days when she earned $1,000 a week at the Palace Theater.

"I'm an old timer," she admitted several years ago, "but let me tell you something. I was never satisfied to sing a song. I wanted to know how to get more, how to bring that salary up, how to be a star. And when I put the greasepaint on and get out on that floor, there's nobody younger. I am an old timer, but I want to see more, more, more."

Show business liked to laugh at the fact that Miss Tucker had been "born on the road"—not the vaudeville circuits but on a road leading from Russia across Poland to the Baltic.

That was true. Her mother was traveling by wagon from Russia to join her husband in the United States. Miss Tucker was born in a farmhouse. That was perhaps her last contact with rural life. The date was January 13, and the year, according to the best available records, was 1887.

Miss Tucker was born of a Russian-Jewish family named Kalish. Her father had fled Russia to escape military service. He arrived in Boston, and a short time later sent for his family.

When Miss Tucker was 8 years old the family moved to Hartford. The entertainer liked to say in later years that, although she learned her English in Boston, "no one has ever admired my Harvard accent."

Her parents opened a 25-cent-dinner restaurant in Hartford. Sophie and her two brothers and a sister worked in the establishment. The future star discovered that she could pick up dimes—sometimes quarters—singing for the customers when she wasn't serving pickled herring and gefüllte fish.

At 16 Sophie was married to Louis Tuck. They had one son Bert Tuck. The marriage did not last, but when Sophie decided to go into show business she added a syllable to her husband's surname and became Sophie Tucker.

In 1906 she came to New York. In classic style, she made the rounds, got nowhere, ran low on money. Then she got a job at the German Village, a rathskeller at Broadway and 40th Street, for $15 a week and "throw money."

From the German Village, Miss Tucker went on to the small-time vaudeville circuits, burlesque, Tony Pastor's. In 1909 she got a part in the "Ziegfeld Follies." But the star, Nora Bayes, cut Miss Tucker's numbers drastically. And when Eva Tanguay then replaced Miss Bayes, she took over Sophie's remaining routine. Both stars later became good friends of Miss Tucker's.

Five years later, however, Miss Tucker was earning $1,000 a week at the Palace Theater. By that time she had already introduced the song that became as much Sophie Tucker as her robust voice and eyecatching costumes—"Some of These Days," by Shelton Brooks.

There followed engagements at Reisenweber's in New York, at clubs and music halls in London, appearances at Sophie Tucker's Playground, her own club on 52d Street, off Broadway; another engagement at the Palace in 1928, where she first sang "I'm the Last of the Red Hot Mamas," written for her by Jack Yellen.

When talking pictures gave vaudeville the "hook," Miss Tucker switched to night clubs and also made movies, including "Honky Tonk," "Broadway Melody," "Thoroughbreds Don't Cry" and "Atlantic City."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 1966]

SOPHIE TUCKER IS DEAD; LAST OF RED HOT MAMAS

NEW YORK, February 9.—Singer Sophie Tucker, long billed as "the last of the red hot mamas," died tonight. She was 78.

Death came to the brassy-voiced singer at her Manhattan residence.

Last October, Miss Tucker was admitted to a New York hospital and remained there for several weeks undergoing treatment for what physicians described as intestinal inflammation.

At that time, she left the hospital and returned home where she was reported recuperating.

A family spokesman said the entertainer had suffered for the last 4 months with a chronic lung condition and a kidney ailment.

She lived in a swank apartment at 737 Park Avenue in recent years. She last appeared in public late last year at the Latin Quarter.

The big and brassy singer with the voice to match was born on the road and never left it. She sang her way all over the world.

"HI-YA KING" (GEORGE V)

Like a luxury liner with a battleship beam she would sail into the spotlight, ablaze with jewels, and belt out tunes with the same lusty good nature—no matter who was in her audience.

"Hi-ya, King!" she shouted with a jaunty wave toward the royal box as she opened her command performance for King George V and Queen Mary at London's Palladium in 1934.

At the end of the show, the audience wouldn't stop applauding when the King and Queen sat down, the signal that the performance was over. So the royal couple got back to their feet and rejoined the applause which brought Sophie back onto the stage for two more numbers—"Louisville Lady" and "Some of These Days."

"Some of these days, you're going to miss me, honey." It was Sophie's song. No matter how she altered the lyrics, or her styling, audiences always wanted it. And the song title became the book title of her memoirs, published in 1945.

She sang it for fathers and their sons. As other stars waxed and waned, Sophie remained a headliner, seemingly indestructible. Her secret of longevity was simple: "Keep breathing."

"Show business has been my life," she said. "I wouldn't have had any other. It is the life I always wanted."

BILLED WITH THE STARS

She shared billings with the greatest of them—Will Rogers, W. C. Fields, Eddie Cantor, Al Jolson, Jack Benny, Fanny Brice, Judy Garland, Jimmy Durante, and Bea Lillie, to name but a few.

She knew Irving Berlin when he was a singing waiter at a Bowery spot. And she taught the Duke of Windsor to dance the Charleston when he was the Prince of Wales.

She sang whatever the times demanded—jazz, blues, swing; you name it.

"Show business is changing all the time," she once said. "If you want to stay with it, you have to change with it. Performers who refuse to do that are stranded."

She sang in nightclubs, in burlesque, and vaudeville; she sang in Broadway shows and motion pictures, on television and radio.

But broadcasting wasn't her dish—"You can't do this. You can't do that. I couldn't even say 'hell' or 'damn,' and nothing, honey, is more expressive than the way I say 'hell' or 'damn.' "

BORN IN RUSSIA

She was born Sophie Abuza somewhere in Russia while her Jewish family was migrating to America, via Poland and the Baltic. She said it was January 13, 1888. Some reference works make the year 1884. Sophie said the confusion resulted from her having added 4 years to her age when she started work in Manhattan cabarets at age 16.

She also said the family name was Kalish, or Kallich, and that the Abuza came from an Italian's passport her father used.

She was 3 months old when the family reached Boston and settled there.

When she was 8, they moved to Hartford, Conn., where her parents opened Abuza's home restaurant, featuring a 25-cent gefüllte fish dinner. As an added attraction, Sophie sang for the customers—for nickels and dimes.

Recalling those years, she said:

"We all have dreams, ambitions. It wasn't that I dreamed in a house of splendor, a house of riches. I didn't have it. I hated everything I did as a girl because I wasn't a normal child.

"NO PLAYMATES, NOTHING"

"I didn't play. I had no playmates. I had nothing. I was 4, 5, 6, and I had to make my own cup of coffee. I had nothing, and I was determined to have it, and I got it.

"The happiest thing of all is that in getting it I hurt nobody. Some people are ruthless. Some hurt others, but I did it the hardest way and the longest one, too.'

In 1961, when asked how much she had earned as a performer, she replied, "I'm not rich, but I can tell you that nobody's going to have to hold a charity performance for me. I'm doing all right."

Sophie was married three times, each ending in divorce. Her first husband was Louis Tuck, from whom she got her stage name of Tucker. They had one child, Bert. Her next husband was Frank Westphal, the pianist for her vaudeville act. And her last was Al Lackey, her business manager.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 10, 1966]

BILLY ROSE DIES AT 66; MILLIONAIRE SHOWMAN

MONTEGO BAY, JAMAICA.—Billy Rose, the master showman who made a fortune out of the unlikely combination of extravaganza, curvaceous girls, and the stock market, died today in Montego Bay.

Rose, 66, died at 2:15 a.m. of lobar pneumonia at the Eldmire Nursing Home.

He had come to Montego Bay, where he maintains a winter home, to recuperate from cardio-vascular surgery performed in Houston, Tex., in December.

Rose, an impresario, theatrical producer, newspaper columnist, nightclub owner and writer of such songs as "That Old Gang of Mine," "Without a Song" and "Me and My Shadow," returned to his New York home December 22.

RECUPERATION PRESCRIBED

He flew to Montego Bay Tuesday with his sister, Polly Gottlieb, wife of Hollywood producer and writer Alex Gottlieb. Doctors had prescribed 6 weeks of recuperation.

In New York, a close friend, Broadway producer Arthur Cantor said, "one of the reasons Billy went to Jamaica was because he was feeling better."

Gottlieb said in Beverly Hills, Calif., that his wife had called him and said Rose had caught a slight cold 2 days ago and developed pneumonia Wednesday.

Mrs. Gottlieb was planning to accompany the body to New York today, where funeral arrangements will be completed.

Besides Mrs. Gottlieb, he leaves another sister, Miriam Stern of New York City.

Death of the flamboyant figure came just hours after the death of another show business personality, Sophie Tucker. She died last night in her New York apartment.

The 5-foot-3 Rose scrambled out of the Manhattan slums and at the time of his death was worth more than $25 million. He once jested that "if my luck holds out by 1970 I will really be a rich fellow."

He made his first million 3 months after the 1939 New York World's Fair opened. His "Aquacade" was the hit of the fair and its star, Eleanor Holm, became one of his four wives. He was actually married five times, but he married one wife, Joyce Matthews, twice.

MARRIED FANNY BRICE

Another wife was Fanny Brice, the comedienne whose life story was told in the hit Broadway musical "Funny Girl." He was also married to Doris Warner, daughter of motion picture executive Harry Warner.

He once characterized success as "a combination of good health, good friends, and a financial career where the winners make $2 more than the losers."

As to marriage Rose said he didn't consider himself "a monumental success in that department because at 65 I'm a bachelor."

Last spring in an interview he said this about death:

"I'm not afraid of it. For the past 5 years I have felt that I'm on velvet after 60 very active years * * *. I just want to spin out life as gracefully as I can with the least amount of storm * * * I have no fears about death. By the same token, I'm not rolling out a red carpet and inviting it in."

SHORTHAND CHAMPION

Rose first gained national attention as a teenager. At 17 he was national shorthand speed champion and 2 years later was chief stenographer to Financier Bernard M. Baruch, who was then the head of the War Industries Board.

From Baruch, a lifelong friend, Rose picked up a knowledge that guided him on many paths. "I learned from him always to get the facts," he said. "Experience and judgment mean little if you don't get the facts."

Rose, who was often referred to as the bantam Barnum, said "I've been more in the tradition of Barnum than in the tradition of Baruch," he said. "I wish it had been the other way around."

Last year Rose donated his million dollar collection of sculpture from his palatial East Side townhouse to the National Museum of Israel.

"BALLYHOO, NOT GENIUS"

Rose gained his real fame from the extravaganzas he staged. "I sell ballyhoo, not genius," he said.

In 1936, when Texas celebrated its statehood centennial with an exposition at Dallas, neighboring Fort Worth hired Rose to stage a wild west show at its rival frontier centennial. His take was $1,000 a day. Fort Worth's slogan was "Dallas for education, Fort Worth for entertainment."

Then Cleveland asked him to glamorize its Great Lakes exposition in 1937. He thought up a water ballet that he called the "Aquacade." Two years later he took it to the New York World's Fair and became a millionaire.

In his theatrical productions Rose borrowed from the late Florenz Ziegfeld and used plenty of pretty girls, sentimental music, and soft lights. Later he was to buy the Ziegfeld Theater for $630,000 cash.

OWNED 17 NIGHTCLUBS

His musicals included "Sweet and Low," "Crazy Quilt," "Carmen Jones," "Seven Lively Arts," and "Jumbo." Among his serious productions were "The Great Magoo" and "Clash by Night."

In 1938 he opened the plush Diamond Horseshoe nightclub. At one time he owned 17 nightclubs.

His syndicated column, "Pitching Horseshoes," was published in 400 daily and 2,000 weekly newspapers. He was the author of "Wine, Women, and Words."

After five childless marriages Rose ended up single again. "The single life," he said, "is like a red-and-gold box of Christmas candy. When you open it, all it holds is a couple of lousy bonbons."

Rose made this critical assessment of himself:

"I size myself up as a fellow who has been a grain of sand in the public eye. Thanks to

a tremendous amount of work and a tremendous amount of luck, I've made out reasonably well in a series of toy careers. I don't see myself as an important fellow. When I'm recognized in a small town, I've never ceased to be amazed by it."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON THE FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have just finished reading the President's food-for-peace address delivered to the Congress today. I wish to take this opportunity to commend President Johnson for a constructive and positive statement, committing the United States to a greater effort to eliminate hunger in the world.

The President says:

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

As he goes on to point out, there can be only victors in that kind of war.

I believe the most significant feature of his message is its change in the concept under which our overseas food programs have been operating since 1954. In the past, our food aid programs have been dependent entirely upon what we happen to have in surplus stocks at any given time.

What the President now proposes is that the Secretary of Agriculture take a careful look at food needs around the world and, on the basis of that survey to determine the amount and types of food that the United States should produce to meet our share of the world food deficit, and, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to make provision for necessary production.

The President properly places a heavy emphasis on self-help programs, so that our food aid will stimulate rather than depress efforts on the part of the countries we are trying to assist to develop their own economies.

There are some things which the Congress must do to implement the concept of the President's message. There may need to be new administrative machinery and a central coordinating office to give direction to this expanded program. Also, strong budget support will be needed. There is need to recognize the very serious distribution bottlenecks which face us overseas—inadequate port facilities, and inadequate warehouse and distribution systems.

However, I am sure that problems of that kind will be faced by the Government and by Congress. This is a hopeful, positive, and constructive message.

The message signifies a change, both in the direction of our overseas aid program, and also in our domestic agricultural policies here at home. I think it is quite clear that in the years ahead, we shall be relying less and less on acreage restrictions and more and more utilizing our production to meet very real needs overseas.

So I wish again to commend the President on this message. Since it moves in the direction of a bill, S. 2157, which I introduced last summer, the International Food and Nutrition Act, I read this message with special interest.

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

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

MESSAGE ON FOOD FOR FREEDOM

To the Congress of the United States:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A WAR ON HUNGER

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A PROGRAM FOR MANKIND

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman, or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are under way.

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the surplus concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of millions of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis on nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

AMERICA'S PAST EFFORTS

This program keeps faith with policies this Nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the four freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction, and development.

This great effort—the Marshall plan—was followed by President Truman's Point Four, President Eisenhower's Act of Bogotá, and its successor, President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition, and famine have been averted.

Schools and hospitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

A BALANCE IS REQUIRED

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on International Health and Education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

IMPROVING LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of those who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside of the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

THE NEED FOR SELF-HELP

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Economic incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon U.S. food increased.

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two—but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations

to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

BETTER NUTRITION

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is 30 times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during preschool years leave indelible scars.

Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life—physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can—and must—be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this Nation to search out new ways to develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world; improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops; apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR OUR ABUNDANCE

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided for American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes; for American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high-quality food at fair prices; for American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today—because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U.S. agriculture—our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for: (1) domestic needs, (2) commercial exports, (3) food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves, and (4) reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by 10 percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the worldwide war on hunger.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will make self-help an integral part of our food aid program; eliminate the "surplus" requirement for food aid; emphasize the development of markets for American farm products; authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate; emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies—except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of 5 years; continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation; increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods; continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs; provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements food for freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

The productive genius of our farmers.

The potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within 12 to 18 months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

Under the two acts I recommend today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books—and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended—we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

A UNIFIED EFFORT

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilateral lending organizations, and of the United Nations development program should be expanded—particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as worldwide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating, less-developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society—where every person can hope for life's essentials—and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the interdependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths—

That agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

That an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

That hunger and want—anywhere—are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep freemen free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1966.*

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Johnson's message of food for freedom just presented to the Congress promises a bold, imaginative, and realistic attack on a problem which is surely one of the greatest our century will have to face. In its approach, in its scope, the President's message has shown the determination of the administration to use our unmatched agricultural capacity to win the war on hunger in the world.

I have been among several Senators who have long argued for a strong world-hunger program. The growing menace of hunger throughout the world, so starkly illustrated by the present Indian food shortage, has made it clear that a strong action is needed. This message makes it clear that the administration is determined that our country will truly meet the need.

I am particularly gratified with the emphasis on self-help, for in my own proposal, the Food for Freedom Act, S. 2826, I placed top priority on programs to help poor countries improve their own farm production. I am also pleased that the President proposes to give not just our surpluses, but to produce enough and give enough to really do the job.

I feel it an honor to sit on the Senate Agriculture Committee, which will consider this proposal. It is my sincere hope that, after giving careful consideration to all the proposals to meet the world food crisis, the Senate will pass this year bold, far-reaching legislation on this matter so vital to our farmers at home, peoples overseas, and the success of our foreign policy in years to come.

I am also pleased that the President proposes to establish a program of food and fiber reserves. If we are to meet the challenge of world hunger, and also make sure we have enough food for our national emergency needs, it is essential that we keep adequate stocks of all major commodities to meet unexpected emergencies.

TIME FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance have until midnight, Wednesday, February 16, 1966, to file its report, with minority views, on H.R. 136 (S. 1912), to amend section 1, 17(a), 64(a)(5), 67(b), 67(c), and 70(c) of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; and H.R. 3438 (S. 976), to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRICE-FIXING CONSPIRACY IN BROAD-SPECTRUM ANTIBIOTIC DRUGS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there exists today one of the worst conspiracies ever foisted upon the American people. What makes this conspiracy so reprehensible and so shameful is that its chief victims are the aged and the poor, not only in our country but also in many of the most impoverished areas of the world.

For more than a dozen years, American drug manufacturers have been involved in a worldwide cartel to fix the price of "wonder drugs"—broad-spectrum antibiotics—at identical, grossly inflated, and unconscionably high prices.

These drugs, developed in part through Government facilities and which cost about 1.6 cents per pill to make,[1] were, until recently, sold to the American public at 51 cents per pill and now sell for about 30 cents per pill.

Although children, the elderly, and the poor have been and are still, unable to afford such drugs, and although the existence of at least one aspect of this conspiracy has been known to Federal agencies since at least 1958, the cartel continues to operate in all its vigor. In fact, documentary evidence which I shall today make available to the Senate will conclusively show that it is operating not only in the United States but also in Canada and Latin and South America.

Among these documents is a secret code used to disguise price fixing and "payoff" communications. Fictitious names, decoded, become drug names: "Pluto" becomes the manager of a U.S. firm overseas, a "sinner" denotes a person who has dared to depart from unlawful price-fixing agreements. A "disturbed family" refers to a price-cutting situation and a "powwow" is a price-fixing meeting. When decoded, an innocuous-looking letter containing highly personal references and a sprinkling of company names becomes a startling document on price fixing.

The American pharmaceutical firms involved are: Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., American Cyanamid Co., Bristol-Myers Co., Inc., the Squibb Division of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., and the Upjohn Co.

To understand the scope and effect of this cartel, it is necessary to explore in detail the nature and use of the drugs involved and the steps leading up to the formation of the conspiracy.

BACKGROUND

Antibiotics are widely used by the medical profession for the treatment of human infectious diseases and are dispensed upon a doctor's prescription. The earlier antibiotics such as penicillin and streptomycin are known as "narrow-spectrum" antibiotics because they are normally effective against either gram-positive or gram-negative bacteria but not both. "Broad-spectrum" antibiotics are effective against both kinds of bacteria, as well as various other disease-producing organisms, and for that reason are commonly referred to as the "wonder drugs."

The major broad-spectrum antibiotics are (1) Parke Davis' Chloromycetin, (2) Cyanamid's Aureomycin, (3) Pfizer's Terramycin, and (4) tetracycline—all of which are marketed under various brand names by the five companies mentioned. All four are effective against substantially the same range of disease-producing micro-organisms and are generally interchangeable in medical use. Aureomycin, Terramycin, and tetracycline, which account for most of the broad-spectrum antibiotic sales, have closely similar molecular structures.

Aureomycin is manufactured and sold exclusively by American Cyanamid Co. under a patent issued in 1949 and was among the first broad-spectrum antibiotics, coming on the market in 1948. Terramycin is manufactured and sold exclusively by Chas. Pfizer & Co. under a patent issued in 1950. Tetracycline, the most widely used broad-spectrum antibiotic, is manufactured by Pfizer, Cyanamid, and Bristol-Myers, under a patent issued to Pfizer on January 11, 1955.

In 1953, Aureomycin and Terramycin were being sold on the market by Cyanamid and Pfizer respectively at identical prices. With the discovery of tetracycline in late 1952, it became necessary to secure a patent on tetracycline because, if tetracycline was unpatentable, its marketing would destroy the existing monopoly price structure for Aureomycin and Terramycin. The reason is that tetracycline was better than the other broad-spectrum antibiotics and was substantially interchangeable with them in medical use.

According to the Federal Trade Commission:

> Cyanamid and Pfizer knew that tetracycline, if produced and sold commercially, would be fully competitive with Aureomycin and Terramycin. They both knew or had reason to believe that the value of their respective patents and their dominant positions in the broad-spectrum antibiotic market would be impaired by the unrestricted production and sale of tetracycline by other firms. Moreover, they knew or had reason to believe that, if tetracycline could be sold by other firms in free and open competition, the price of this product as well as that of other broad-spectrum antibiotics would be forced downward as the price of penicillin had been in recent years.[2]

Mr. President, I digress from my prepared remarks to point out that—if I recall correctly—in open competition, the price of penicillin had been forced down to about 1 percent of what it was when it was first marketed. It is in the public domain and available for any other pur-

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

pose. The same thing could have happened with regard to the broad-spectrum antibiotics, if tetracycline was, in fact, not subject to a patent because it was already known and merely had to be identified.

Recognizing this danger, Pfizer and Cyanamid entered into an agreement to assist one another to secure a patent, the successful patentee to cross-license the other, and, as a result of misrepresentations made to the Patent Office, Pfizer eventually secured the patent in 1955. Tetracycline was introduced on the market in late 1953 and early 1954 by Cyanamid and Pfizer at prices substantially identical to those of Aureomycin and Terramycin.

Bristol, a competitor of Pfizer and Cyanamid, also attempted to secure a patent on tetracycline and during the course of the patent fight the Pfizer and Cyanamid misrepresentations came to light. Rather than risk exposure and possible loss of the patent, and with the assurance that Bristol and its licensees would strictly adhere to the price structure, an arrangement was made in late 1955 whereby Pfizer agreed to: first, license Bristol to manufacture and sell tetracycline; and second, license Bristol's licensees, Squibb and Upjohn, to sell tetracycline. In this connection, the FTC found that Pfizer settled the patent infringement suit because it knew or had reason to believe that Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn would be able to prove that Pfizer had obtained the tetracycline patent by means of false and miselading representations to the Patent Office or that the patent would otherwise be declared invalid.[3]

From 1954 to the present, Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn have been selling tetracycline at identical prices and at prices substantially identical to Cyanamid's aureomycin and Pfizer's terramycin.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart showing these identical prices be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Tabulation of price to retailer of tetracycline, aureomycin, and terramycin 1951–58 (when FTC brought suit)

	Cyanamid achromycin	Pfizer tetracyn	Bristol polycycline	Squibb steclin	Upjohn panmycin	Cyanamid aureomycin	Pfizer terramycin
Capsules:							
100 milligrams, 25's	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.61	$3.60
100 milligrams, 100's	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77	13.77
250 milligrams, 16's	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10	5.10
250 milligrams, 100's	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60	30.60
Intramuscular: 100-milligram vial	.94	.94	.94	.94	.94		.94
Intravenous:							
250-milligram vial	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62	1.62
500-milligram vial	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.91	2.90
Ped. drops: 100 milligrams per cubic centimeter, 10 cubic centimeters	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47	1.47
Oral suspension: 250 milligrams per 5 cubic centimeters, 1 ounce	2.54	2.55	2.54	2.54	2.55		2.55
Syrup:							
125 milligrams per 5 cubic centimeters, 2 ounces	2.54	2.55	2.54	2.54	2.55		2.55
125 milligrams per 5 cubic centimeters, 16 ounces	18.36	18.36	18.36		18.36	18.36	18.36

THE PRICE FIXING CONSPIRACY—DOMESTIC ASPECTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Cyanamid entered the tetracycline market in November 1953 under the brand name "achromycin" and was followed shortly thereafter in January 1954 by Pfizer with "tetracyn." The published prices of these drugs were identical to one another and to Cyanamid's aureomycin and Pfizer's terramycin. The identity of these prices, however, was not the result of accident, but was the result of agreement. Let us take a look at some relevant documents.

On May 27, 1954, the Cyanamid Chicago regional manager sent the following message to his sales manager:

> Apparently Pfizer and Roerig [a sales division of Pfizer] are abiding by reduction of samples because the number of calls from all reports from the field since my return from Absecon, have been practically none. (CX 593B)[4]

As you can easily imagine, if you give away 1 bottle with every 10 bottles sold, the practical effect is a reduction in price. This letter shows that an agreement had been reached by the companies to close this particular loophole for price cutting. That it was successful is indicated by Cyanamid's Chicago regional manager when he wrote on June 17, 1954, that:

> Within the last 30 days, complaints from the field regarding the Pfizer and Roerig operations have been practically nil. From all indications, it is presumed that these competitors are adhering to the operation that was reported by Mr. Wendt [Cyanamid's director of sales] at the regional manager's meeting. (CX 494A)

About 1 year later the same Cyanamid representative made the following comment with respect to the furnishing of free tetracycline to Michael Reese Hospital, Chicago, Ill.:

> Approximately 1 year ago, we were furnishing this same institution material for clinic use through Dr. Kagan, chief of pediatrics. This procedure was stopped due to a report by Pfizer to Mr. Wendt. (CX 595)

As previously stated, Mr. Wendt is Cyanamid's director of sales. In other words, Pfizer complained to Cyanamid and as a result Cyanamid stopped furnishing free tetracycline for clinical use. During this period, Cyanamid and Pfizer were following an agreed-on policy with respect to supplying free samples to physicians and clinics.

In addition, governmental agencies at all levels were the victims of bids which were absolutely identical even to the third decimal place.

In March 1955, shortly before a 14-month period of noncompetitive bidding to the Veterans' Administration, a Cyanamid representative complained to his superiors that Pfizer was undercutting Cyanamid and "everybody" on bid prices to certain city, county, and State hospitals. He stated that "this should be checked into the prices arranged as we have done on the VA setup." CX 558B—Another Cyanamid representative stated on July 30, 1955:

> If Pfizer is trying to hold the price line, would it be helpful to collect some copies of bids showing the low-cut bids by Pfizer's accounts so that Pearl River [Cyanamid] could show them to Pfizer officials?" (CX 597B.)

Bristol entered the tetracycline market in April 1954 with "polycycline," followed by Squibb in September 1954 with "Steclin" and Upjohn in October 1954 with "panmycin." Squibb and Upjohn, Bristol customers, were cautioned not to deviate from the existing price structure inasmuch as the Bristol-Pfizer patent fight could only be settled if Pfizer was satisfied that Bristol and its customers would adhere to the price structure. In this connection, the FTC said:

> Numerous intracorporate memorandums prepared by Squibb's sales officials demonstrate that insofar as its tetracycline products were concerned, Squibb suddenly became obsessed with a desire to correct its "loose business practices" to live down a reputation as a price cutter.[5]

Notice, Mr. President, that if someone ceased to do something he was not supposed to do under the law, he was engaged in "bad business practices." We have a situation in which, when we are talking about doing something wrong, the industry is talking about doing something right, and when we are talking about doing something right, the industry is talking about doing something wrong.

On September 17, 1954, the day Squibb began marketing tetracycline under the trade name Steclin, the Squibb manager of marketing, Heberger, sent the following message to all representatives of his firm:

> The Steclin pricing schedule must be adhered to strictly. Steclin is not to be involved in any special terms used to meet competitive situations on other antiobtiotic products.
>
> Steclin should be sold direct in every case possible. When a handling credit situation must apply we will arrange 10 percent handling credit only on a drop shipment basis.
>
> We have had some reports of competitive prices of Tetracycline products at variance with public schedules. Please send along to your branch promptly any specific information regarding such deviations you run into on your territory. (CX 204.)

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

On October 13, 1954, Squibb's Heberger informed his Atlanta branch manager by telegram:

Squibb cannot be officially connected with any price maneuver on Steclin which can be construed as cutting the price. There can be no compromise with our position of maintaining prices on this product. (CX 207.)

On November 12, 1954, all of Squibb's field managers were informed:

It is our fixed policy not only to avoid price cutting on Steclin but to avoid any practice which might lay us open to such an accusation." (CX 210.)

On April 27, 1955, Heberger again wrote:

I was disturbed to learn that we were the successful bidder to Los Angeles County because we bid on tetracycline 250 Mg. capsules $22.49 per 100 less 2 precent discount. It is nice to get a Steclin order finally from Los Angeles County but I have my fingers crossed, anticipating certain reactions to what we did, which may not be good.

As I say, it would be nice to get the order but I am hoping there are no serious results. (CX 213.)

Here was someone who feared he might have made a competitive bid, and he was fearful of the consequences.

Now, Mr. President, here we have a strange situation where a bidder, Squibb, is actually disturbed because he was successful. The reason, of course, is that Squibb was violating the price-fixing agreement to which it was a party, and in the eyes of Squibb, violating this agreement was more disturbing than violating the laws of the United States.

On August 19, 1955, the assistant manager of Squibb's marketing department wrote the following letter to a sales representative:

We are well aware of the problem that you are confronted with on the tetracycline quotations. We too want the bid at King County for the 10,000 250 Mg., but under no circumstances can we give you authority to quote less than $22.49 per 100.

You may of course allow a 10 percent handling allowance to the Northwest Medical Supply less the usual 2 percent cash discount. If they are inclined to pass this handling allowance on down I don't think we can do anything about it, however, it would be inadvisable for you to suggest this arrangement, particularly in writing." (CX 217.)

On April 6, 1955, an Upjohn branch manager wrote the following letter to Upjohn's price determination department manager concerning a low bid by Squibb:

As requested, we are enclosing the results of the bids at Los Angeles County Hospital:

864 Tetracycline Caps. 250 Mg. went as follows: Pfizer, $22.49 2 percent 15th Proximo; Squibb, $22.49 2 percent open; Lederle, $22.49 net; Bristol, $22.49 net.

Homer Hammond feels Squibb will get the bid with an open 2 percent time limit.

* * * * *

We will forget that one. On the panmycin it looks like Squibb scuttled our ship. I wonder if Bristol will complain to them as they did with us. (CX 473.)

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I regret I did not get to the Senate Chamber in time to hear the opening remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, and I regret that more Senators are not present, because the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is one of a handful left in this country who are concerned about this problem over all of its aspects, and particularly the consumer aspects. Is the Senator saying in his speech that there was a bid on certain medicines and that—was it four companies?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is what these four companies have done. Actually there are five companies.

Mr. NELSON. All came in with the same bid?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They started by obtaining a patent by fraudulent representation.

Mr. NELSON. Who obtained the patent?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Pfizer first obtained the patent for these broad-spectrum wonder drugs. There is doubt that that patent is valid and it would appear that it was obtained by misrepresentation. In fact, this was turned down several times by the Patent Office on the basis that it was not properly subject to patent.

Having done so, they proceeded to enter into a conspiracy with five other companies, all bidding all over the world. They bid identical prices which were 50 times the cost of the product. They use all sorts of procedures and lawsuits to see that the public did not get the benefit of competition.

Mr. NELSON. Are these offers for bids by companies in which they say to each company:

We want to bid on x amount of these wonder drugs.

And then, they come in with identical bids?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. NELSON. What I am curious about is whether this situation has been referred to the Department of Justice, and if so, why has the Department of Justice not started prosecution? Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Department of Justice has known about this for 5 years. It may be more than 5 years. It has been since 1961, and in some instances since 1958. Yet, this case has not been prosecuted. It absolutely defies me to understand why they would have all of this and know that the public in this country and all over the world is being completely robbed by illegal conspiracy and they have not moved to do something about it.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator might send a copy of his address to the Attorney General. He is a courageous Attorney General, and if there is a violation of law he would not hesitate to prosecute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He will know about it.

Mr. President, this might be called the effective working of an industrial Gestapo. The policing prices by the five companies involved was so tight that, when one of them gave a 2-percent discount with no time limit specified on payment, it was reported. And the culprit had committed a treasonable act and was accused of "scuttling the ship." Does this sound like a competitive system?

On November 22, 1955, shortly before the Pfizer-Bristol patent suit was settled, Richard Anderson, director of sales for Bristol Laboratories received a letter from Henry Wendt, director of sales for Cyanamid. This letter was found by FTC attorneys in Bristol's files in a mutilated condition with the letterhead and the sender's name torn off. Apparently this was regarded as a very "hot" letter—so hot that neither the company nor the executive's name was to be kept in the Bristol files in the event that a Government agency got curious and made an investigation. And when one hears this letter, it will be understood why they wanted to be so careful. The letter reads:

NOVEMBER 22, 1955.

DEAR DICK: I am enclosing the most recent prices on all of our achromycin prices, together with what we call a trade class chart. This trade class chart is our standard procedure for classifying accounts for our Lederle purchase plan and our handling charge policy.

Our branches are instructed to follow this chart with great precision. Basically, except for the subject of our discussion Friday afternoon, there are no deviations. I might say that the branch offices do not report to the sales department but rather to the treasurer's office, so that the opportunity for special situations is nonexistent.

Our Dominion price for 250-milligram capsules has been and will continue to be $17.01. This price applies to the Department of Defense Production and the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Our price to the Canadian Provincial departments is $25.50.

The name of the hospital survey group is Davee, Koehnlein & Keating at 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Sincerely,

(CX 328).

This "Dear Dick" letter I just read is especially interesting because it shows:

First, that Bristol Laboratories and American Cyanamid were exchanging price information.

Second, that a price-fixing discussion was held.

Third, that prices were being rigged in Canada, also.

Fourth, that at the time when our own Defense Supply Agency had to pay $19.58 on a bottle of one hundred 250 milligram capsules, the Canadian Defense Department was purchasing this bottle for $17.01 less 2 percent, both prices resulting from bids rigged by the conspirators.

Despite the price agreements, continual vigilance had to be used to keep the conspirators in line. Each spied on the other.

The Pfizer-Bristol patent suit was settled on December 14, 1955. On December 16, 1955, Heberger, Squibb's manager of marketing, sent the following letter to a sales representative in regard to a Lederle—Cyanamid—bid:

On bid No. 635 for 100's of tetracycline 250 milligrams Lederle's product was offered at $21.08 per 100. In order to properly record this violation I must know whether this was a direct bid by Lederle, or whether the bid was made through a dealer. (CX 220).

On April 5, 1956, Squibb's Heberger wrote to another sales representative:

In checking back over your recent report on tetracycline bids to the King County Hospital, I notice that Joseph Hart and Northwest Medical quoting on the Pfizer

product cut the price to $20.23 and $20.44, respectively. Bracken quoting on the Lederle product quoted $21.

You will notice that all three dealers quoted within the framework of their 10-percent handling credit. We can only assume that it was a decision made by the dealers and that there is no official approval of what they are doing. Of course, our own bid must be strictly in accord with the schedule. (CX 222).

The official approval referred to here, let me add, is not official governmental approval but approval by the illegal conspiracy.

On May 11, 1957, a Bristol sales official complained that Squibb has deviated slightly from the price agreed upon by the conspirators and that this was a bad precedent:

On a bid that opened on May 10, 1957, for the Ohio State University Hospital, which called for a 10–100 tetracycline phosphate complex, both Bristol and Upjohn conformed to the stated price (stated price means the price agreed upon by the conspirators) whereas Squibb bid it at 22.04 net. I fully realize that 22.04 net is theoretically the same as 22.49 less 2 percent, and on this particular bid it amounts to the same thing. However, supposing the bid had called for 100–100 or 150–100 which they have been buying of the HCL Salt, then Squibb would have been awarded the bid because they would have been .02 or .03 less than our bid.

I am only calling this to your attention, Charlie, in order to stop whatever precedent may occur in the future. This is a very technical point, but as you know, .02 or .03 can make the difference whether you are awarded the bid or not.

The bid or inquiry number is 2791–D–61510, and was signed by Paul Wherry, one of the Squibb representatives.

I hope this does not happen in the future, and if we can nip it in the bud I am sure that it will not be tried elsewhere. (CX 843.)

Here we see that Bristol was quarreling because Squibb had bid $22.04 net instead of $22.49 less 2 percent, and it was conceivable that, with a minute change in the capsule, Squibb's bid might be 2 cents lower than Bristol's bid. Yet one of the documents taken from Bristol's files during the Federal Trade Commission investigation showed their actual cost of production at that time was $1.66. No wonder they had to be a bunch of "eager beavers" in policing the price structure where this kind of a margin—$1.66 as against $22—existed between cost and price; in fact, $22.49—quite a difference. In other words, that is a difference of ten times the cost.

Mr. President, if all prices and terms are going to be the same, how can it be determined who should get the business? One method could be by rolling dice, and this is exactly what happened in a bid to New Orleans Charity Hospital. Each of the five conspirators, as well as three dealers, bid identical prices on quantities of 200, 600, and 1,000 bottles of tetracycline capsules. Cyanamid won the award in a roll of the dice as explained in a letter written by Upjohn's Memphis branch manager to Upjohn's assistant director of branch sales. This letter will be included among the documents which will be placed in the RECORD. It will be noticed that Upjohn's assistant director of branch sales, in a penciled notation addressed to Upjohn's pricing manager and hospital sales manager, described the competitive nature of the bidding as follows:

Too bad that our boy isn't a better crap shooter.

This, Mr. President, is the conspirator's idea of how a free competitive market should operate. In fact, Upjohn's man said that "maybe this is a good trend, too." For them he is undoubtedly right; but very bad for the rest of us.

On October 22, 1957, a Squibb official stated that Squibb would be competitive on penicillin and streptomycin products and that it would be "willing to meet or beat anything Pfizer quoted. We cannot do this on the broad spectrum, but in our own penicillin and streptomycin products we can"—CX 250.

The documents I have just read make clear that Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn were engaged in a scheme to fix the retail price of tetracycline capsules in the United States at 51 cents per pill—a pill which at that time cost about 1.6 cents to make and which, today, costs even less. Let me refer back to the "Dear Dick" letter of November 22, 1955, from Cyanamid's Wendt to Bristol's Anderson, which I read only a few minutes ago. The FTC points out that:

The most significant feature of this (letter) is that it contains assurances to Bristol that Cyanamid would adhere to its published prices. Certainly Cyanamid would not give such assurances to Bristol without an understanding that it would not be undercut by Bristol. Clearly both firms must have agreed not to deviate from the published prices. In the third paragraph the writer discusses Cyanamid's price for 250-milligram capsules to agencies of the Canadian Government. The Dominion price was secret information, but Cyanamid not only furnished it to Bristol but again gave assurance that the price "will continue to be $17.01." It is also of some significance in this connection that Pfizer was also bidding $17.01 to the Canadian Government." [6]

This one document, which so clearly shows the existence of a price-fixing conspiracy both in the United States and in Canada, sets the stage for the next branch of our inquiry. For if these pharmaceutical manufacturers who were fixing the price of broad spectrum antibiotics in the United States were also fixing the price in Canada, in what other countries were they fixing prices?

THE PRICE-FIXING CONSPIRACY—INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS

Mr. President, here are some examples of prices in other countries:

In Australia, for example, the 1959–60 price [7] to the druggist for a bottle of 16 250-milligram tetracycline capsules was as follows:

Cyanamid (achromycin)	$5.62
Pfizer (tetracyn)	5.62
Squibb (steclin)	5.62
Upjohn (panmycin)	5.62

Cyanamid's Australian price for Aureomycin was—you guessed it—$5.62.

Keep in mind that while these drugs are called by different names, they are identical. There is no difference in them whatever except the difference in trade names.

In Austria, the 1959–60 price [8] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (achromycin)	$6.02
Pfizer (tetracyn)	6.02
Hoechst (Bristol licensee) (hostacyclin)	6.02
Bayer (Bristol sublicensee) (tetracycline)	6.02

In West Germany, the 1959–60 price [9] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (achromycin)	$4.31
Pfizer (tetracyn)	4.31

Cyanamid's West German price for Aureomycin was exactly the same—$4.31.

In Italy, the 1959–60 price [10] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Alfar (Cyanamid licensee) (acromicina)	$5.86
C. N. B. (Bristol licensee) (bristaciclina)	5.86
Squibb (steclin)	5.86
Pfizer (tetracyn)	5.86

Twelve other Italian tetracycline manufacturers charged the same price, and Cyanamid's Italian price for aureomycin was also the same.

In Japan, the 1959–60 price [11] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (acromycin)	$4.58
Pfizer-Taito (tetracyn)	4.58
Banyu Pharmacol (Bristol licensee) (Bristocycline)	4.44

Cyanamid's Japanese price for aureomycin was $4.58.

In Mexico, the 1959–60 price [12] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was:

Cyanamid (acromicina)	$5.82
Pfizer (tetracyna)	5.82

Cyanamid's Mexican price for aureomycin and Pfizer's Mexican price for terramycin was exactly the same—$5.82.

In Panama, the 1959–60 price [13] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was as follows:

Cynamid (acromicina)	$5.40
Pfizer (tetracina)	5.40
Squibb (steclin)	5.40
Bristol (bristaciclina)	5.40

Cyanamid's Panamanian price for aureomycin and Pfizer's Panamanian price for terramycin was exactly the same—$5.40.

Note, Mr. President, that while the prices vary from country to country, they are identical within the country.

In Venezuela, the 1959–60 price [14] to the druggist for the same bottle of tetracycline capsules was as follows:

Cyanamid (acromicina)	$5.31
Pfizer (tetracina)	5.08
Bristol (bristaciclina)	5.31

Cyanamid's Venezuelan price for aureomycin and Pfizer's Venezuelan price for terramycin matched the prices each was charging for tetracycline, that is, $5.31 and $5.08, respectively.

Mr. President, are these examples of identical and near-identical pricing practices the result of accident? Or do

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

they demonstrate something more frightening and sinister, such as a worldwide price-fixing agreement—an American-sponsored cartel?

If we look at the evidence from Venezuela—where prices were not always identical despite the conspirators' efforts to make them so—the facts, I believe, will startle everyone. It is unfortunate that these startling facts were unavailable to the Federal Trade Commission, which has been trying since 1958 to put a stop to this conspiracy.

On May 9, 1957, Luis H. Ball, an executive of Biogen Laboratories Corp., Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, sent a communication to a Cyanamid official in New York. That communication reads in part as follows:

Mr. B. G. PRIETO,

Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PRIETO: Yesterday afternoon we tetracycline distributors had a meeting in the offices of the Pfizer Laboratories, to talk once again about the prices of these products. Attending the meeting were the manager Remedia, S.A., representative of Hoechst, the manager of Squibb, Mr. Miguel Octavio, representative of Le Petit; Mr. Keblinger, sales manager for the Western Hemisphere of Bristol Laboratories, and their representative in Venezuela, the manager of the Royal Drugstore, the gentleman from Pfizer, and I.

At that meeting, we were accused of not having adhered to the agreement which, according to them, we had made in October of last year with respect to these products. This agreement—to recall in a way what we had been talking about with them—had applied solely to the presentations of pure tetracycline, i.e., acromycin, tetracyn, and hostacycline, which at that time were the only ones on the market, and had not applied to aureomycin and terramycin; furthermore, we, for our part, had always taken for granted that each of the firms would deposit with a bank, in favor of the other firms, a check for 25,000 bolivares, which would become effective in case any one of the firms were to violate the agreement—

Imagine that, Mr. President, here is an illegal conspiracy with earnest money being put up so that in the event someone should do what the law requires and compete for the market, the other fellow is entitled to take his money. It is a payoff in the event that someone should accidentally obey the law.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the letter:

our proposal, which of course was not accepted, Pfizer giving us the excuse that the Caracas branch could not commit the company.

The main purpose of arriving at that agreement was to equalize the list prices of the products, and we did so in almost all cases, with small exceptions such as, for example, pediatric drops which we offer at 4.55 bolivares to the pharmacies, and Pfizer at 4.80 bolivares. Of course, we had not been willing to raise the price since this would give the press and interested persons of the Medical Federation a reason to vociferate against Lederle, and I feel it is easier to lower a price than to raise it.

In yesterday's talk, the gentlemen from Prizer, who have been selling terramycin to the Government also for 17 bolivares per bottle of 250 x 16's ever since they started to distribute the product, want us to raise the aureomycin price from 15.50 bolivares to 17 bolivares. This we did not want to do, because aureomycin, in contrast to acromycin, is selling very satisfactorily to the principal Government outfit, which is the Social Security Institute, and, moreover, we have no argument to present to the Comptroller General of the Nation—which is the office in charge of control of the prices at which the Government buys all its requirements—in support of this increase.

Consequently, we decided not to increase the aureomycin prices and we shall say so to the gentlemen from Pfizer in another talk which we will have tomorrow. I am telling you all this for your cognizance, and also asking that you let Mr. Bogan (cyanamid official) know so that he may be informed of the present price situation in Venezuela, and to enable you, in case Pfizer tells you that we are fooling around with prices, to answer them immediately that we have at no time lowered the prices.[15]

Note that language. Fooling around with prices means offering a competitive bid or failing to keep a price-fixing conspiracy agreement.

Six months later, on October 30, 1957, Mr. Ball, Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, again write Prieto (Cyanamid) in New York complaining that Pfizer-Venezuela was giving the Brion Pharmacy in Caracas a 20-percent discount on broad spectrum antibiotics:

As you will understand, the name of this pharmacy must be kept in strictest confidence, and I don't believe that things are going to be settled by a simple telephone conversation between you and Pfizer in New York.[16]

This was followed by a cabled instruction from Prieto to Ball directing Ball to telephone Bogan, Prieto's superior, in New York. Bogan—Cyanamid—thereafter contacted his opposite number at Pfizer, Frank P. Wilson, pricing manager for Pfizer-International, who, in turn, telephoned R. N. Silva, Pfizer's manager in Venezuela.

The pattern in general went something like this: When the Venezuelan distributor violated the price-fixing agreement in his area, he would complain to his superior in New York who, in turn, would call the New York office of the company that was violating the price-fixing agreement. The New York office of the violating company would then communicate with its representative in Venezuela.

And let me say something right here. We know that whenever the local boys get caught in a price-fixing conspiracy, the important fellows at the top of the company always say, "We never knew a thing about it. We told them never to do anything like that." That, we will remember, is what happened in the famous antitrust case against General Electric and the other electrical companies. And it was practically impossible to pin anything on the top officials, and the lower guys took the punishment. But here the top fellows in the New York offices were directly involved. If the matter could not be solved locally, the big guns were called in.

On December 10, 1957, Silva—Pfizer-Venezuela—wrote Wilson—Pfizer-New York—as follows:

This memorandum will serve the purpose of introducing Mr. Charles Anderson to your good self. Mr. Anderson is the manager of the Royal Drugstore of Caracas, one of the largest pharmaceutical wholesalers in this country which firm also happens to be Bristol's exclusive distributors for Venezuela.

Mr. Anderson is, therefore, a person fully familiar with what goes on in the pharmaceutical field here. He has been a party to the countless powwows held in Caracas re broad-spectrum talks and re wholesalers-retailers-laboratories talks. Mr. Anderson, a good friend of Pfizer's and of Mr. Juan Franco's and of mine as well, is anxious and willing to go along with you and/or any authorized Pfizer executives and talk to the respective ACCO (American Cyanamid) people to explain what is really going on in the Venezuelan market re the latest Biogen complaint to ACCO and all related matters, specially with reference to the Brion case.

If possible, one of the Ball gentlemen should be present so that things would be squared away once and for all (perhaps a vainless hope) in front of the respective ACCO executives that you are already familiar with.[17]

Immediately thereafter, Ball was instructed to come to Cyanamid's New York office to discuss the matter with Ralph Roland, at that time export sales manager for Cyanamid-International. And while Ball was in New York complaining to Roland about Pfizer, Silva and Anderson were also in New York complaining to Pfizer about Cyanamid.

On December 30, 1957, Ball wrote Roland from Venezuela as follows:

DEAR RALPH: This is my first day in the office after 3 weeks of what we might call vacation in New York. I had a meeting here this morning with our general sales supervisor and with the man in charge of special affairs, Messrs. Ghioral and A. J. Osorio, respectively. The latter had informed me that Mr. R. N. Silva called him during my absence to complain that we had reported to New York the special discounts which the Pfizer branch in this city is giving to the Brion Pharmacy.

In the first paragraph of the second page of my letter * * * of October 30, I clearly indicated the desirability of keeping in strictest confidence the name of the pharmacy which supplied us with the copies of invoices showing the special discount. Pfizer is granting them, and now my fears have become a reality, since somebody in the New York office has informed Pfizer of the name of that pharmacy, which is taking reprisals against us and does not want to buy Lederle products from us.[18]

Obviously, the special discounts granted to this pharmacy by Pfizer violated the price-fixing agreement.

Subsequently, Ball learned from his father, Dr. R. R. Ball, that both Pfizer and Bristol had complained about him to Cyanamid and in a letter to a Cyanamid official dated January 30, 1958, Ball wrote as follows:

DEAR MR. BOGAN: My father related to me the conversation he had with you about the charges made against me by the representatives of Pfizer and Bristol in connection with the prices of the wide-spectrum antibiotics. I want to thank you warmly for the confidence you have shown in me by not listening to those false accusations.[19]

Mr. President, here is one criminal thanking another criminal for the confidence he showed in him in confiding to him that other people were failing to violate the law.

The following day Ball wrote another Cyanamid official, explaining the situa-

---

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

tion more fully, referring to the price-fixing conspiracy he was accused of violating:

DEAR MR. PAGAN: I enclose copy of the letter which I am writing to Mr. Bogan, LHBM 63, dated the 30th of this month and year.

In it, I refer to a conversation which my father had with Mr. Bogan, because the latter was informed that Mr. R. N. Silva and Mr. Charles Anderson, manager of the Royal Drugstore and distributor of Bristol in Venezuela, had complained to Lederle that I had been indulging in all sorts of price schemes in Venezuela and ignoring the agreements with which you are already familiar.

Once again it was my experience that at Lederle's they don't take care of the problems of this market. To the eight letters which I wrote in the course of last year, to you and to New York, about the problem of the Pfizer maneuvers, I only got your reply. When I was in New York in December of last year, I took up the matter in person, and the only token of attention to these problems was that I was invited to lunch with a Pfizer vice president and Mr. Silva, which invitation I naturally did not accept because I was convinced of the futility of talking once again with representatives of that firm, which was confirmed to me by the absurd charges that are now made against me.[20]

These "absurd charges" are that the man failed to violate the law.

On August 7, 1958, following meetings in Venezuela in May and July at which time the Pfizer-Cyanamid pricing dispute was apparently settled, Frank P. Wilson (Pfizer-New York) wrote R. N. Silva (Pfizer-Venezuela) as follows:

DEAR RAFAEL: We have been advised that [Luis H. Ball] has stated that [our] * * * quotation in Maracaibo of Bs. 4.00 on pediatric drops was under his quotation of Bs. 4.15, and therefore he considers the entire situation as being changed and intends to authorize his detailmen to aggressively quote on all Government business. Is he looking for a reason to go after Government business? [21]

This letter is marked "Personal and confidential" and contains the handwritten notation on the bottom, "Please destroy." There was a good reason, Mr. President, why Wilson wanted this letter destroyed. It contains a written admission that Cyanamid's officials contacted him concerning a "price variation" by Pfizer-Venezuela—the clearest kind of evidence that Pfizer and Cyanamid were fixing prices on an international scale.

Pfizer-Venezuela received this letter on August 13, 1958, and 5 days later Luis H. Ball, an official of Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, was on an airplane to New York. In a letter-memorandum, Ball said:

On August 19, I had lunch with Mr. Ralph Roland, at the time export sales manager of Cyanamid Interamerican Corp. and Cyanamid International Corp., and explained to him that once again Pfizer's Venezuelan branch was giving special discounts of 10 percent on all terramycin purchases, contrary to the previous agreements to the effect that such a discount was to be accorded only to wholesalers. It was agreed during that lunch, that Mr. Roland would contact Mr. Frank P. Wilson, manager of pricing for Pfizer Corp., to see what could be done about it.

The following day, when I arrived at Cyanamid's office at the time in the U.S. Rubber Building on 6th Avenue, I was told that a luncheon had been agreed with Mr. Wilson, during which we could discuss the whole matter of Pfizer's pricing. Mr. Roland, Mr. Tamblyn, his assistant, Mr. J. R. Porro, sales manager for the Latin American area and myself went to the restaurant at the Drake Hotel to meet Mr. Frank Wilson (Pfizer). I had met Mr. Wilson during several opportunities in the past, and had the impression that he was a very capable man in his field. Throughout this lunch I confirmed this opinion, and I was glad to hear him say that he would take the matter up with his Venezuelan branch manager, Mr. R. N. Silva at the time, so that the situation would be finally stopped.

Later, we were joined at this lunch at the Hotel Drake with Mr. Wilson, by Mr. H. C. Hesse, at the time director of Cyanamid International.

That lunch ended by assurances given by Mr. Wilson to the effect that he would correct the situation, and assurances given by me that we would wait for them to do it and not start a price competition. Late that afternoon, coming out of Mr. Flag's office, who at the time was manager of the Formica Division of Cyanamid, I saw both Mr. Frank Wilson and Mr. R. N. Silva enter Mr. Hesse's office.[22]

These documents I have quoted from show that the price conspiracy was going on right here in our own country—in New York City. And they show that top officials of these corporations were involved in setting prices and getting all the local people back in the price harness which they had arranged.

The agreement not to engage in price competition so carefully worked out on August 18 and 20, 1958, at the Drake Hotel in New York City had to be shored up. Unfortunately, that is what happens when there is the kind of a margin which these companies had to play with. Remember, their costs were about a cent and a half a pill as against a price of 51 cents to the consumer. When people have that kind of a situation, they have to work hard to keep their price conspiracy in perfect running order. In late September 1958, an employee of Biogen, Cyanamid's Venezuelan distributor, discovered that Pfizer and Bristol were again quoting discounts on broad spectrum antibiotics. When Dr. R. R. Ball, father of Luis H. Ball, and head of Biogen Laboratories, was informed, he wrote a Cyanamid official on September 29, 1958, that he was matching "the prices of the competition, which I hasten to tell you since this news will surely already have been transmitted to you by interested parties." Dr. Ball added:

I have just telephoned Rafael Nicanor (Silva of Pfizer) to communicate to him my conversation with Casas and the order I had given him to adjust our products to the prices quoted by the competition. He assured me that there is no such discount by his company (Pfizer); that it may possibly be an employee who had become overanxious to get the order and had given the discount, but inasmuch as the billing is done from Caracas there will be no such discount. He also told me he would call Anderson (Bristol) to talk with him about the matter so that Bristol won't reduce prices.[23]

On October 12, 1958, Dr. Ball wrote a Cyanamid official, making his position explicit. The trouble was that not all of the gentlemen in this "gentlemen's conspiracy" were real gentlemen. Ball was getting sick and tired of the fact that some of his colleagues occasionally yielded to temptation when they had just sworn on a stack of Bibles that they wouldn't cut prices:

I assure you that * * * I will not lose one more order because of price cuts from the competition. I will not make any "fuss" nor will I fight with anybody, but simply return to the independent policy which I maintained in the past without agreements for such nonsense. * * * [24]

This really got results. When it was discovered that one of their number was going to kick over the traces and try a little real competition for a change, the conspirators got busy. This letter touched off a visit to Venezuela by a Pfizer official, Meredith C. Hough, who discussed the matter with Silva, Pfizer's Venezuelan manager.

Now, Mr. President, what follows is the most startling price-fixing document I have ever seen, and even though it is long, I shall read it, because I think the Senate will find it as interesting as I did: [25]

CARACAS, *November 7, 1958.*

DEAR FRANK: When Houghie was here not long ago, I had the opportunity to chat with you over the phone with reference to the difficulties we were experiencing in the brdspctrm field. Following Houghie's departure, a powwow was convoked in our office with brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr in attendance. Our friend, sqbb could not attend but was no party to any offense and was fully desirous of others reestablishing the previous atmosphere of confidence. Of the participants in attendance, the third one herein listed Olympianly limited itself to merely sending an unauthorized observer with instructions to say that it was not willing to participate any further in any such agreements. Fesa (see today's memo to Herb Bauer) had not attended because it had not done so previously but said, prior to and after the powwow, that it would abide by whatever collective conclusions were reached, and, so far, has not sinned following said powwow.

During this powwow it became evident that brstl was engaged in a nationwide cutting scheme, granting a 10 percent by means of either free goods or a like open or disguised discount. It also became evident that ldrl had followed suit without consulting the remaining partners; what is even worse, the old man personally told me that he had authorized his salesmen to go down to whatever level was necessary in order not to lose any business, something very dangerous because things of this nature, as you know, can't be entrusted to the very limited and uncoordinated judgment of individual salesmen. Apparently the origin of the whole thing was simply that brstl has a sales force headed by a special representative reporting directly to stateside headquarters while the distribution is in the hands of our friend Charlie; said special representative wants to become a branch manager and, to this end, is trying to prove to his superiors that he can sell lots, while lacking in managerial training and experience that would show him that such methods can be disastrous to a p&l.

In other words, Mr. President, profits come from rigged prices, not from increased sales.

The letter continues:

During the powwow the previous confidence was restored and it was said and agreed "let's try again" Fesa and sqbb, informed a posteriori, were happy about the conclusions.

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

Yesterday lptt phoned me saying ldrl was at it again. The news, having originated in the Interior, I immediately sent over one of my aids and he just came back confirming the fact that in Maracaibo, to the Hospital Chiquinquira and to the Zulia State Medicine Purchasing Department, ldrl was selling its equivalent of our LACAR at the proper level but delivering 10 percent of free goods, what caused lptt to lose appreciable business.

Next week I shall call another powwow, as agreed upon at the last one, in order to thrash out this Maracaibo violation. I anticipate, however, that ldrl will in all probability refuse to attend and shall deny the sins. This is tantamount to saying that it shall be most difficult to hold the brdspctrm governmental prcg totem pole in the future. The stubbornness of a disturbed family shall be, as usually, the cause of it all.

I shall keep you further posted.

PLUTO.

P.S.—Next week I shall also call a powwow to discuss sinning in the field of glccrtods (hrmns). We have the strength of being a major party that has not sinned at all.

P.P.S.—It should be noted that, at these powwows, no objections have been raised with regard to steps similar to those of our special G–13.

Thank you.

Now, Mr. President, this letter is obviously in code, which the writer used in an attempt to disguise price-fixing and "pay-off" communications. What, for example, does brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr mean? What does "violation" actually mean? One must first know the identity of the persons and firms referred to and the meaning of the code employed before we can fully understand the letter. The key to the code, fortunately, was supplied with the other documents.

"Frank" is Frank P. Wilson—that very fine and estimable person referred to earlier in my remarks who made such a fine impression on the Venezuelan representative who came up with the suggestion to get this crooked conspiracy straightened out so that it could go back to its old efficient operation—Pfizer-International's pricing manager; "Houghie" is Meredith C. Hough, then a Pfizer-International area manager; "brdspctrm" stands for "broad spectrum."

"Powwow" is a code word meaning inter company price-fixing discussion; "brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr" refers to Bristol, Hoechst,[26] Lederle (Cyanamid), Lepetit,[27] and Pfizer; "sqbb" refers to Squibb; "offense" means a competitive price variation; now that is a specially nice term, I think. Anyone who engages in price competition is an outlaw; he is committing an "offense"—probably a capital offense.

"Previous atmosphere of confidence" means a prior understanding on prices.

"Fesa" refers to a local antibiotic dosage form producer, Farmaco Especialidades; "Herb Abuer" is a Pfizer-International staff lawyer in New York; "the old man" refers to Dr. R. R. Ball, head of Biogen Laboratories, Cyanamid's Venezuelan representatives.

"Charlie" is Charles Anderson, Bristol's exclusive distributor in Venezuela; "Lacar" is Pfizer's code name for a broad spectrum antibiotic; "violation" refers to a price cut.

"Sinner" means a person or firm who has departed from a price-fixing agreement; "prcng" means pricing; "a disturbed family" means a price-cutting situation among competitors; "Pluto" is the code name for Rafael N. Silva, Pfizer's Venezuelan manager.

"Glcrtds" refers to glucocorticoids; "Special G–13" refers to "Murray G–13 disbursements," Pfizer-Venezuela's "pay-off" fund to "facilitate" sales to governmental purchasers in Venezuela.

It is important to understand that these meetings, agreements and understandings to fix the price in Venezuela were part of the same conspiracy which "fixed" the price in the United States. Complaining about stateside instructions from Cyanamid not to compete with Pfizer and Bristol in Venezuela, Dr. Ball wrote on October 12, 1958 that:

> Certain narrow mentalities (at Cyanamid) see and think only about the domestic market. * * * When they sign an agreement with their overseas agents they commit themselves to a moral obligation, and, therefore, have no right to make us waste our efforts and money by trying to level us to the domestic policy.[28]

Cyanamid's Dr. Ball was entirely correct in that the primary concern of the American companies was the maintenance of identical prices in the domestic market. The constant pressure by the drug companies on their foreign distributors to adhere to the agreements in their own areas was due to the fear that if one of the companies got away with a price deviation with impunity, such deviations would become infectious and would spread to the U.S. market. The one fact that should be kept uppermost in our minds is that to the conspirators the domestic market was the most important one and prices had to be maintained there at all costs.

This consideration—keeping the agreed-upon price structure intact in the United States—was advanced by Pfizer some 8 months later in refusing to let Pfizer-Venezuela compete with Biogen—Cyanamid-Venezuela—on antibiotic animal food supplements. Wilson wrote Silva on June 16, 1959, that:

> The prices as quoted in the United States to this account (Ralston Purina) by both of us (Pfizer and Cyanamid) are about the same, and therefore it looks as though, at the present, without destroying the price pattern, we cannot compete too aggressively at the local level. I know this must hurt you but it is out of my control. * * * We know that the above does not help you obtain the sales at a local level, yet we feel to do so on a price basis would create a situation which in the long run would be detrimental to the overall profit picture of Pfizer.[29]

DRUG PRICES AND DRUG PROFITS

In November 1957, Bristol was making 250 milligram tetracycline capsules at a cost of about 1.6 cents per pill,[30] which were priced to the consumer at $51 per hundred or about 51 cents per pill—the list price to the consumer for a bottle of 16, the most popular quantity sold, was $8.50 or about 53 cents per pill. Since at that time Bristol accounted for about one-third of the total U.S. output, its cost figures can probably be taken as representative.

The drug industry may dispute this cost figure on the ground that it fails to account for expenditures for drug research. Indeed, this is the industry's traditional response to the charge that drug prices are unconscionably high. But since research costs represent only 6.4 percent of the industry's total sales dollar[31] this argument is obviously absurd. For every 6 cents of a sales dollar spent on research, the large companies spent 25 cents on promotion and advertising of their brand names.

In other words, they spend more than four times as much on advertising brand names as they do on research.

Because of the high prices they charge, they can afford to spend over $600 million a year trying to impress upon prescribing physicians the existence of fictitious differences which will induce them to order brand name products for their patients.[32]

Today, with improved production methods, the cost of producing a 250 Mg. tetracycline capsule is undoubtedly much lower than 1.6 cents. This is confirmed by recent bids to the Defense Department as low as $1.49 per hundred capsules, which suggests a production cost of less than 1 cent per pill.

Sale of broad spectrum antibiotics in this country exceed $200 million annually and tetracycline accounts for more than half of this total. Yet, notwithstanding a production cost of 1.6 cents, the American public paid these millions at a rate of 51 cents per pill during the period 1954 to 1961 and is paying them at a rate of 30 cents per pill today. The sole reason for the price reduction is not improved production methods; it is the fact that in about 2 percent of the prescription market[33] a number of firms are today marketing tetracycline under its generic or nonproprietary name at prices to the consumer of 10 cents per pill and less. Drugs sold generically are uniformly less expensive than trade name drugs, despite the fact that, as most experts agree,[34] the only difference between them is the name under which they are sold.

Rather than engage in price competition, the conspirators have embarked on an extensive campaign to destroy their competitors. This campaign includes: First, filing patent infringement suits, second, excluding the competition from other markets, and third, waging a public relations program against the use of generic drugs. Here are their actions in detail:

First. Although the Federal Trade Commission found that Pfizer's tetracycline patent was obtained as a result of misrepresentations made to the Patent Office,[35] from October 25, 1960, to June 1, 1965, Pfizer brought patent infringement suits against 31 drug companies who were marketing generic tetracycline. I ask unanimous consent to

---

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

have printed in the RECORD a list of the names of these companies and the dates on which these suits were brought.

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

Defendant	Filed	Court	Civil action No. —
Mondial Chemical Co. et al	Oct. 25, 1960	District of New Jersey	927-60.
Noramco	Feb. 8, 1961	Western district, Texas	2929.
Philipp Bauer Co., Inc	Apr. 13, 1961	Southern district, New York	51/1230.
International Rectifier Corp. et al	Oct. 2, 1962	Southern district, California	62/1350 CC.
International Drug Trading, Inc. et al	Aug. 28, 1963	Eastern district, Michigan	24280.
Premo Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Inc	Sept. 20, 1963	District of New Jersey	766-33.
TMCO Pharmaceuticals, Inc	Sept. 30, 1963	Eastern district, Missouri	63C-364.
Narco Drug Co., Inc	do	do	63C-363.
Hallmark Laboratories, Inc	Nov. 12, 1963	Northern district, Illinois	63C-2026.
Zenith Laboratories, Inc. et al	do	District of New Jersey	936-63.
Approved Pharmaceutical Corp	do	Northern district, New York	9832.
Davis-Edwards Pharmacal Corp	Nov. 13, 1963	Southern district, New York	63 C 3327.
Pennex Products Co	Nov. 14, 1963	Western district, Pennsylvania	63-1011.
West-Ward, Inc	Dec. 12, 1963	Southern district, New York	63 C 3619.
Pennex Products Co	Jan. 23, 1964	do	64 C 233.
Vitamin Pharmaceuticals, Inc	Feb. 19, 1964	Eastern district, Pennsylvania	35119.
Hance Bros. & White Co	Mar. 11, 1964	do	35120.
Columbia Pharmaceutical Corp	do	Eastern district, New York	64C-258.
Barry Martin Pharma., Inc	Mar. 19, 1964	Southern district, Florida	64-175 Civ-EC.
Delta Drug Corp. et al	Mar. 25, 1964	Middle district, Florida	64-71-J.
Ortega Pharmaceutical Co., Inc	do	do	64-72-J.
Garden Labs., Inc	Apr. 13, 1964	District of New Jersey	341-64.
Freedman Pharmacy	June 26, 1964	Eastern district, Pennsylvania	36060.
Stoneham Lab. et al	July 16, 1964	Eastern district, New York	64C-752.
McKesson & Robbins, Inc	Aug. 11, 1964	District of Connecticut	10, 600.
Evsco Pharma Corp	Jan. 11, 1965	Eastern district, New York	65C-18.
Diamond Labs., Inc	Mar. 29, 1965	Southern district, Iowa	6-1652-C-2.
Biocraft Labs., Inc	do	District of New Jersey	323-65.
Bates Labs., Inc	do	Northern district, Illinois	65C-486.
Henry Schein	May 5, 1965	Eastern district, New York	65C-475.
Wolins Pharmacal Corp	June 1, 1965	do	65C-543.
Mike Berk Associates	do	Southern district, California	65-810 EC.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, many of these firms were unable to withstand the cost of litigation and signed consent decrees agreeing to get out of the tetracycline market. Others, such as McKesson & Robbins, Inc., Premo Pharmaceutical Laboratories, Inc., and International Rectifier Corp., are waging legal battles to prove the patent invalid and, thus, to stay in the tetracycline market.

Second. On July 31, 1964, McKesson, the country's largest drug wholesaler, which had been selling Cynamid pharmaceutical products to the drug trade for more than 30 years, announced it was going to market tetracycline in the United States at approximately one-third the price charged by Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn. One day later, Pfizer announced it would sue McKesson for infringing its tetracycline patent. Two days after that, Cynamid announced that McKesson would no longer be allowed to wholesale Cyanamid products to the drug trade. This is another example showing how the conspirators coordinate their activities to protect their monopoly. The Cyanamid cutoff maneuver was stopped by a Federal Court injunction on November 4, 1964.[36]

Two years previously, McKesson had bought a half interest in a Latin-American drug firm and started marketing drugs generically at prices substantially below the Latin-American prices fixed by the conspirators. Retailers were told to boycott the generic line; doctors were advised that it was impossible to produce quality pharmaceuticals at the prices being offered; literature, some of which originated in the United States, was sent to doctors attacking generic drugs; medical journals refused McKesson's advertising, and McKesson found it difficult to secure pharmaceuticals for use in its generic program.[37]

Third. Many large hospitals in this country purchase drugs under their generic names. The same procedure is followed by the Defense Supply Agency, the Veterans' Administration and State and local governments purchasing for institutional use. Welfare departments in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Michigan, and a number of other States require that prescriptions for welfare patients be written in generic names. The reason in all cases is the same—drugs purchased generically are uniformly less expensive than trade name drugs.

Let me just cite for you a couple of examples. In 1960 Schering bid $17.97 on prednisone—important in the treatment of arthritis—on sales to the military procurement agency. Its price to the druggist at that time was $170 for the same bottle—5 mg. tablet, 1,000 in bottle—selling under the trade name Meticorten. Schering did not get the order from the Military Medical Supply Agency; one of the smaller companies won out with a bid of around $10.

Note that, Mr. President. Here the product, which is being traded under a trade name in competition with a small company which, presumably, is making money on it, instead of being sold at $170 is sold for $10.

What is the price situation today? According to the 1966 Red Book, which publishes the prices provided by the drug companies themselves, Schering is still selling at the price of $170 to the druggist. And, if you add the druggist's markup, the price to the patient is about $280.

Imagine that. A small company is willing to sell, on competitive bid, at $10 to the Defense Department, what is being sold for $170 to a druggist.

If the doctor writes the prescription under the generic name the prednisone instead of Meticorten, the consumer can buy the identical drug for less than $20. Instead of $170, some companies sell the same amount for $7.50, and, with the druggist's markup, the price to the public is about $17.50.

Or, take the case of reserpine, an important hypotensive drug. In 1959, Ciba was bidding 60 cents on sales to the military, and, believe me, it was not losing money at this price. At that same time, its price to the druggist was $39.50 for the same quantity—.25-milligram tablet, bottle of 1,000.

Imagine that. It was sold to the druggists for $39.50 while a bottle of 1,000 250-milligram tablets was sold for 60 cents. And the patient paid about $65. And even today this same differential exists. By 1964 the military people were buying for around 47 cents. And, according to the 1966 Red Book, Ciba's price for the same drug, sold under its trade name of Serpasil, is $39.50 even today. The consumer still pays $65 or more.

Imagine that difference, Mr. President; here is a drug that someone has to have. If the company has to bid for the business, it sells it for 47 cents, but the poor fellow who is ill and goes to the drugstore to buy it has to pay $65. That is a high price to pay for merely using a drug with the name "Serpasil."

To prevent the spreading use of generic name buying by experienced purchasers, the conspirators—Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn—joined with others in 1953 to form the National Pharmaceutical Council, the main purpose of which was, and still is, to discourage the sale to institutions and to the public of drugs under generic names. When this council was formed in 1953, only four States had laws prohibiting pharmacists from substituting for an expensive brand-name drug the same drug under a generic name. As a result of the National Pharmaceutical Council's activities, by 1959 some 44 States had adopted similar laws and, in those States, generic drugs at lower cost could be obtained by the patient only if the doctor added at the end of the prescription "or its generic equivalent."[38]

Those drug firms marketing tetracycline generically at prices to the consumer of 10 cents per pill and less have by reason of their competition in only 2 percent of the prescription market forced the conspirators to reduce the price from 51 cents to 30 cents per pill across the board and it is precisely for this reason that the conspirators' attack on the sale of generic tetracycline continues unabated.

In this price-fixing conspiracy or broad spectrum antibiotics, the real pressure on the conspiracy came almost entirely from one source—the institutional buyers such as hospitals, Government agencies, and the like. These experienced purchasers had a pretty good idea of what was going on; and they knew that their orders were substantial enough to tempt the price conspirators to do a little price cutting to get the business. As a result, much of the correspondence which I am

Footnotes at end of Mr. LONG's remarks.

putting into the record today deals with the price backsliding that occurred here and there on this business, and the continuous efforts of the parties to keep everybody in lockstep on prices.

This kind of problem does not exist at the drugstore level. For one thing, the ordinary druggist does not buy enough tetracycline at any single time to make his business so attractive that the drug companies will break their price agreement in order to get his business. And there is another factor—and this is of the greatest importance. Here is where the prescribing physician comes in, and, believe me, at this point he is a key figure in the maintenance of monopoly prices. If he can be persuaded, bludgeoned, brainwashed to write a prescription in terms of a company's particular brand name, the druggist is by law required to supply only that company's product. And today perhaps 98 percent of the prescriptions written by doctors for broad spectrum antibiotics is in terms of major companies' brand names.

Mr. President, imagine that. Here is a sick man and a poor man. A physician writes down a fancy name, "Serpasil." Having written down the word "Serpasil," the man goes to the druggist and the druggist has to sell this poor fellow—and maybe he cannot even buy a pair of shoes—that drug for $65. If he had not written the word "Serpasil," the druggist could sell him the same bottle of pills for 47 cents or perhaps slightly more.

So it can be seen the price conspirators had little to worry about on their sales through drugstores. Through the prescribing physician, they held both the drugstore and the patient in captivity. Once the prescription was written in terms of Achromycin—the brand name for Cyanamid's product—or Tetracyn—Pfizer—or Polycycline—Bristol—the business was all wrapped up. There could be no shopping around for a less expensive brand of tetracycline. So there is little correspondence here on price backsliding at the druggist's level. There did not need to be any for the simple reason it did not exist. Here the price conspiracy worked fine.

At 30 cents per pill, broad spectrum antibiotics cost the American public $4.80 for the average prescription. This is the price of a pair of children's shoes, the combined weekly milk and meat bill for a family with an annual income of $3,000 and less, and 40 percent of the same family's total weekly food budget. No wonder "that one-third of all prescriptions are not filled." [39]

When the price to the consumer—30 cents—is 30 times higher than the cost of manufacture—1 cent—when gross profits on sales are 85 percent and higher,[39] when price competition is nonexistent in more than 98 percent of the prescription market,[40] we must ask whether the American public and people in other lands are paying for these drugs—a price which is based on competitive market forces or whether they are victims, as is most likely the case, of the most monstrous price-fixing conspiracy of our time.

In this country in 1962 people of all ages with a family income of $2,000 a year and under spent $112 a year on health expenses, $28 of which was spent on medicine and $28 of which was spent on hospitalization. People of all incomes in the age bracket of 65 and over spent $208 per year on health expenses, $54 of which was spent on medicines and $53 of which was spent on hospitalization. People 65 and over with an annual family income of $2,000 and under spent $162 per year on health expenses, $48 of which was spent on medicines, $40 of which was spent on hospitalization and $47 of which was spent on doctors' bills.[41]

In other words, poor people of all ages spent the same amount of their health expense dollars for medicines as they did for hospitalization; people 65 years and over spent more of their health expense dollars for medicines than they did for hospitalization, and poor people 65 years and over spent more of their health expense dollars for medicines than they did for either hospitalization or doctors.

Without essential drugs, people die. Yet those who need them most—poor people 65 years and older—are those who can afford them least. These are the real victims, the persons from whom Pfizer, Cyanamid, Bristol, Squibb, and Upjohn have been wringing the fat expense accounts, the company cars, the six-figure executive salaries, and profit margins unheard of anywhere else in American industry.

Since 1954, these conspirators have been victimizing us all. It is high time that we stop them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the documents I have referred to, as well as other relative documents and supporting footnotes, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

FOOTNOTES

[1] Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 7–9, 1961, pp. 2407–8.

[2] In the Matter of American Cyanamid Co., et al., FTC docket No. 7211.

[3] Op. cit. supra, footnote 2; FTC finding No. 28, Aug. 8, 1963.

[4] "CX" refers to an FTC exhibit in Matter of American Cyanamid Co., et al., FTC docket No. 7211.

[5] Op. cit. supra, footnote 2; FTC opinion, p. 92, Aug. 8, 1963.

[6] Op. cit., supra, footnote 2; FTC opinion, p. 101, Aug. 8, 1963.

[7] Hearings, Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 86th Cong., 2d sess., Sept. 8, 1960, pp. 13741–43.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] See exhibits, annexed hereto.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Hoechst, a German company, is licensed by Bristol to manufacture tetracycline.

[27] Lepetit, a French company, is licensed by Pfizer to manufacture tetracycline.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Op. cit. supra, footnote 1.

[31] S. Rept. No. 448, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 12 (1961).

[32] Administered Prices—Drugs, Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. Rept. No. 448 (1961), p. 157.

[33] John McKeen, former president of Pfizer, in a speech before the New York Society of Security Analysts, as reported in Drug Trade News, June 22, 1964, estimated the "market penetration less than 2 percent."

[34] Hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 86th Cong., 2d sess., May 10–11, 1960, pp. 11569, 11592, 11632.

[35] Matter of American Cyanamid Company, et al., Aug. 8, 1963, finding No. 26.

[36] *McKesson & Robbins, Inc.* v. *Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc., et. al.*, 235 F. Supp. 743 (E. D. Pa., 1964).

[37] New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 11, 1963, pp. 1, 16.

[38] S. Rept. No. 448, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 235–238 (1961).

[39] Berkov, "Development and Administration of a Pre-Paid Drug Program," Pension and Welfare News, p. 35 (October 1964).

[40] Hearings before Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, 87th Cong., 1st sess., December 7–9, 1961, pp. 2403–2406.

[41] "Medical Care, Health Status, and Family Income," p. 48, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1964).

THE UPJOHN CO.,
MEMPHIS BRANCH,
October 25, 1957.

Subject: Bid on Panmycin 250 mg. capsules.

Mr. W. C. PEZE,
The Upjohn Co.
Kalamazoo, Mich.

(H.E.W.—Hal—too bad that our boy isn't a better crap shooter—maybe this is a good trend too.—KID.)

DEAR RED: On our recent bid to Charity Hospital of Louisiana, New Orleans, La., on Panmycin 250 mg. capsules the following bids were submitted:

[In bottles of 100]

	200	600	1,000
I. L. Lyons	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
McKesson	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Bristol	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Pfizer	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Upjohn	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Lederle (successful)	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Squibb	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
SS Drug	22.49	22.49	[1] 22.49
Legendre	25.50	25.50	[1] 25.50

[1] Less 2 percent.

Lederle was awarded the bid on 200—100's as their representative threw the highest dice, which is done when all bids are equal.

Thought you would like to have this information.

Very truly yours,

THE UPJOHN CO.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The enclosed attachments—all in photostatic copies (the originals still available at this writing, whether "incoming originals," "outgoing carbon copies," etc.)—could in principle be duplicated at any time.

Such attachments basically pertain to correspondence—on pricing matters—exchanged primarily, during the period 1956–59, between the Pfizer Venezuelan branch and the Pfizer International headquarters.

These attachments are hereafter divided in several basic exhibits, to wit:

Exhibit 1: This exhibit consists of only one piece of correspondence (RNS–90), addressed by the Pfizer-Venezuela manager to

his immediate superior, an assistant area manager.

It is of particular interest to note—in the bottom paragraph on page 3—that Pfizer-Venezuela was seemingly in possession of advance information as to what Lederle (and its Venezuelan distributors, Biogen) and Schering Corp. were expected to do in certain pricing fields.

It should further be noticed that two Pfizer-International executives, Messrs. Kapp and McGoodwin, were seemingly getting copies of said correspondence.

Exhibit 2: This exhibit consists of several communications between Pfizer-Venezuela and Pfizer-International—beginning with RNS–959 and ending with another identifiable as "Dear Frank," dated "Caracas, November 7, 1958," and signed by "Pluto" (Pfizer-Venezuela's manager's code name for intercompany secret purposes)—all referring, one way or another, to price agreement difficulties in Venezuela arising principally, between Pfizer-Venezuela on the one hand, and upon the other, Laboratorios Biogen (Cyanamid's exclusive distributors for Venezuela), but not excluding other firms such as Bristol Laboratories, Hoechst, Lepetit, and Squibb, etc.

RNS–959 was prompted by a phone call, from Mr. Frank P. Wilson, Pfizer-International's pricing manager, directly from New York, relaying a Biogen complaint to Cyanamid (ACCO) re Pfizer-Venezuela's pricing policies with regard to a Caracas drugstore (Farmacia Brion). It should be noted from this cablegram that, in order to confuse the outside reader, "vowels are pulled out," i.e., "prc" stands for "price" and "dscnts" for "discounts." "Hesse" refers to Mr. Ernest G. Hesse, financial director of Cyanamid International.

RNS–961 and 962 are self-explanatory, except for two items, i.e.:

(a) "Ball" refers to the fact that the Venezuelan Ball family are the controlling shareholders of Biogen.

(b) "Roland" is one Cyanamid International executive, Mr. Ralph Roland.

(e) "Powwow/s" hereinafter denotes a word used to cover up inter-company private price discussions.

RNS–1209/14/16 are self-explanatory. However, let it be noted that:

(a) "Brodspctrm" obviously stands for "broad-spectrum."

(b) "Murray G–13 Disbursements" stands for Pfizer-Venezuelas "war chest" to "facilitate" sales to governmental purchasers in Venezuela.

"Dear Frank," ("Caracas, November 7, 1958"), is quite a comprehensive piece of "powwow" reporting. It comprises terms such as:

"Frank," i.e., Mr. Frank P. Wilson.

"Houghie," i.e., Mr. Meredith C. Hough, a Pfizer-International area manager.

"Brstlhstchldrllpttpfzr," i.e. Bristol, Hoechst, Lederle, Lepetit, Pfizer.

"Sqbb", i.e., Squibb.

"Fesa", i.e., one local antibiotic dosage form producer, Farmaco Especialidades.

"Herb Bauer", i.e., a Pfizer-International staff lawyer in N.Y.

"Charlie", i.e., Mr. Charles Anderson, someone already referred to.

"Disturbed family", i.e., competitors wary of coming to price agreements that might prove detrimental to each firm's interests.

"Glcrtcds", i.e., glucocorticoids; same for "hrmns", i.e., hormones.

"Special G–13", i.e., war chest as described above.

Exhibit 3: This exhibit consists of several pieces of correspondence, ranging from RNS–932 of "Re: Ralston Purina" of "June 16, 1959."

RNS–932, addressed to Mr. J. T. Smart (Pfizer-International pricing executive), begins to spell out the difficulties in reconciling Pfizer's and Cyanamid's pricing policies on animal feed supplements when it comes to dealing with Pfizer-Venezuela's main animal feed supplement buyer and exclusive veterinary product distributor, Protinal, on the one hand, and, on the other, Pfizer-Venezula's animal feed supplement prospect, Purina, the latter being, at the same time, Cyanamid's execlusive distributor for Venezuela's Biogen's main potential buyer of animal feed supplements.

RNS–1441, addressed to Mr. James Mathew (a Pfizer-International Area Manager's Assistant for Agricultural and Veterinary Products), ends with a plea to Mr. Frank P. Wilson to try to intervene—stateside—with Cyanamid and Purina.

RNS–1634 conveys a complaint about a breach of understanding on the part of Cyanamid's exclusive distributors for Venezuela, Biogen, re animal feed supplements.

RNS–1666 is kind of the same thing as RNS–1634.

RNS–1702 conveys a plea for a stateside intercompany discussion re animal feed supplement pricing problems in Venezuela.

"Re: Ralston Purina" closes the chapter in a dramatic fashion. Please read carefully the last paragraphs of said communication. It is signed by Mr. Frank P. Wilson.

Exhibit 4: This exhibit consists of several communications beginning with "Dear John" of "Caracas, May 29, 1957," till a cable of May 16, 1958, sent "Pfizer Folkestone (England)" by Mr. Frank P. Wilson from Caracas.

"Dear John,"—addressed to Mr. J. T. Smart by Pfizer-Venezuela's R. N. Silva—begins to spell out the difficulties in finding out the proper agreeable selling price level for Pfizer's oleandomycin (Matromycin) because of the necessity of being on a comparable level with:

(a) Lilly's & Abbott's erythromycin.

(b) Hoffmann-La Roche's oleandomycin (at least abroad).

(c) Pfizer's tetracycline, oxytetracycline and tetracycline-oleandomycin human dosage forms.

Idefra Caracas is a cable sent to a private address (not Pfizer-Venezuela's but intended for the latter), by Pfizer-International's Mr. Neil A. Morton, questioning the advisability of several New York billing prices to Pfizer-Venezuela, including for Matromycin.

RNS–783 throws further light on the problem. Again code words are used.

NY-VEN-29 and NY-VEN-30 plus a memo to Mr. T. J. Raineri (a New York Pfizer-International executive about a visit to Caracas), dated October 14, 1957, illustrate—in a guarded way—New York's desire that, at least initially, in Venezuela Pfizer's Matromycin be sold at a price level comparable with Hoffmann-La Roche's Romicil; particular attention should be paid to paragraph 2 of Smart's memo to Raineri.

RNS–907 transmits several Product Price Schedule requests, as suggested by New York.

Pfizer Folkestone (England) is a cable sent by New York's Frank P. Wilson to somebody in England. It is very interesting to note the mentioning of "Bowie and Kuster" because Bowie stands for Mr. Robert Bowie, a Hoffmann-La Roche's international executive usually headquartered at Montevideo, Uruguay, and Kuster stands for Hoffmann-La Roche's Venezuelan distributor; i.e., Alfredo Kuster & Co.

The whole case ended when, at a later date, and in view of Pfizer-Venezuela not having raised Matromycin's prices to Romicil's levels, all Pfizer-Venezuela's stocks of Matromycin were ordered by New York transferred to Pfizer-Panama.

Exhibit 5: This exihibt consists of communications RNS–1745, RNS–1791 and RNS–1796. The whole thing being so clear, it needs no explaining.

Exhibit 6: This exhibit consists of several communications, beginning with RNS–1890 (with attachments) and ending with RNS–2021. It should be obvious, to the careful reader, that there have been countless price talks between Pfizer executives and some of other drug companies.

FINAL REMARKS

The above comments refer to the situation as it existed, personnelwise, etc., during the period 1956–59.

[RNS–90]

SEPTEMBER 10, 1956.

Mr. ALLEN M. DEBOVOISE, New York
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA, Caracas
Proposed sales policy.

This is with further reference to my memorandum to you RNS–39 of August 13, 1956, on "Sales Controversy." Bill Kapp has already replied to it with his No. 175 of August 21, 1956, and I can readily see that Bill was mislead by some of the facts outlined in my memorandum under reference. I cannot in all fairness blame Bill for it because the information I gave you in my memorandum was incomplete and of a highly tentative nature. I think, therefore, that it would be much better if I would completely forget about my previous memorandum in question and would give you now the whole story together with the ideas regarding the plans that we would like to put into practice in this market.

Background: The ethical pharmaceutical business in this country is presently going through a period of crisis owing to some basic reasons, among which stand out the following:

(a) The further spreading of the social security and other public welfare programs chiefly of medical nature, with their subsequent sequelae and complications so familiar to your good self. In other words, this has resulted in the channeling through the respective institutions of much of the ethical pharmaceutical business that used to be handled by drugstores.

(b) The growing competition in the ethical pharmaceutical business arising chiefly from the efforts, sometimes quite unethical, on the part of the basic suppliers (national and foreign manufacturers, manufacturers' agents, etc.) toward securing each a larger share of the market.

(c) The bitter competition that until recently there existed here among the wholesale druggists. This competition was started by that Filipino gentleman, Mr. Galata (who in the Philippines, I know, is quite a troublesome businessman), who is the chief owner of one of the major pharmaceutical wholesale firms in this country. Mr. Galata, in order to increase his firm's business, some time ago began to grant excessive credits to retailers and to finance the establishing of an excessive number of seemingly independent pharmacies.

The end result has been that a good percentage of pharmacies are in bad or extremely poor financial shape and that some wholesalers find themselves likewise and some of the latter are going out of business.

The Venezuelan Chamber of Pharmacy has been urging the Ministry of Health and Public Welfare to once more legally restrict the number and distribution of new retail stores, but nothing has been accomplished so far along these lines.

Proposals: The wholesalers themselves have finally gotten together and have agreed to reshape their policies. Even Sr. Galata, an individual to be very wary of, has definitely fallen into line and he could not act otherwise because the wholesalers' movement is guided by businessmen of undisputed power and of moral integrity.

The wholesalers have agreed:

(a) To not compete creditwise with one another in regard to their transactions with retail stores.

(b) To not deal with pharmaceutical products smuggled into this country. You see,

some of the foreign labs like Squibb and Winthrop have been plagued by the fact that products of theirs are smuggled in from Colombia to be sold here at prices much lower than those locally established by the respective houses in this country. The wholesalers, not only will not carry such products but have promised that, in the event the Venezuelan Chamber of Pharmacy should find a given drugstore guilty of such transactions, the wholesalers would abide by the disciplinary recommendations that the chamber may decide upon, for instance, to stop supplying goods to the guilty pharmacy for a certain period of time.

(c) To invite the basic suppliers to sell to drugstores at prices and discounts not inferior to the same ones that the respective products would be sold at by the wholesalers to the retailers.

(d) To fully cooperate with the basic suppliers in respect to the latter's selling and sales promotion activities.

As you also know, an autonomous unit of the Caracas Chamber of Industrialists has been formed under the title of National Association of Pharmaceutical Laboratories and distributors and representatives of national and foreign pharmaceutical products. The majority of the members of this association agrees with the wholesalers' proposals and plans; a small minority does not agree and is currently creating a great deal of confusion but these are precisely the firms that are operating in a devious manner and who would prefer not to be bound by any businesslike agreements.

As you know, Pfizer has by now joined the said association and I am enclosing a clipping which shows that the undersigned is one of the alternates of the Junta Directiva of that entity. I did not wish to be a member of the said Junta Directiva because I felt that some unpleasant tasks should rather be left to others, but I was elected just the same. Pfizer-Venezuela will continue to be a member of the association in question until such time when it may be contrary to our business; for the time being it is good for us to be one of their members. By the way, the comments made in the same clipping are a misrepresentation on the part of the press of some of the basic points discussed and agreed upon.

With regards to the wholesalers' proposals we would like to put into effect here in Venezuela the following sales policy:

Prices and discounts: As you know, at the present time we have basic schedules of discounts for our products in this country, excepting for the "institutional sales" which are handled in a peculiar fashion in some respects.

[In percent]

	To wholesalers	To retailers
Broad-spectrum antibiotics	10+10	10
Narrow-spectrum antibiotics	20	5
Hormones	15+5	None
Vitamin products	20	10
Miscellaneous pharmaceuticals	20	5

After very carefully studying this matter, we have come to the conclusion that the chart in question should be changed so that wholesalers would get 20 percent on every thing and the pharmacies 6 percent, also on everything. This is precisely what most basic suppliers are doing and/or will do shortly. This is precisely what the wholesalers are asking for. It would enable us to give consistency to our sales policy. The list prices to the retailers, that is, without the 6 percent discount, would be based upon what the most important competitors have or will set as list prices for the respective products (particularly Biogen-Lederle for tetras and Schering for prednisolone). Such competitors are following or will follow the same policy of 20 percent and 6 percent with regards to those basic list prices. On such list prices the retailers will have the markup of approximately 23.08 percent they are legally authorized to have, thus arriving at the retail prices to the consumer. When a wholesaler would sell one of our products to a retailer, the wholesaler would effect the sale at the list price minus the 6 percent.

If this policy is put into effect, we would:

(a) Have consistency in our prices and discounts as said before.

(b) Place the wholesalers in a position to carry our products and sell them at a reasonable profit to the retailers.

(c) Obtain that the retailers, while making a good profit on our products, would prefer to buy from the wholesalers for the most part. This, to us, would mean less credit problems, a simplification of our administrative task, and a wider, less burdensome distribution of the Pfizer products.

(d) Have the wholesalers as our strong allies, particularly against Squibb, Hoechst and Glaxo who are the chief firms that, in the field of narrow-spectrum antibiotics, go around all the time giving all sorts of discounts, extra benefits, etc. The wholesalers being in a position to strongly influence the retailers when it comes to choosing among similar products, would cooperate with Pfizer against these competitors of ours that maintain poor relations with the wholesalers or none at all.

(e) Be sacrificing ourselves only something like 2 percent on our present gross income from sales to wholesalers and retailers, something very small if one considers that it can be reasonably expected that our sales to these customers would become more solid and would tend to increase.

It is of utmost urgency that you review this matter and give us your consent at the earliest possible opportunity. Here we are dealing with a case of public relations of the first order, because almost inevitably practically everybody will have to adopt the same policy in Venezuela. If we fall in line right now, we would place ourselves in a most favorable position with the wholesalers, and indescribable but very significant benefits would derive from it.

We realize that the foregoing information is by no means complete. We realize that the formulation of a sales policy is something of vital importance in any business and that all factors must be taken into consideration; this we have done to the best of our ability and, in fact, we have not made this proposal to you before because we wanted to feel very sure about the whole thing. Countless deliberations, consultations, staff meetings and personal contacts have gone into this affair. Logically if you have any particular questions with regards to one point or another, we would be more than happy to try to supply you with the requested additional information.

In point of fact the whole thing is so complex that the undersigned would have rather liked to have the opportunity to personally discuss these proposals with you but it is clear to him that this would be too much to ask for.

For your information and guidance, please find enclosed a local price structure schedule that will give you the contemplated list prices (to retailers without the 6 percent) the real list price (to retailers minus the 6 percent) and the wholesale prices (to wholesalers, list prices minus the 30 percent). We hope this schedule will help clarify matters in your eyes.

I most eagerly remain waiting for your reaction concerning the above proposals with regards to which time is of the essence.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[LHBM-292]

CARACAS, *May 9, 1957.*

Mr. B. G. PRIETO,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp.,
Lederle Laboratories Division,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PRIETO: Yesterday afternoon we Tetracycline distributors had a meeting in the offices of the Pfizer Laboratories, to talk once again about the prices of these products. Attending the meeting were the Manager Remedia, S. A., representative of Hoechst; the manager of Squibb, Dr. Miguel Octavio, representative of Lepetit; Mr. Kemblinger, sales manager for the Western Hemisphere of Bristol Laboratories, and their representative in Venezuela, the manager of the Royal Drugstore, the gentlemen from Pfizer and I.

At that meeting, we were accused of not having adhered to the agreement which, according to them, we had made in October of last year with respect to these products. This agreement—to recall in a way what we had been talking about with them—had applied solely to the presentations of pure tetracycline, i.e., acromycin, tetracyn, and hestacycline, which at that time were the only ones on the market, and had not applied to aureomycin and terramycin; furthermore we, for our part, had always accepted [taken for granted?] that each of the firms would deposit with a bank, in favor of the other firms, a check for 25,000 bolivares, which would become effective in case any one of the firms were to violate the agreement—our proposal, which of course was not accepted, Pfizer giving us the excuse that the Caracas Branch could not commit the company.

The main purpose of arriving at that agreement was to equalize the list prices of the products, and we did so in almost all cases, with small exceptions such as, for example, "Gotas Pedtiaticas" [Pediatric Drops] which we offer at 4.55 bolivares to the pharmacies, and Pfizer at 4.80 bolivares. Of course, we had not been willing to raise the price since this would give the press and interested persons of the Medical Federation a reason to vociferate against Lederle, and I feel it is easier to lower a price than to raise it. As for the negotiations with the Government, we agreed to offer our products at list prices (you have various copies of it) insofar as acromycin, hestracycline, and tetracycline were concerned. This united us, because, as you know, that way, up to a certain point, we would be able to again take orders from Social Security which, in view of the higher special discounts offered by Hoechst, we had completely lost, though for us that had represented a great sacrifice, because, when we sold acromycin for 15.50 bolivares and gave a special discount of 10 percent, or 1.55 bolivares, the net price came to 44.95 bolivares, and starting in October when we began to sell it for 17 bolivares per 250 by 16's to match Hoechst, we had to give 20 percent, or 3.40 bolivares, which meant a net price of 13.60 bolivares, i.e., we had to give, as special discount, 1.35 bolivares more per bottle.

In yesterday's talk, the gentlemen from Pfizer, who have been selling terramycin to the Government also for 17 bolivares per bottle of 250 by 16's ever since they started to distribute the product, want us to raise the aureomycin price from 15.50 to 17 bolivares. This we did not want to do, because aureomycin, in contrast to acromycin, is selling very satisfactorily to the principal Government outfit, which is the Social Security Institute, and, moreover, we have no argument to present to the Comptroller General of the Nation—which is the office in charge of control of the prices at which the Government buys all its requirements—in support of this increase.

Consequently, we decided not to increase the aureomycin prices and we shall say so to the gentlemen from Pfizer in another talk

which we will have tomorrow. They sneakily threatened us that if we did not raise the prices they would set off a price war. Personally, I don't believe this is true, or that they are in a position to do so, and I view all this as a trap which they have set for us in order to improve their own situation by profiting from the difficulties which we would undoubtedly have with the hospitals if we were to raise the prices to them.

I am telling you all this for your cognizance, and also asking that you let Mr. Bogan know so that he may be informed of the present price situation in Venezuela, and to enable you, in case Pfizer tells you that we are fooling around with prices, to answer them immediately that we have at no time lowered the prices.

Another matter which was taken up was the price of the presentations of all tetracyclines in 250 by 100's containers on which we had agreed some time ago that all of us interested parties would sell them at a minimum price of 90 bolivares per bottle. Lepetit has been selling them for 80 bolivares, but agreed not to continue to do so; I personally believe in what Dr. Octavio said. In return, Pfizer, who stated that he would not sell at less than 90 bolivares—and, in reality, all his invoices to the hospitals show that price—is delivering bottles of 100's to complement the discount and (thus the price?) to the amount of 81.50 bolivares. Obviously, this is very difficult to substantiate; but we have, however, been able to establish it from the number of bottles they show on their invoices, and from the entries in the hospital checklists of stock on hand. Furthermore, what clinches the evidence even more is that our sales to many hospitals of this presentation, of aureomycin as well as acromycin, have dropped.

I realize full well that Lederle is not interested in entering into a price war, and we are not either because we would be the first to suffer; but this Pfizer maneuver must be immediately counteracted, and therefore we submit, for your consideration, the following proposal which we hope will be approved:

For the year 1956, you authorized and send us 12,000 samples of aureomycin in bottles of 8's, which represent 960 bottles of 100's. These samples are naturally for promotion, for the doctors, and we cannot use them for some other purpose. Therefore, we would like you to authorize us to take 100 bottles of 250 by 100's from out sales stock, or that you send up 100 bottles of the same presentation with sales labels, for use in the same way as Pfizer is doing. This way the invoicing prices would not be lowered and we could recoup this sale that we are losing.

Please submit this case to Messrs. Tamblyn and Bogan for consideration, and inform me as soon as possible of the decision they would take.

As you will understand, this is a matter which requires the greatest urgency; therefore I am sure you will not wait until you come here to let me know.

Waiting to hear from you, I remain,

BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS H. BALL M.

[LHBM-530]

CARACAS, *August 14, 1957.*

Mr. RAFAEL PAGAN TORRES,
Lederle Laboratories Co., Avenue Fernandez Juncos, Santurce, P.R.

DEAR MR. PAGAN: We take pleasure in informing you that Pfizer continues to be Pfizer, although they may [sic] have changed the manager of their branch in Venezuela.

Those gentlemen called me at the end of last week to inform me very politely that they have decided to change their sales policy in the interior of the country with reference to the retail drugstores. According to them, from now on they will give drugstores only 6-percent discount on prices [for drugs bought from them], instead of 10 percent which they had been giving to majority of them. This is, according to Dr. Silva, following instructions which they have received from the United States urging them to unify their discount policy all over the country.

Naturally, at first glance, this seems to be a big mistake on their part, which would, in consequence, create a very satisfactory situation for us. However, viewing as everything coming from Pfizer must be viewed, the representative of Bristol, of Hoechst and myself, in an exchange of ideas on this situation came to the conclusion that Pfizer is now considering those firms in the interior as drug retailers to whom one cannot sell anyway because of their very bad credit, those firms which, traditionally, all of us laboratories have left to the wholesalers; in other words, all of the Republic's good clients, who are those to whom all of us laboratories sell, are being declared wholesalers by Pfizer.

Furthermore, Frenco himself confessed to me that to the retailers to whom they will give only 6-percent discount will be compensated for by larger discounts on other products of their line.

I don't believe any imminent danger exists for us because of this new policy of Pfizer's, but naturally we shall keep our eyes peeled. As I told you when you came to visit us several months ago, I feel we are making our own rules in the antibiotic trade, and we are not going to give up easily our position as leader, but I deemed it desirable to keep you in touch with what is going on here in connection with this business, because, as I said at the beginning of this letter, so far as I am concerned, Pfizer will always be Pfizer.

With a firm embrace,

Very truly yours,

BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS H. BALL M.

[LHBM-649]

CARACAS, *October 11, 1957.*

Mr. RAFAEL PAGAN TORRES,
Lederle Laboratories Co.
Avenue Fernandez Juncos,
Santurce, P.R.

DEAR MR. PAGAN TORRES: When you receive this letter you will have returned to Puerto Rico, because of which I hasten to convey to you certain points of extreme interest.

It will not be possible for me to send Ghiorsi to you on the 20th of this month as we had planned in Mexico, because extremely serious things are going on here in Caracas right now, to which I shall refer later, because of which his traveling on that date would not be convenient. If you agree, Ghiorsi could go to Puerto Rico on November 1, and stay there until the 16th, when he would go to Cuba, returning to Caracas on the 22d of that same month. I am very grateful to you for this invitation which you extended to Ghiorsi, which will undoubtedly be very profitable for him and for the Lederle business in Venezuela, and please let me know whether you agree with this itinerary.

On returning to Caracas I found that the wholesalers had made the drugstores sign an agreement under which they promise to purchase all their requirements solely through the wholesalers or otherwise the latter would stop selling them pharmaceutical goods. Furthermore, the Association of Laboratories knows that once this agreement were signed by all pharmacies, the drugstores would come to the laboratories to demand bigger discounts, which would apparently be 25 percent plus 5 percent for cash payment. As you will understand, this is an extremely grave situation, because it establishes a monopoly of the pharmaceutical trade on the part of the wholesalers, because of which the Association of Laboratories (AFIDRO) has decided that, if the wholesalers do not withdraw this agreement by next Monday, the 14th, they will be no longer sell to those establishments and will make their distribution directly to the pharmacies. Of the 52 members of the association, 30 have already signed this agreement, including ourselves, because, though I don't think this is the solution, it would be difficult for us to keep out of it at this time because it would mean the breaking up of that association, which would put each of us laboratories individually into a weaker position with respect to the drugstores.

I view this problem as extremely grave and am afraid that it won't be solved for many months to come, since there is also the possibility of intervention by the health authorities, which would complicate things even more. All this is extremely regrettable because our business this year had been going very well. Our plans for 1958, as you know, were for an even more considerable increase in sales, and the many projects I brought from the convention in Mexico will have to be postponed indefinitely, unless a solution is brought to this serious situation which will extend to the whole country if it is not possible to arrive at an understanding with the wholesalers in what is left of this month.

There is the aggravating circumstance that some firms who signed the agreement among the laboratories will not comply with it, among whom is Pfizer; and therefore they will avail themselves of the upheavals, which the first weeks will bring to us, to take care of the drugstores directly. Serious also is the fact that this convention, by being restricted solely to the city of Caracas, leaves a free hand to wholesalers with branches or affiliates in the interior to stock up that way and so to make fun of the blockade which is tried to be imposed on them.

Upon my arrival I also found out that Pfizer's friends have been trying to lure away two of our men: Carbonell, who has been 7 years with the company, and Molina, who joined us at the beginning of this year. Both told Silva, who went to Argentina last Saturday, to get lost, and I am waiting for him to come back so that I can tell him off, because, apparently, he has lost all the refinement acquired in long years of honest work for Lederle. These tactics have never been used by Pfizer in Venezuela until now, and it is not that I am afraid to lose two men because nobody makes a contract with us for life, but I am not willing either to keep quiet and swallow those insults until I choke.

Personally, and coming back to the matter of the drugstore, I am trying to establish some point of understanding between laboratories and drugstores which would be a basis for a renewal of talks and, thus, for arriving at a solution to this situation which hurts all of us equally.

I want to thank you once again for your good advice at the conference in Mexico, and, with my affectionate greetings to Digna. drg. Dignita, receive a cordial embrace from,

BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS H. BALL M.

[LHBM-709]

CARACAS, *October 30, 1957.*

Mr. B. G. PRIETO,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp.,
49 West 49th Street,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PRIETO: I am sending you with this letter, statement and copies of invoices of the Pfizer Corp. to the Brion Pharmacy of Caracas for merchandise sold in September.

You will be able to see from these that this firm is giving the pharmacies [and/or drugstores] a 20-percent discount on the price of its entire line of pharmaceutical products, including wide-spectrum antibiotics, plus 2 percent for payment within 30 days.

We do not yet have all the information together, but we have sufficient data to be

sure that Pfizer is giving these discounts to at least 15 pharmacies [or drugstores] in Caracas. As you will understand, this puts us into an extremely unfavorable position with those clients since they are getting better conditions from Pfizer than we are able to give to the wholesalers.

It is not our intention to act hastily to counteract this new Pfizer maneuver. We are going to wait until December to see how our sales to that pharmacy develop in those 2 months. Meanwhile, we would like to prepare ourselves so that, in the event our sales go down, we can act vigorously and positively, for which we need your prompt recognition of the extra credit of 12 percent on prices f.a.s. New York for the sales we are making to these pharmacies, seeing ourselves forced to grant them more discounts, as is the case now with the wholesalers.

As you will understand, the name of this pharmacy must be kept in strictest confidence, and I don't believe that things are going to be settled by a simple telephone conversation between you and Pfizer there in New York. As I told you at the conference in Mexico, they are losing ground and are therefore trying to recoup it with all these maneuvers. We cannot go on relying on the good faith of that company, and it is necessary, therefore, to give it back to them, blow for blow.

The Brion Pharmacy has demanded the same discounts from us. It is a very important pharmacy and controls several others. Our conversation has been that we must consult with you on this matter, because of which they are expecting our reply within the next few days.

I have heard that Mr. Pagan Torres will arrive in New York very shortly. Please show him this letter to keep him informed of these latest happenings.

Waiting to hear from you, I remain,

Very truly yours,

LUIS H. BALL M.

[RNS-962]

DECEMBER 10, 1957.

Re Mr. Charles Anderson.
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mr. FRANK WILSON,
New York,
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas:

By means of this memorandum I wish to confirm the wireless message I sent you on 12-6-57 with reference to the impending visit to New York of Mr. Charles Anderson.

This memorandum will also serve the purpose of introducing Mr. Anderson to your good self. In point of fact, Mr. Anderson will be the bearer of it.

As I tried to explain to you in the cable under reference, Mr. Anderson is the manager of Broqueria Royal, of Caracas, one of the largest pharmaceutical wholesalers in this country, firm which happens to be also Bristol's exclusive distributors for Venezuela. Royal is, in addition, one of Pfizer's best customers here.

Mr. Anderson is, therefore, a person fully familiar with what goes on in the pharmaceutical field here. He has been a party to the countless powwows held in Caracas re broad-spectrum talks and re wholesalers-retailers laboratories talks. Mr. Anderson, a good friend of Pfizer's and of Mr. Juan Franco's and of mine as well, is anxious and willing to go along with you and/or any authorized Pfizer executives and talk to the respective ASCO people to explain what is really going on in the Venezuelan market re the latest Biogen complaint to ASCO and oil related matters, especially with reference to the Brión case.

If possible, one of the Ball gentlemen should be present, so that things would be squared away once and for all (perhaps a vainless hope) in front of the respective ASCO executives that you are already familiar with.

Any courtesies that you may wish to extend to Mr. Anderson shall be greatly appreciated by Pfizer-Venezuela.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[LHBM-837]

CARACAS, *December 30, 1957.*

Mr. RALPH ROLAND,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N.Y.

DEAR RALPH: This is my first day in the office after 3 weeks of what we might call vacation in New York. I had a meeting here this morning with our general sales supervisor and with the man in charge of special affairs, Messrs. Ghorisi and A. J. Osorio, respectively. The latter had informed me that Mr. Pfizer called him during my absence to complain that we had reported to New York the special discounts which the Pfizer branch in this city is giving to Brion Pharmacy. In view of this, I deem it my duty, in order to protect the interest of Lederle in this country, to present to you my most vigorous complaint because of the manner in which this matter has been handled by the New York office.

In the first paragraph of the second page of my letter LHBM-709 of October 30, I clearly indicated to you the desirability of keeping in strictest confidence the name of the pharmacy which supplied us with the copies of invoices showing the special discounts Pfizer is granting them, and now my fears have become a reality, since somebody in the New York office has informed Pfizer of the name of that pharmacy, which is taking reprisals against us and does not want to buy Lederle products from us.

I insist that it is necessary to give it back to Pfizer, blow for blow, and to abandon the policy of not giving battle which Lederle has supported up to now; and at the same time I hope that incidents like this, which have the gravest consequencies for your business in this market, are not going to be repeated and that the person responsible for it has learned his lesson.

I look forward to hearing from you on this particular with the despatch that the case requires, and with my best wishes for a happy and prosperous New Year, I remain, with a firm embrace,

Very truly yours,

BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS BALL, *Manager.*

[LHBM-63]

CARACAS, *January 30, 1958.*

Mr. E. T. BOGAN,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. BOGAN: My father related to me the conversation he had with you about the charges made against me by the representatives of Pfizer and Bristol in connection with the prices of the wide-spectrum antibiotics.

I want to thank you warmly for the confidence you have shown in me by not listening to these false accusations. However, I note, from what my father reports to me, that you were not informed of the many letters I wrote to Lederle in the course of last year about the maneuvers Pfizer was and still is carrying on in this market, because of which I beg to include photostatic copies of all of them.

With most cordial greetings, I remain, once again,

BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS H. BALL M.

[LHBM-70]

CARACAS, *January 31, 1958.*

Mr. R. PAGAN TORRES,
Lederle Laboratories Co., Av. Fernandez Juncos, Santurce, P.R.

DEAR MR. PAGAN: I enclose copy of the letter which I am writing to Mr. Gogan, LHBM-63, dated the 30th day of this month and year.

In it, I refer to a conversation which my father had with Mr. Bogan, because the latter was informed that Mr. R. N. Silva and Mr. Charles Anderson, manager of the Royal Drugstore and distributor of Bristol in Venezuela, had complained to Lederle that I had been indulging in all sorts of price schemes in Venezuela and ignoring the agreement with which you are already familiar.

Once again it was my experience that at Lederle's they don't take care of the problems of this market. To the eight letters which I wrote in the course of last year, to you and to New York, about the problem of Pfizer maneuvers, I only got your reply. When I was in New York in December of last year, I took up the matter in person, and as the only token of attention to these problems was that I was invited to lunch with a Pfizer vice president and Mr. Silva, which invitation I naturally did not accept because I was convinced of the futility of talking once again with representatives of that firm, which was confirmed to me by the absurd charges that are now made against me.

You will possibly remember that when I went to New York in the spring of 1956 to discuss the price competition which Hoechst was carrying on against us at that time the [only] attention given to the problem which I had brought with me, was that I should go to Germany to talk with the heads of that firm. Now, in 1957, after writing eight letters, copies of which I enclose again, explaining the problem with the competitors with respect to wide-spectrum antibiotics, Mr. Bogan was informed of what the people of the competition had said, but obviously not the content of my correspondence.

Friend Pagan, you have known me for many years, you know this company, and you have seen the way we do business in Venezuela. Because of that I count on all your understanding and consideration, and these are the only reasons prompting me to write you this letter and to inform you of what has happened. Insofar as I am concerned, the matter is finished, and I don't want to blame anyone for what has happened, or to see ill will where I am sure there is none; but I do feel it necessary to put on record, to you who have always given me your friendship and good advice, the truth of these facts. I also want to tell you that the books of this company are at your disposal so that you may, at your convenience, check the prices and the discounts offered by us in our antibiotics line.

Moreover, I know that you will share my satisfaction in seeing that in 1957 our acromycin trade increased 77.61 percent; aureomycin 4.34 percent; and pharmaceutical specialties, 43.73 percent; or a total increase of 40.37 percent above the totals of fiscal 1956. These figures speak for themselves and will determine the policy of this company for 1958, aimed at obtaining even greater increases in our sales, and at solving our own problems here without writing to New York because we see now that it leads to nothing good for us.

With a firm embrace from your friend,

BIOGEN LABORATORIES CORP.
LUIS H. BALL M.

[RNS-1214]

APRIL 30, 1958.

PFIZERSUB,
New York:

F. P. Wilson Mytel refers human line only. Of course, we've in common with Biogen only

broad spectrum but obviously forces us general human adjustment to Government accounts.

Regards,

RNS.

PFIZER CORP.,
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

AUGUST 7, 1958.

Mr. R. N. SILVA,
Pfizer Corp., Apartado de Correos Caracas, Venezuela.

DEAR RAFAEL: We have been advised that Luis Enrique has stated that the Seguro Social quotation in Maracaibo of Bs. 4.00 on pediatric drops was under his quotation of Bs. 4.15, and therefore he considers the entire situation as being changed and intends to authorize his detailmen to aggressively quote on all Government business.

We are still awaiting a new schedule of local prices as our records indicate that this product is sold to the public and hospitals at Bs. 4.55, to the retailer at Bs. 4.28, and to the wholesaler at Bs. 3.64. Will you please advise as soon as possible.

Is he looking for a reason to go after Government business?

Sincerely yours,

FRANK.

P.S.—Is there any possibility of you reconsidering the matromycin prices and raising them to the romicil level as we are still being pressed on this matter?

JULY 23, 1963.

Mr. EDWARD J. GINER,
Vice President, International, McKesson & Robbins, Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR ED: I have received a number of letters from you today, and shall immediately answer the one dated July 18, which seems the most urgent at the moment.

I am afraid it will be impossible for this letter to reach your hands before next Thursday since tomorrow we have another official holiday in the country and therefore, no mail service.

I arrived in New York on Monday, August 18, 1958, with my wife on Pan American flight 202. I had traveled there on my way to London, and planned to remain for 4 days to discuss with the Cyanamid people, of whom Labroatorios Biogen was the exclusive distributor for Venezuela, two important matters. The first one dealt with the renewal of the agency agreement, and the second, with Pfizer's price policy in Venezuela which was in conflict with the agreed policy with all tetracycline distributors and branches operating in Venezuela at the time. Since I was traveling abroad, unfortunately I did not have access to secretarial help and therefore did not keep written minutes of the discussions during my stay in New York, but only some handwritten notes in my agenda book.

On August 19, I had lunch with Mr. Ralph Roland, at the time export sales manager of Cyanamid Interamerican Corp. and Cyanamid International Corp., and explained to him that once again Pfizer's Venezuelan branch was giving special discounts of 10 percent on all terramycin purchases, contrary to the previous agreements to the effect that such a discount was to be accorded only to wholesalers. It was agreed during that lunch, that Mr. Roland would contact Mr. Frank P. Wilson, manager of pricing for Pfizer Corp., to see what could be done about it.

The following day, when I arrived at Cyanamid's office, at the time in the U.S. Rubber Building on Sixth Avenue, I was told that a luncheon had been agreed with Mr. Wilson, during which we could discuss the whole matter of Pfizer's pricing. Mr. Roland, Mr. Panblyn, his assistant, Mr. J. R. Porro, sales manager for the Latin America area, and myself went to the restaurant at the Drake Hotel to meet Mr. Frank Wilson. I had met Mr. Wilson during several opportunities in the past, and had the impression that he was a very capable man in his field. Throughout this lunch I confirmed this opinion, and I was glad to hear him say that he would take the matter up with his Venezuelan branch manager, Mr. R. N. Silva at the time, so that the situation would be finally stopped. The whole thing sprang from previous price maneuvers by Pfizer, which I am sure you will understand from my memorandum of May 16, 1958, to Dr. R. R. Ball, general manager of Laboratories Biogen, on a meeting held in Caracas with all the tetracycline distributors and branches operating in the country. I am attaching a photostat of this memorandum.

Later, we were joined at this lunch at the Hotel Drake with Mr. Wilson, by Mr. H. G. Hesse, at the time director of Cyanamid International.

That lunch ended by assurances given by Mr. Wilson to the effect that he would correct the situation, and assurances given by me that we would wait for them to do it and not start a price competition. Late that afternoon, coming out of Mr. Flag's office, who at the time was manager of the Formica division of Cyanamid, I saw both Mr. Frank Wilson and Mr. R. N. Silva enter Mr. Hesse's office and I imagined that they would discuss what we had talked about at lunch that same day.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

LABORATORIES BIOGEN, C.A.
LUIS H. BALL M.

CARACAS,
September 29, 1958.

MY DEAR RAFAEL: Last Friday, Angel Casas telephoned me to tell me that Pfizer, Bristol, and another laboratory, the name of which I don't remember, had quoted to the Government of the State of Zulia, products, equivalent to acro(mycin), at the present prices plus a 10-percent discount.

I asked Casas to send me a photostatic copy of those price quotations, and he replied that he could not secure them for the moment because they had been refused, but that he hoped to be able to get them later on.

I told Casas that I was holding him responsible for whatever decision the management would take in view of false data supplied by him, and he replied that he accepted the responsibility since he had seen the price quotations with his own eyes.

I also admit that previously those same laboratories were giving a 10-percent [discount] on merchandise, but that this time they had dared to quote in writing, indicating 10 percent.

In view of this, I authorized Casas to match the prices of the competition, which I hasten to tell you since this news will surely already have been transmitted to you by interested parties.

I have just telephoned Rafael Bicanor to communicate to him my conversation with Casas and the order I had given him to adjust our products to the prices quoted by the competition. He assured me that there is no such discount by his company; that it may possibly be an employee who had become enthused [overanxious] to get the order and had given the discount, but inasmuch as the billing is done from Caracas there will be no such discount. He also told me he would call Anderson to talk with him about the matter so that Bristol won't reduce prices.

I am thinking of sending Ghiorsi to Maracaibo to check on Casas' information, but meanwhile there is the danger of our losing a sale which, it seems, is a very considerable one, and for that reason, while I clear up the business some more, I am going to let the order stand which I gave to Casas to match prices with those of the competition.

I am sending a copy of this letter to our friend Prieto.

With a cordial embrace from your friend,

RICARDO.

EXTRACT FROM DR. BALL'S LETTER TO MYSELF DATED OCTOBER 12, 1958

The antibiotic situation in Maracaibo continues to give us trouble. Next Tuesday I will send Ghiorsi to Maracaibo to confirm all the information sent by Casas so that I can act with assurance. I will inform you in New York so that you may submit this matter to Mr. Bogan. I assure you that (and please make it known there) I will not lose one more order because of price cuts from the competition.

I will not make any fuss nor will I fight with anybody, but simply return to the independent policy which I maintained in the past, without agreements or such nonsense. Tell Bogan that this is the last time I am informing New York about it * * * that from now on I will fight here with my own resources until the business ceases to be profitable and I place it at the disposal of Lederle so that others may manage it.

During my long history of doing business with Cyanamid they have done very little to help me fight the competitors. They act exactly like the State Department toward Russia; they calm me down with promises of agreement, etc., etc. They do not give me weapons, and meanwhile, slowly but surely the competitors take away from us the markets that we have conquered during years of work with our money and our efforts.

One example of this is the Titanium Dioxide and Formica. With the former they left us to "cool our heels" by refusing to accept orders that we had taken from clients so that they could take care of the importunate policy of one of the many big bosses who germinate in Cyanamid as if by spontaneous generation. Every day a new one pops up.

With formica they give us such bad service that all our great efforts to take over this market are neutralized; our shipping instructions are not followed, they do not send us samples in spite of the fact that their expenses are charged to our account as if we ordered them because we have the pleasure of doing so or because we are going to use them to make our own colored quilts.

Certain narrow mentalities over there see and think only about the domestic market. If this is so, why do they spend money on the export markets? Why don't they close them altogether? When they sign an agreement with their overseas agents they commit themselves to a moral obligation and therefore, have no right to make us waste our efforts and money by trying to level us to the domestic policy. We are getting the short end of the deal, and nevertheless, it is we who must pay for the broken dishes for their ignorance about export, for their eagerness to earn merits in the eyes of the executives and for their shortsightedness.

On January 1, the European Common Market Agreement will commence. We shall soon see the pocket statesmen of Cyanamid very busy revising their export policy and asking us to work miracles in order to correct their mistakes.

On October 18 in another letter, Dr. Ball goes on to say:

"Chiorsi arrived yesterday from Maracaibo. I did not inform you about his trip before because I have been very busy. As far as the antibiotics are concerned, he found that Bristol is openly giving discounts in merchandise as you will notice from the credit notes I am attaching. It has not been possible to confirm anything about Pfizer although Casas insists that they are also giving discounts in merchandise; but it has not been possible to obtain any credit notes. Casas asks me to give him time to obtain them. What we have been able to prove is

that they have openly been giving a price reduction of ophthalmic ointment from Bs. 95 to Bs. 70, and I have given orders to meet these prices.

"Chiorsi brought with him some orders from the Hospital Chiquinquira and the Hospital Niños for achromycin and aureomycin in capsules and syrup with a 10-percent discount. On Monday I will have a meeting with Fabiano, Chiorsi, and Osorio to see what we can decide. I might call Silva and Anderson to let them know before I give the discount. Nevertheless, I am more inclined to take the order away from them, giving the discount this time, until I learn the outcome of your conversations with Bogan and Roland."

CARACAS,
November 7, 1958.

DEAR FRANK: When Houghie was here not long ago, I had the opportunity to chat with you over the phone with reference to the difficulties we were experiencing in the brdspctrm field. Following Houghie's departure, a powwow we convoked in our office with brstlhstchldrillpttpfar in attendance. One friend, sqbb, could not attend but was no party to any offense and was fully desirous of others reestablishing the previous atmosphere of confidence. Of the participants in attendance, the third one herein listed Olympianly limited itself to merely sending an unauthorized observer with instructions to say that it was not willing to participate any further in any such agreements. Fesa (see today's memo to Herb ———) had not attended because it had not done so previously but said, prior to and after the powwow, that it would abide by whatever collective conclusions were reached, and, so far, has not sinned following said powwow.

During this powwow it became evident that brstl was engaged in a nationwide cutting scheme, granting a 10 percent by means of either free goods or a like open or disguised discount. It also became evident that ldrl had followed suit without consulting the remaining parties; what is even worse, the old man personally told me that he had authorized his salesmen to go down to whatever level was necessary in order not to lose any business, something very dangerous because things of this nature, as you know, can't be entrusted to the very limited and uncoordinated judgment of individual salesmen. Apparently the origin of the whole thing was simply that brstl has a sales force headed by a special representative reporting directly to stateside headquarters while the distribution is in the hands of our friend Charlie; said special representative wants to become a branch manager and, to this end, is trying to prove to his superiors that he can sell lots, while lacking in managerial training and experience that would show him that such methods can be disastrous to a p&l. Apparently too, Charlie has no recourse but to reluctantly go along lest he should lose that distributorship.

During the powwow the previous confidence was restored and it was said and agreed "let's try again." Fesa and sqbb, informed a posteriori, were happy about the conclusions.

Yesterday lptt phoned me saying ldrl was at it again. The news, having originated in the interior, I immediately sent over one of my aids and he just came back confirming the fact that in Maracaibo, to the Hospital Chiquinquirá and to the Zulia State Medicine Purchasing Department, ldrl was selling its equivalent of our LACAB at the proper level but delivering 10 percent of free goods, what caused lptt to lose appreciable business.

Next week I shall call another powwow, as agreed upon at the last one, in order to thrash out this Maracaibo violation. I anticipate, however, that ldrl will in all probability refuse to attend and shall deny the sins. This is tantamount to saying that it shall be most difficult to hold the brdspctrm governmental prong totem pole in the future. The stubbornness of a disturbed family shall be, as usually, the cause of it all.

I shall keep you further posted.

With kindest personal regards.

PLUTO.

P.S.: Next week I shall also call a powwow to discuss sinning in the field of glucocorticoids (brmns). We have the strength of being a major party that has not sinned at all.

P.P.S.: It should be noted that, at these powwows, no objections have been raised with regard to steps similar to those of our special G–13. Thank you.

JULY 7, 1959.

Mr. RALPH ROLAND,
Cyanamid Inter-American Corp.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR RALPH: Confirming our today's telephone conversation, I wish to point out the highlights of my trip to Venezuela, where the situation can be summarized as "SNAFU."

The week before last, importers of tetracycline (capsules 250 mg. by 16) had a meeting to compare import prices which had been requested by the Ministerio de Fomento. Prices compare as follows:

Lepetit, $2.37 f.o.b., Milan.
Hoechst, $2.81 c.i.f., La Guaira.
Pfizer, $3.83 f.a.s., New York.
Bristol, $3.43 f.a.s., New York.
Squibb (misteclin), $4.32 f.a.s., New York.
Lederle, $4.04 f.a.s., New York.

As you will note there are variations in prices from $1.95 to 44 cents.

Upon my arrival, Henrique and I had a luncheon with Dr. Ayala and Mr. Rubio (Bristol), Mr. Finch (Squibb), and Dr. Silva (Pfizer); all of us representing U.S. firms.

The seriousness of the situation was accepted by all. If the above prices were declared and submitted to the Ministerio de Fomento, it will mean the end of tetracycline business in Venezuela. Whichever the markups to be fixed by the Ministerio, they would greatly favor Hoechst and Lepetit.

After a long and thorough review of all the matter involved, and at my request, it was accepted to hold another luncheon next day together with Mr. Franco Fracasso Mason (Lepetit) and Mr. Henrique Hartung (Hoechst). This second luncheon meeting lasted 3½ hours and Mr. Mason and Hartung were briefed on what happened during the previous meeting.

Both Mr. Mason and Mr. Finch were very well aware of the great danger on Lepetit and Hoechst's tetracline [sic] business if they officially declare the prices of $2.37 f.o.b. Milan and $2.81 c.i.f. La Guaira. Each one of us made our contributions as to what will happen should the government establish percentages for the distributors, wholesalers and retailers on such rockbottom prices. There will be not a penny left for promotion, advertising, overhead, etc. Mr. Hartung (Hoechst) was willing to jack up the prices to more or less our levels and so was Mr. Mason of Lepetit. However, Mr. Mason had no authority to make such a price decision and was expecting the visit of some high official from Lepetit. We should have their decision either today or tomorrow.

We all are very hopeful that an agreement be reached as otherwise Luis Henrique and I anticipate a price war on the tetracycline and other wide spectrum antibiotics. And I am not only concerned about Venezuela, but I fear that these extremely low prices in this market will have a repercussion in other countries. Furthermore, I anticipate a flow of low-priced tetracycline, being smuggled into Colombia, Curacao, Trinidad, etc.

When I inquired as to what was the attitude of the wholesalers and retailers regarding this regulation of prices by the Ministerio de Fomento, I was informed that they do not seem to be worried at least.

My recommendation was that we all should inform the wholesalers and retailers in a frank, firm and definite way, that none of us will be able to allow a single (under the table) discount. In other words, to let wholesalers and retailers know that we are not going to be the "goat" again and that they should make common cause with us protesting firmly this new Government ruling. If they can "make this sale" they could count with five important institutions—Camara Venezeluna de Farmacia, Asociacida Nacional de Droguaries, AFIDRO (distributors and branches), and Camara Nacional de la Industria Farmacutica to back them up in this protest.

It was completely impossible to find out what is in the minds of the Ministerio de Fomento as to the percentages to be fixed. However, everybody agrees that the Government is going to be pretty tough as they must quiet down the public's demand on the high cost of drugs.

Presently there is not a thing that we or anyone else can do but hope for the best. However, looking forward to the future we are going to have a lifesaver on our Ledermycin. As I said in the meeting at New York, let us get out of the tetracycline crowded subway and ride alone in our Ledermycin soft and air-conditioned Cadillac.

Mr. L. H. Ball will keep us fully informed on further developments and I can assure you that the whole matter is being handled very nicely and in complete harmony with Dr. Silva, Hoechst, Lepetit, Bristol, and Squibb.

Cordially yours,

R. PAGAN TORRES.

MANAGERS ACCOUNT, REIMBURSEMENT REPORT

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N. Y., branch, Caracas, Venezuela, May 20, 1959.

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

	Amount
Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	6,429.44
Total	3,570.56
Approved limit for this account	10,000.00

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

Apr. 30, 1959, check No. 26, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	U.S.$1,634.79
May 11, 1959, check No. 27, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	1,163.66
May 19, 1959, check No. 28, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	3,630.99
Total	6,429.24
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Caracas	Bs9,993.10
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Karakaibo	2,104.00
Onarico Hospital, San Juan de los Morres	96.30
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	80.30
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	798.70
Children's Hospital, Caracas	901.75
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracas	426.00
Ministry of Defense, Caracas	4,532.60
University Hospital, Caracas	89.90
Sagra State Medicine Purchasing Department, Caracas	244.50
Central Hospital, Valencia	464.00
Carabobo State Medicine Purchasing Department, Valencia	517.00
Rodriguez Rivero Hospital, San Felipe	764.00
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institute, Caracas	395.70
Total	21,410.05

NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$ as per attached bank slips.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

MANAGERS BANK ACCOUNT REIMBURSEMENT REPORT

(First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., branch, Payer Corporation, June 25, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	4,947.96
Total	8,953.94
Approved limit for this account	10,000.00

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

June 27, 1959, check No. 29, paid to Rafael Nicaner Silva	US$2,215.14
June 17, 1959, check No. 30, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	2,732.82
Total	4,947.96
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Caracas	Bs8,988.65
Cuarico Hospital, San Juan de les Morres	697.35
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	874.20
Children's Hospital, Caracas	1,176.15
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	31.00
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institute, Caracas	423.45
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracus	419.00
University Hospital, Caracas	3,063.25
Suere Caracas Centeral Hospital, Postain	176.25
Suere State Medicine Purchasing Department, Caracas	183.00
Monagas State Medicine Purchasing Department, Martarin	233.00
Valencia Central Hospital, Venezuela	305.00
Curatatey State Medicine Purchasing Department, Valencia	326.00
Total	Bs16,476.70

(NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$, as per attached bank slips.)

RAFAEL VICAURBLIR.

MANAGERS BANK ACCOUNT REIMBURSEMENT REPORT

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., Caracas, Venezuela, August 18, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	4,092.31
Total	529.14
Approved limit for this account	5,378.55

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

June 23, 1959, check No. 31, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	US$529.41
July 3, 1959, check No. 32, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	4,092.31
Total	5,378.55
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Caracas	Bs4,297.75
Venezuelan Institute of Social Security, Maracaibo	2,623.00
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	87.30
Caurico Hospital, San Juan de los Morros	81.50
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	965.50
Children's Hospital, Caracas	645.25
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institute, Caracas	308.40
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracas	620.25
Emergency Medical Hospital, Pariata	83.60
University Hospital, Caracas	3,993.30

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS—continued

Sucre State Medicine Purchasing Department, Cumania	Bs140.75
Monagas State Medicine Purchasing Department, Matarin	432.50
Araque State Health Department, Naracay	90.00
Central Hospital, Valencia	462.25
Carabobo State Medicine Purchasing Department, Valencia	359.00
Rodriguez Rivero Hospital, San Felipe	198.50

(NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$ as per attached bank slips.)

MANAGERS BANK ACCOUNT REIMBURSEMENT REPORT

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., branch, Venezuela, Sept. 22, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

	Amount
Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	2,324.52
Total	2,758.57
Approved limit for this account	4,916.91

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

Aug. 21, 1959, check No. 33, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	US$2,324.52
Aug. 28, 1959, check No. 34, paid to Rafael Nicanor Silva	2,758.57
Total	5,083.09
Venezuelan Institution of S.S., Caracas	Bs14,709.15
Guarico Hospital San Juan de los Morros	126.85
Ruiz & Paéz Hospital, Ciudad, Bolivar	540.45
Emergency Medical Hospital, Pariata	272.15
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	775.35
Children's Hospital, Caracas	181.30
National Armed Forces Social Welfare Institution, Caracas	318.35
Sala's Emergency Medical Hospital, Caracas	392.20
Luis Ortega Central Hospital, Porlamar	198.25
Cumana Hospital, Cumana	42.70
Sucre State Medical Purchasing Department, Cumana	1,279.20
Monages State Medical Purchasing Department, Maturia	281.00
Cumanatoa Sugar Mill, Cumana	216.40
Aragae State Health Department, Maracay	90.00
Central Hospital, Valencia	465.20
Carabobo State Medical Purchasing Department, Valencia	643.20
Unclaimed	(1,002.05)
Venezuelan Institution of S.S., Maracaibo (not paid)	(2,623.00)
Total	Bs16,923.70

(NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.33 to US$, as per attached bank slips.)

MANAGERS ACCOUNT REIMBURSEMENT REPORT

(The First National City Bank of New York, Brooklyn, N.Y., Branch Venezuelan, Oct. 27, 1959.)

REIMBURSEMENT SUMMARY

	Amount
Balance before reimbursement	US$10,000.00
Amount of this reimbursement	7,391.41
Total	2,108.58
Approved limit for this account	10,000.00

REIMBURSEMENT DETAILS

	Amount
Sept. 11, 1959, check No. 35, Rafael Micanos Silva	US$1,646.69
Sept. 25, 1959, check No. 36, Rafael Micanos Silva	2,277.21
Oct. 19, 1959, check No. 38, Rafael Micanos Silva	2,076.23
Oct. 27, 1959, check No. 38, Rafael Micanos Silva	1,901.27
Total	7,891.40
Venezuelan Inst. of S.S., Caracas	Bs7,427.55
University Hosp., Caracas	8,241.80
Susra State Med. Purch. Dept., Camand	3,560.00
Luss Ortega Cent. Hosp., Perlamar	291.40
Camand Hospital, Camand	94.80
Hanadas State Med. Purch. Dept., Maturfa	815.25
Salas Emerg. Med. Hosp., Caracas	192.00
Grarios Hosp., San Juan de les Mares	207.00
Central Hospital, Valencia	1,044.75
Arsgsa State Health Dept., Karagay	45.00
Emerg. Med. Hosp., Pariata	103.15
Navy's Health Service, Caracas	1,035.50
Fuiz & Koaz Hosp., Ciudad Bolivar	554.00
Guarico Santo Med. Purch. Dept., San Juan de les Mares	671.00
Vargas Hospital, Caracas	1,036.70
Nat'l Armed Forces Social Welfare Inst., Caracas	938.45
Total	26,278.35

NOTE.—Exchange rate, Bs3.38 to US$, as per attached bank slips.

RNS.

[RNS-1956]

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Re G-13 RNS-20.
Mr. J. W. MURRAY,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

I take pleasure in listing below the information you would like to receive in connection with the aforementioned G-13:

Invoice 26936	Bs 33,495.00
Invoice 27074	52,460.00
Invoice 27079	26,230,00
Invoice 26270	932.00
Invoice 26243	814.00
Invoice 26729	675.00
Invoice 26787	140.00
Invoice 26663	3,558.55
Invoice 26341	509.49
Invoice 26940	2,590.60
Invoice 24796	3,956.00
Invoice 23726	247.50
Invoice 24580	247.50
Invoice 24709	1,993.93
Invoice 26637	2,476.00
Invoice 26691	3,712.50
Invoice 26887	2,490.00
Invoice 26760	836.25
Invoice 26366	9,000.00
Invoice 26967	5,940.00
Invoice 24906	9,000.00
Invoice 26907	3,600.00
Invoice 26797	2,015.00
Invoice 26974	6,250.00
Invoice 27035	2,400.00
Invoice 26069	1,000.00
Invoice 27047	4,622.50
Invoice 25739	1,900.00

Invoice 26913	Bs820.00
Invoice 27006	870.00
Invoice 26678	166.00
Invoice 27034	1,800.00

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[RNS-1970]

SEPTEMBER 22, 1959.

Re G-13 RNS-21.
Mr. J. W. MURRAY,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

I take pleasure in listing below the information you would like to receive in connection with the aforementioned G-13:

Invoice 27303	Bs111,504.00
Invoice 27462	18,000.00
Invoice 27545	9,846.00
Invoice 27665	5,440.00
Invoice 27899	149,373.50
Invoice 27323	495.00
Invoice 27404	98.40
Invoice 27616	675.00
Invoice 27132	1,378.00
Invoice 27387	4,026.00
Invoice 26740	836.25
Invoice 27206	[1] 942.50
Invoice 27049	1,297.40
Invoice 27114	2,048.40
Invoice 27344	1,170.90
Invoice 27404	810.60
Invoice 27055	1,250.35
Invoice 27111	2,039.70
Invoice 27192	1,260.35
Invoice 27451	1,314.60
Invoice 27062	450.00
Invoice 27112	2,555.00
Invoice 27363	1,467.00
Invoice 26675	900.00
Invoice 26919	897.50
Invoice 27179	900.00
Invoice 27419	817.50
Invoice 27464	450.00
Invoice 27373	1,253.75
Invoice 27292	15,720.00
Invoice 27463	270.00
Invoice 27158	400.00
Invoice 27319	5,220.00
Invoice 27075	4,328.00
Invoice 27212	1,800.00
Invoice 27497	4,652.00
Invoice 27296	3,402.00
Invoice 27491	3,030.00
Unclaimed disbursements	[2] 1,002.05
Invoice 27079 not paid	[3] 2,623.00

[1] As a result of a computation error, the respective G-13 disbursement should have been Bs177.90; therefore, the next G-13 will show a Bs94.25 surplus.

[2] Self-explanatory.

[3] Disbursement decision reversed.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[RNS-2036]

OCTOBER 28, 1959.

Mr. J. W. MURRAY, *New York.*
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA, *Caracas.*

Re G-13 RNS-22.

I take pleasure in listing below the information you would like to receive in connection with the aforementioned G-13:

Invoice 28030	Bs6,460.00
Invoice 28332	6,285.00
Invoice 28222	4,950.00
Invoice 28446	124,291.00
Invoice 28496	6,685.00
Invoice 27502	3,940.00
Invoice 27974	5,821.50
Invoice 28006	7,200.00
Invoice 28007	7,200.00
Invoice 28008	7,200.00
Invoice 28209	4,789.00
Invoice 28210	5,910.00
Invoice 28211	11,600.00
Invoice 28312	216.00
Invoice 27790	9,835.80
Invoice 27795	Bs1,050.00
Invoice 28028	900.00
Invoice 28027	10,405.00
Invoice 28189	20,510.00
Invoice 28213	1,280.00
Invoice 28419	800.00
Invoice 27563	450.00
Invoice 27628	495.00
Invoice 27780	900.00
Invoice 27927	895.00
Invoice 28014	450.00
Invoice 28058	895.00
Invoice 28276	188.00
Invoice 28343	900.00
Invoice 28387	655.00
Invoice 27923	1,896.25
Invoice 27841	6,718.00
Invoice 28019	560.00
Invoice 28185	8,475.00
Invoice 28214	560.00
Invoice 27690	1,105.00
Invoice 27733	265.00
Invoice 28033	965.00
Invoice 28450	1,105.00
Invoice 27918	4,767.00
Invoice 28377	450.00
Invoice 28404	5,230.40
Invoice 27686	900.00
Invoice 27849	2,023.75
	[1] —942.50
	1,081.25
Invoice 28649	20,389.80
Invoice 28670	320.00
Invoice 27713	1,704.90
Invoice 27730	108.00
Invoice 28078	1,700.50
Invoice 28344	540.00
Invoice 28460	1,478.70
Invoice 28375	13,420.00
Invoice 27552	406.00
Invoice 27584	2,103.45
Invoice 27738	900.00
Invoice 27814	1,085.70
Invoice 27866	91.35
Invoice 27975	980.45
Invoice 28017	730.80
Invoice 28043	1,833.60
Invoice 28315	1,380.65
Invoice 28339	180.00
Invoice 28440	735.60
Invoice 27111	2,039.70
Invoice 27192	1,260.35
Invoice 27451	1,314.60
Invoice 27583	237.25
Invoice 27754	2,165.55
Invoice 28005	1,859.10
Invoice 28114	459.80
Invoice 28173	932.15
Invoice 28357	2,565.30
Invoice 28462	984.15

[1] Please see RNS-1970(1).

Cordially.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

EXHIBIT 3

[RNS-932]

NOVEMBER 22, 1957.

Re Agrivet price schedules VEN-98 and 97.
Mr. J. T. SMART,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.
Mr. JUAN FRANCO M.
Mr. M. C. HOUGH.
Dr. LUIS POCCHIO.

I am referring herein to the memorandums on the above subject matter Mr. Niel A. Morton wrote us on October 8, 1957, and October 11, 1957.

With regards to VEN-98, that is, vigofac, we agree with the point of view explained in the above-said memorandums, and, as a matter of fact, please find attached a revised VEN-98. However, and merely by way of comment, I only wish to add that our branch billing price issued on April 1, 1957, was US$30.315 in 100-pound drums. On the other hand we realize that your information price list carries a quantity price schedule and we shall bear this point in mind henceforth.

With regards to VEN-97, that is TM-3+3, this is a different story, and here it is:

(a) In the first place, we wish to state that, so far as our animal feed supplements are concerned, we find it necessary to apply to protinal's indent orders the corresponding F.A.S. level depending upon the amount to be ordered for each individual shipment. This is so in order to evade any price conflicts arising from any price differential with regards to Purina-U.S. and Purina-Venezuela (the same could be the case with any American feeds manufacturer that may decide to operate in Venezuela in the future). In other words, as originally agreed upon, we want protinal to have its own indent orders billed at the same F.A.S. levels at which any Purina indent orders would be billed (the latter in keeping with the respective domestic billing prices).

(b) In the second place, you already know we have been allowing protinal a set of markups having complete regularity and consistency (28%—31%—25%) in connection with our animal feed supplements line. If we were to give protinal a higher markup with reference to a given product of this type, Protinal could very well then request that the same thing be done in connection with the other like products.

(c) In the third place, we don't find it necessary to have absolute consistency, pricewise, on a gram-per-gram basis, regardless of the antibiotics and/or vitamins concentrations of the feed supplements involved. We say this because, for one thing, Pfizer itself doesn't adhere strictly to this principle of absolute price consistency. In point of fact, to prove yourself the point the only thing you have to do is to compare, for instance, concentrationwise and pricewise, TM-5 with TM-10 and TM-1+3 with TM-3+3. Moreover, Biogen (the Cyanamid distributor here) ain't following the same principle when marketing the Cyanamid animal feed supplements in Venezuela. To illustrate the point, Biogen's price to the public here for Aurofac D (similar to our TM-5) is Bs204.00, and that of Aurofac 10 (Similar to our TM-10) is Bs275.08, in both cases such prices to be understood per bag of 50 pounds each.

(d) In the fourth place, the Bs9.50 per kgm. price to the public Mr. Morton suggested in the bottom paragraph of page 1 of his memorandum of 10-11-57 cited above, would be on a gram-per-gram basis higher than the corresponding price to the public here of Biogen's plain Aurofac listed in VEN-97, taking into consideration that both this type of Aurofac as well as our TM-3+3 are mixtures of antibiotics plus B12.

(c) In the fifth place, we are reluctant, speaking again about Protinal's markups, to allow these people much higher markups on a product which is basically the same as others. We say this because, for one thing, we have already established the principle of the need of uniformity concerning F.A.S. prices, and because, for another, if while giving Protinal the regular F.A.S. we establish the price to the public suggested by Mr. Morton, Protinal would have to be given unusually higher markups which might possibly invite the attention of the Venezuelan price control organisms.

Consequently, please find attached a new VEN-97 which bears the following characteristics:

1. Firstly, the F.A.S. therein used is U.S.SO.455 (the one currently applicable to shipments of 2,000 lbs., the most likely case at the present time).

2. Secondly, the markups for Protinal, as you can plainly see, are definitely in line with what the case happens to be with the other Pfizer animal food supplements here.

3. The price to the public has been figured out taking into consideration what Biogen's price to the public is here for Aurofac 1.02

plus 1.82, plus the fact that ours does not have the same concentration of both antibiotic and vitamin as Biogen's. In reality on the basis of this twofold comparison we should have arrived at a price to the public, on a gram-per-gram basis for the antibiotic-vitamin mixture only 21 percent lower than for the corresponding Biogen mixture. We are, nevertheless, proposing a price to the public which is actually 27 percent lower, on the basis just stated, than Biogen's; this should be no cause for alarm owing to the fact that, in the first place, we are thus upsetting neither the F.A.S. nor the local markups, and, in the second place, please do not think that Biogen's prices to the public here for Cyanamid animal feed supplements do follow a pattern of absolute consistency. Hence, if Biogen and/or Cyanamid should scream, we are also in a position to scream.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[RNS-1441]

NOVEMBER 26, 1957.

Re Ralston Purina.
Mr. JAMES MATHEU,
México
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas
Dr. L. PECCHIO B.

I should like to make reference to your kind and interesting memorandum on the above subject, VA-43 of October 6, 1958.

Yes, we have kept an eye on Purina ever since this giant began gnomishly operating here; by now, I suppose you could call it just a little man that is growing.

Cuz of the above, and cuz of what your letter sez, we have of late given undivided attention to Purina and, in a nutshell, the situation is as follows:

(a) Purina is presently managed locally by a gentleman named Mr. Dietrich F. Rosenberg. We have spoken to Messrs. Rosenberg and Palmer (the latter being the assistant general manager) and they acknowledge the fact that Purina is presently using Aurofac-10. We are told that Purina cannot switch over to TM-10 owing to the twofold reason that, for one thing, Purina-Venezuela has to follow to the letter the formulas exactly as handed down by Mr. Lamar Kishlar, a Purina executive of St. Louis, Mo. There seem to be no hedging on that and no compromising as well. For another, the same gentlemen advise us that they enjoy special ACCO concessions pricewise while, at the same time, they refuse to tell specifically what are the concessions in question. They simply ask us what have we got to offer.

(b) Biogen also acknowledges the fact that Purina-Venezuela is locally supplied by Biogen with Aurofac-10 at special prices dictated by ACCO-N.Y. (? as usual) but refuse to tell us what are these price levels.

The price per carload for TM-10 (40,000 pounds) stateside of U.S.$0.09 per gram of activity, that is U.S.$0.09 per pound f.a.s. New York, that you suggest in your memorandum we should give to Purina-Venezuela, said price to include freight and duties, we have not openly mentioned it to Purina-Venezuela yet inasmuch as we know that these people are presently not in a position to buy the stuff by the carload. Therefore, may I ask you the question of whether or not same price could be passed on to Purina for fractions of carload? This seems to be the crux of the matter.

Most kindly rest assured that our local contacts with Purina have been pleasant and rather frequent ones.

Can you help?

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

P.S.: As early as June 18, 1958, Dr. Pecchio in his memorandum LPB-492, addressed to Mr. Richard Wilson with copy to your good self, explained that Purina-Venezuela would not deviate from using Aurofac-10 unless specific instructions were given by a certain Bob Woodward of the "Product Control Department" in St. Louis, Mo. Thank you. Why don't you pass a copy of this memorandum on to Mr. Frank P. Wilson, who may be in a position to help by making contacts stateside both with ACCO and Purina. Thank you again.

[RNS-1634]

CARACAS, VENEZUELA,
March 20, 1959.

Mr. FRANK P. WILSON,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: Please see a memo that John Smart wrote to us on February 19, 1959, on the subject of order No. 695-433.

What actually happened was that Biogen suddenly decided to drop the local price to the public of Aurofac 1.82+1.82 from Bs5.41 to Bs4.95 per kgm. This entails, as you can plainly see, a cut of 8.5 percent also at the level to the retailer. When caught using this new price, Biogen simply explained that the New York f.a.s. has been lowered by ACCO and that locally a corresponding reduction was made. I would like to on record—and please remember this very clearly—that this is one more instance of complete lack of cooperation on Biogen's part; to say anything else would be utter nonsense.

By means of separate, normal and formal correspondence Luis Pecchio is replying to John in a perfunctory manner proposing a new product price schedule. Please intercede with John so that same shall be granted approval. Please also remind John that, because of the difference in concentration between the above Aurofac and TM 3+3, in the past we had a whale of a time trying to come with New York to a meeting of the minds as regard the calculations leading toward the respective equivalent comparison between these two products. Luis, therefore, is simply just proposing a similar reduction percentagewise, without any further ado. It makes me mad to think of all this nonsense about the local ACCO people cooperating with Pfizer; to hell with it, as this is purely a misrepresentation insofar as these people are concerned.

With kindest personal regards.

PLUTO.

[RNS-1666]

CARACAS, VENEZUELA,
April 8, 1959.

Mr. FRANK P. WILSON,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: I am sorry having to bring something else to your attention which would be completely useless to do on a local basis cuz, as you know from past experience, one would only meet denials and counter-accusations (the latter completely unfounded as ever).

As you know, our animal health line has a certain level of prices to the public/consumer below which the retailers ("distribuidores"—in local lingo) have a 20-percent discount, i.e., a 25-percent markup with reference to their purchase prices from our exclusive distributors, Protinal. This is supposed to be the same situation that Biogen should have with reference to the respective competitive items.

Many a time Dr. Luis Pecchio and myself have considered the advisability of our authorizing Protinal (Protinal would be more than willing to do this) to grant a discount to certain major retailers/semiwholesalers larger than 25 percent; however, even you yourself have never heard from us in this respect before cuz we understand that this would be out of line with what our understanding is with Biogen.

Now then, we have discovered that Biogen is giving to certain such "distribuidores" special discounts beyond that 20 percent which results in an obvious reluctance of these accounts to handle our line.

I realize that this is for all intents and purposes an incurable illness and that ACCO would never succeed in getting the local gents to allow an examination of the latter's billing practices to ascertain the accuracy of this complaint. Just the same, can you help * * * or can we at least go on record and threaten with taking, in specific cases, a similar course of action?

Please drop me a line re this matter.

With regretful sincerity,

PLUTO.

[RNS-1702]

CARACAS, VENEZUELA,
April 28, 1959.

Mr. FRANK P. WILSON,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR FRANK: Sorry having to bother you again.

For one thing, I haven't received any news from you with reference to mine (RNS-1666 of 4-8-59, personal), although I realize that the required contacts take time. I continue, however, entertaining the hope that you will let me hear from you.

Now, another item. I am attaching hereto photostat of a memorandum we received from James Matheu back in October of last year. I am also attaching hereto photostatic copy of my reply to Jim. I have a twofold reason for directly bringing this exchange of correspondence to your personal attention. To begin with, not having heard any further from Jim and the situation here with regard to Purina continuing to be the same, I am assuming that this problem is one that obviously hinges on top contacts stateside. For another, Dr. Luis Pecchiò had a conversation just a few days ago with Dr. Félix Arostegui, a Puerto Rican agronomist who handles at Biogen here everything pertaining to the farm and home ACCO line including the vet one, and, of course, the animal feed supplements. Amid drinks, Arostequi freely acknowledged the fact that Biogen locally keeps separate stocks of ACCO animal feed supplements, most particularly of Aurofac-10, specially for Purina and to be supplied to Purina at special conditions specifically authorized by ACCO. Now then, in view of the fact that to Purina here we have offered our animal feed supplements, on an indent order basis, at the corresponding f.a.s. levels quantitywise which are listed in your informational price lists, etc., and we haven't gotten anywhere with Purina in Venezuela, one must logically conclude that there must be a Negro in the woodpile. In other words, we just find ourselves completely helpless in dealing here with the Purina situation. Therefore, I am simply invoking the close friendship that Jim Matheu sez (first and second paragraphs of his memorandum to me on Purina) exists between Pfizer and Purina in the United States, in the hope that we at least be told without pulling punches what the ACCO-Purina deal re Venezuela consists on and that we be authorized to match the respective conditions even though the latter may be a slightly risky proposition if one considers that, on the other hand, we do not grant such special concessions even to Protinal.

As I did with my RNS-1666, I am sending Houghie a complete set of copies of the aforementioned communications purely for his very own personal information and consideration and with the plea that he should destroy this RNS-1702.

With kindest regards,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

JUNE 16, 1959.

Re Ralston Purina.
Mr. R. N. SILVA,
Pfizer Corp.,
Caracas, Venezuela.

DEAR RAFAEL: We have done all possible to find out how the competitor handles

this account and feel that the following information is basically correct:

First, the sales are made direct to St. Paul in the United States, and there are no local sales made in Venezuela (unless very minor) regardless of what Mr. Rosenberg has stated. The only sales that possibly could be made in Venezuela would be made at or about the local price. The reason why I say "at or about" is because you know New York has no absolute control over the prices quoted by their distributor, although they have stated that the local distributor could not quote prices which would be attractive to Ralston Purina without having the same prices come back to New York from this account in St. Paul.

The prices as quoted in the United States to this account by both of us are about the same, and therefore it looks as though, at the present, without destroying the price pattern, we cannot compete too aggressively at the local level. I know this must hurt you but it is out of my control.

However, it is a natural inclination of all purchasing agents to try and obtain a much better price than the home office and therefore it would be quite a feather in his cap if he could obtain from Pfizer a price locally which was much better than currently quoted from their St. Paul office. This, of course, could create quite a situation here and should be guarded against by you.

We know that the above does not help you obtain the sales at a local basis, yet we feel to do so on a price basis would create a situation which in the long run would be detrimental to the overall profit picture of Pfizer.

Sincerely yours,

J.P.W.

EXHIBIT 4

CARACAS,
May 29, 1957.

DEAR JOHN: When I was there last April I discussed with you the tentative price schedule we should have originally proposed for Matro.

Upon further reviewing this matter here I encounter the following situation:

Ilo: 100 x 12's (1.2 gm.), Bs. 14; 200 x 12's (2.4 gm.), Bs. 23.50.

Brythro: 100 x 12's (1.2 gm.), Bs. 10.23.

Matro: 250 x 12's (3 gm.), Bs. 34, Bs. 30, Bs. 25.60.

Terra/atras: 250 x 8's (2 gm.), Bs. 9.50; 250 x 16's (4 gm.), Bs. 17.60.

The Ilo, Brythro, and Terra/tetras (regardless of the brand of the latter) prices are the so-called "list prices" presently existing here. The three Matro prices are the ones that would be the equivalent on a gram-per-gram basis to the two Ilo and the Brythro, respectively. Please note the discrepancies with the Terra/tetras ones(please note that for the tetras including oxy- and chlor- such prices are identical here).

In view of this situation, senor Franco and I prefer to let you decide which one should be the level at which we should propose predatedly the Matro prices. We should be happy to oblige.

Two copies of this personal memorandum I am attaching hereto, one for FP and the other for AMDeB, so that they may have a chance to help you out in what I would appreciate your conveying to me in an equally personal memorandum.

Cordially,

RAFAEL.

NEW YORK A CARACAS:

En nuestro cablegrama de fecha 18 del presente dirigido idefra Caracas. Favor insertar como firma del expedidor Morton.

IDEFRA,
Caracas.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1957.

NEW YORK (USA):

"Morton reorder 18th FSPRCS were higher owing samje samfa samdy matci matog having been figured basis plus percentage for lamef etc. rather than torhu etc. Sending corrected P10155 forms with fsprcs similar torhu etc.

PFIZERVEN.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1957.

Mr. N. A. MORTON,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.
Pricing.

I am sorry that I did not reply to your idefra wire of September 18, 1957, until yesterday. The message I wired you was the following:

"Morton reorder 18th FSPRCS were higher owing samje samfa sandy matci matog having been figured basis plus percentage for lamef etc rather than torhu etc. Sending corrected P10155 forms with FSPRCS similar torhu etc."

In the point of fact, may I explain to you that our FAS prices for LAMEF & Co. are slightly higher than those for TORHU & Co., owing to the fact that the latter line has a more complete variety of dosage forms owing to which, and because of the cost vs. weight ratio, the transportation, insurance, and other "plus" factors listed on the P-101-55 forms, gives us a higher percentage (5 percent) in the case of TORHU & Co. than in the case of LAMEF & Co.

Inasmuch as we presume, on the basis of your above-cited idefra wire, that you would rather have us follow the TORHU line instead of the LAMEF one when dealing with SAMJE & Co. and MATCI & Co., we have revised the P-101-55 forms we were just about to send you on SAMJE & Co. and MATCI & Co. when your idefra wire came, in order to fall in line with what we surmise is your wish.

Your idefra wire is also asking us for "compet" data to be included in the respective P-101-55 forms. You will recall that last June, at lunch time, Allen, Frank, John, and myself agreed that SAMJE & Co. should locally follow here the TORHU & Co. party line, and that MATCI & Co. should do likewise. Specially in connection with MATCI & Co. John could once more show you my personal memorandum to him dated May 29, 1957, in which I reviewed the flabbergasting local MATCI & Co. "compet" data. At the same luncheon engagement we all agreed that, consequently, MATCI & Co. should be placed in line with TORHU & Co. regardless of ILO and its relatives.

Toodle-oo, old boy.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

Date: October 11, 1957.
To: Mr. R. Silva, Caracas.
From: New York Pricing Department.
Subject: Family relations.

Kindly refer to your memorandum No. RNS-783 dated September 25.

Enjoyed your message and understand the company relationships which exist in Venezuela. Since I am the only one presently in New York who enjoyed lunch with you last June, I am taking the opportunity of reminding you of our pleasant discussion.

I concur with your thoughts concerning our luncheon date that Samje & Co. should follow the Torhu & Co. family line in your neighborhood. It would also seem logical that your FAS be in with Lamef & Co. and the explanation in your second paragraph seems very logical to me and certainly would substantiate any questions concerning Samje & Co.'s local activity; and so in a nutshell, we will not use the FAS as indicated with form P-101-55, but will use those pertaining to 71603-18-1, 71603-16-1, and 71603-08-1 now in your possession.

Now the other half of our conversation at lunch time seems to fall in a slightly different direction. As I recall, we discussed the Matci & Co. family problems and how these problems were solved in Cuba. We mentioned that Matci & Co. was announced in Cuba at "compet" with the understanding that if happiness and success was not to be enjoyed, Matci & Co. would move in to the same apartment and floor currently being maintained by Torhu & Co. This establishes a good record in case the teachers and principals of our family question us. I was under the impression after lunch time that you would proceed to announce Matci & Co. locally with "compet," thus being consistent. (This was to be done whether Matci & Co. was or was not available.) Naturally, this would make us consistent and clean. We also indicated that when you wanted to really get to work with this company, we would cooperate and comply with your request that Matci & Co. get their feet on the ground and be consistent with Torhu & Co.

If this has been the fact, then we are in agreement and you can now relate Matci & Co. with Torhu & Co. locally. If for some reason this has not been done, we suggest you do so, complain about it and change it. We will assume it has been done or you are doing it and FAS will be based on the final family line.

J. T. SMART.

OCTOBER 11, 1957.

Mr. R. SILVA,
Caracas-New York pricing department.
Family relations.

Kindly refer to your memorandum No. RNS-783 dated September 25.

Enjoyed your message and understand the company relationships which exist in Venezuela. Since I am the only one presently in New York who enjoyed lunch with you last June, I am taking the opportunity of reminding you of our pleasant discussion.

I concur with your thoughts concerning our luncheon date that Samje & Co. should follow the Torhu & Co. family line in your neighborhood. It would also seem logical that your f.a.s. be in line with Lampf & Co. and the explanation in your second paragraph seems very logical to me and certainly would substantiate any questions concerning Samje & Co.'s local activity; and so in a nutshell, we will not use the f.a.s. as indicated with form P-101-55, but will use those pertaining to 71603-18-1, 71603-16-1 and 71603-08-1 now in your possession.

Now the other half of our conversation at lunchtime seems to fall in a slightly different direction. As I recall, we discussed the Natoi & Co. family problems and how these problems were solved in Cuba. We mentioned that Natoi & Co. was announced in Cuba at "compet" with the understanding that if happiness and success was not to be enjoyed, Natoi & Co. would move into the same apartment and floor currently being maintained by Torhu & Co. This establishes a good record in case the vouchers and principals of our family question us. I was under the impression after lunchtime that you would proceed to announce Natoi & Co. locally with "compet," thus being consistent. (This was to be done whether Natoi & Co. was or was not available.) Naturally, this would make us consistent and clean. We also indicated that when you wanted to really get to work with this company, we would cooperate and comply with your request that Natoi & Co. get their feet on the ground and be consistent with Torhu & Co.

If this has been the fact, then we are in agreement and you can now relate Natoi &

Co. with Torhu & Co. locally. If for some reason this has not been done, we suggest you do so, complain about it and change it. We will assume it has been done or you are doing it and f.a.s. will be based on the final family line.

J. T. SMART.

MEMORANDUM

Date: October 30, 1957.
To: Mr. R. Silva-Caracas.
From: New York Pricing Department.
Subject: Matromycin.

Kindly refer to our memorandum No. NY-VEN-29 dated October 11.

Unfortunately, we have not received your reply and we can no longer delay the establishment of your branch prices for Matromycin 12's and 100's. Therefore, we have priced the Matromycin items on order No. 695-66-1 based on our calculations in New York. We hope that the branch prices so established will be in line with your recommendations which we hope to receive in the near future.

J. T. SMART.

Date: October 14, 1957.
To: Mr. T. J. Raineri.
From: Pricing department.
Subject: Prices—Venezuela.

Should you have the opportunity to discuss our memorandum of October 12 with Mr. R. Silva, we would appreciate your mentioning the following points:

1. Sigmamycin should be priced at the Tetracyn levels for the purposes of billing the branch. This higher branch price and consequently, the higher landed cost in Venezuela, should justify the local market price levels which are to be established.

2. As we mentioned to Rafael, it was our desire to have our records indicate we had established Matromycin at the unusual high competitive levels. Once we had this in our records for a short period of time, it was our understanding that a complaint would be registered with the recommendation that we reduce the prices to the levels of Terramycin. Naturally, we would comply with Rafael's request and launch the product at the Terramycin levels.

3. If this establishment of records has not been accomplished, we suggest that it be done immediately. We will be happy to help on this by issuing a price change authorization if you will bring back from Venezuela the attached penciled product price schedule listing theoretical prices for Matromycin 250 capsules x 12's and 100's.

4. The matromycin capsules 250 x 100's is at the levels of Terramycin and we will propose Rafael's prices for this dosage form. On the other hand, the pack of 12's appears to be more closely priced with the Terramycin. 250 x 16's than the 8's.

Price per gram

	Proposed matromycin 12's	Terramycin	
		8's	16's
Public price	5.666	6.125	5.50
List price	4.333	4.75	4.25
To retailer	40.73	4.465	3.995
To wholesaler	3.466	3.80	3.40

It would appear that Matromycin 12's should have a list price of 4.50 per gram which we hope results in a price to the wholesaler of about 3.60. If Mr. Silva agrees to this per gram price, will you please bring back with you product price schedules establishing these prices.

We trust that this explanation will permit you to discuss the subject with Mr. Silva and that the local market prices can be established promptly upon your return to New York. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

J. T. SMART.

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

NOVEMBER 9, 1957.

Mr. J. T. SMART—New York
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA—Caracas
Mr. J. FRANCO
Mr. M. C. HOUGH
Mr. N. A. MORTON
Personal—family relations.

Reference is made herein to your NY-VEN-29 of October 11, 1957 and to your NY-VEN-30 of October 30, 1957, plus to the one you gave to Tully dated October 14, 1957.

Attached hereto you'll find the following papers:

(a) VEN-20-A, wherein the two list prices set forth we believe have an accurate correlation on a gram-per-gram basis, with the exception of the minor rounding off to comply with the peculiarities, already known to you, of the Venezuelan currency when it comes to figures of less than Bs0.05, such fractions being uncollectable.

(b) VEN-140, where we raise hell and make MATCI follow the corresponding terra party line. I'm sorry to say that we're in disagreement with your October 14, 1957, memo to Tully; we are using a list price of the Bs13.25 owing to the fact that (speaking of list prices only), terra caps 250 mgm. 8's being Bs9.50 and 16s being Bs17.00, 8 plus 16 being 24, and Bs9.50 plus Bs17.00 adding up to Bs26.50, so if 12 is one-half of 24 likewise Bs13.25 is one-half of Bs26.50.

(c) VEN-20-B, wherein we use a list price of Bs199.70 because terra caps 250 mgm. 100's are Bs90.00, and matro caps 250 mgm. are Bs13.25, the ratio being 14.72 percent, so Bs29.40 (please see VEN-20-A) is the 14.72 percent of 199.70.

(d) VEN-141, wherein we again raise hell, and make matro caps 250 mgm. 100's follow the corresponding terra party line.

I hope these preschedules throw a reasonable amount of peace into the MATCI & Co. family relations.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

P.S. I know your electric calculator is like a machinegun in your capable hands. When verifying the figures given in the above said preschedule, please bear in mind the fact that, whenever we had to set forth a local external price, some rounding off had to be made when necessary in order to make the corresponding figures fully collectable as indicated above.

P.P.S. With reference to your NY-VEN-30, we hope that these preschedules will reach you in time to be used, if OK with you, in connection with the first trip to Caracas of MATCI & Co. Thank you.

PRODUCT PRICE SCHEDULE

Venezuela, October 14. Matro 250 mg. 12's.

List price:
Present Pfizer schedule, $30.
Present competitive schedule, $13.50.
Remarks: Impossible to sell at these prices. Must be in line with Lena, etc.

A product price schedule in duplicate must accompany all requests for price revisions.

PRODUCT PRICE SCHEDULE

Venezuela, June 12, 1957. Matro 259 mg. 12's.

List price:
Present Pfizer schedule, $30.
Present competitive schedule, $23.50.

A product price schedule in duplicate must accompany all requests for price revisions.

[RNS-1745]

MAY 19, 1959.

Re Venezuelan pricing situation.
Mr. W. J. DONOHUE,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mr. C. G. HURLIMANN,
PAUL P. MCDERMOTT, Esq.
Mr. F. P. WILSON.

I have received today your cable reading as follows:

"Silva if U.S. Government representative requests info as to our products advise New York McDermott by cable and forward request direct New York McDermott."

This morning too I had the opportunity to basically discuss over the phone the same problem with Conrad and Houghie.

As of this moment (for the situation is very fluid), the whole thing could be summed up in this manner:

(a) Definitely the question of medicinal prices continues to be a political football of great importance, definitely the Government continues to investigate back and forth, and definitely something is bound to happen.

(b) Up to the present, other than the requirement enacted late last year to the effect that each package of finished pharmaceuticals for human use should carry stamped on the outside the public price, no concrete measure has been taken save for the fact that price authorization requests filed with the Ministry of Development in connection with human pharmaceuticals have not been approved yet. I am not referring to Pfizer for fortunately enough we have not of late experienced the urgent need to file any such requests and, anyway, before doing so, we'd rather wait till we see what is exactly going to happen to those competitors of ours who did already file requests of this nature.

(c) One thing we do know; i.e., that the above requests are not being considered lightly. This simply means that all such requests have prompted the Government to in turn request the applicants to furnish miscellaneous data such as billing prices to Venezuela, complete internal price structures in the country, selling prices in the countries of origin, and billing prices to other Latin American countries as well with apparent emphasis on Mexico and Panama.

(d) We do know also that the Venezuelan Government is asking the local legations/embassies of the respective countries of origin for data re billing prices to Venezuela, various selling price levels in the countries of origin and billing prices to other Latin American countries.

(e) If we are locally approached by the U.S. Embassy in connection with what the previous paragraph refers to, we shall play dumb turning over to Paul in New York the case as per your wireless instructions, something we wholeheartedly agree with.

(f) With reference to the previous paragraph, upon comparing our human antibiotic billing prices to Venezuela with Pfizer's billing prices to domestic wholesalers and with Lederle's (I don't have Pfizer's) billing prices to the U.S. Government, it seems to me that said Pfizer billing prices to Venezuela are the lowest of the three. This is, as you know, an excellent argument insofar as Venezuela is concerned, but, may I humbly raise the question, should Pfizer put any U.S. Government official in the know to the effect that our billing prices to Venezuela are lower than our selling prices to the U.S. Government? As far as we locally are concerned I don't think the disclosure of this information is essential in connection with the local Venezuelan pricing problem.

(g) Nobody but nobody, I think, is in a position to say what is exactly going to happen here except that something is going to happen. One very likely probability is that we would be forced to sell directly to retailers at our current prices to wholesalers, thus bringing about a reduction of public prices while keeping the retailer's profit margin within constrained limits.

(h) I don't know to what extent this recommendation may be welcome, but, just the same, I should like to suggest that, if the New York headquarters are approached there in connection with the Venezuelan case, we here be confidentially informed as to what the reply is going to be like in case we here again were in a position to make helpful comments which would make it easier for the New York headquarters to go ahead in a safer fashion in dealing with such a delicate situation which is fraught with im/complications.

Needless to say, if and when any major development should take place here, we would advise headquarters without delay. Incidentally, as I told Conrad this morning over the phone, this continuing unsettled situation coupled with pertinent factors unrelated to pricing has caused us to temporarily postpone making in writing a pretty final proposal with reference to the investment project for Venezuela that Conrad and Houghie looked into on the occasion of their last visit to Caracas recently.

With kindest regards.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

P.S.: With reference to paragraph (f), it would be a lot safer to bring out the reality that the prices to the public (Government approved) in Venezuela, of the majority of our finished human pharmacuticals, are lower than the respective prices to the public in the U.S.A. (the country of origin). Thank you.

JUNE 18, 1959.

PFIZERSUB,
New York (U.S.A.):

McDermott Embassy representative came today requesting data. Please refer memo RNS1745 May 19th, addressed Donohue, copy yourself as info wanted was meager and publicly known, see no reason for alarm, writing details.

Regards,

RAFAEL.

[RNS-1796]

JUNE 22, 1959.

PAUL P. MCDERMOTT, Esq.,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.
Re request for data.

On 6-18-59 I wired you the following message:

"McDermott Embassy representative came today requesting data, please refer memo RNS1745 May 19th, addressed Donohue copy yourself as info wanted was meager and publicly known, see no reason for alarm, writing details. Regards."

What actually happened was that Mr. Eldon Joseph Cassoday phoned me on 6-17-59 saying that he, as First Secretary to the U.S. Embassy here and as the person in charge of commercial affairs, would appreciate my receiving his Assistant, Mr. Russell Edward Olson, a Third Secretary, who had been detailed to look me up to obtain certain commercial data.

Not knowing what the score was, I welcomed Mr. Olson the following day, who explained to me that the Department of Commerce, at the request of the U.S. Congress, was gathering certain data abroad with regard to drug prices.

Specifically, Mr. Olson wanted to know about the following:

(a) If the Pfizer products sold in Venezuela were manufactured within the country. He already knew that they weren't and I simply confirmed verbally this publicly known fact.

(b) If said products were distributed in Venezuela by Pfizer Corp., to which he obviously already knew the answer.

(c) If, in connection with a listing of a rather small group of pharmaceutical dosage forms for human use (including some of Pfizer such as terramycin capsules 250 16s, same for tetracyn, moderil tabs, and diabinese tabs) were retailed at the prices established by decree of the Ministry of Development late last year. He too did know the answer except for moderil and diabinese which he couldn't locate at any drugstore and I simply told him that they were not available in Venezuela.

(d) He sort of wanted to know what were the prices at which the retailers would buy human pharmaceuticals in general and I kind of insinuated to him that said prices would vary somewhat depending upon the relationship between a given retailer and a given wholesaler, etc., but he understood that on the whole a retailer makes a 30 percent markup, something which is inaccurate because below the respective purchase price the retailers enjoy certain discounts including from us.

(e) He wanted to know who sold a few items that he could not locate here from U.S. manufacturer such as Chlorpromazine (this one, for instance, is sold in Venezuela from French origin only) and I helped him out with explanations in this respect.

In a nutshell, his visit was basically of a chatty nature, he impressed me as a young man bored with the factfinding he was entrusted with, and as someone who had already been given the runaround, also, by other people he had previously interviewed without his actually getting to the core of the matter.

I was quite mindful of the instructions given me by cable from Mexico by Bill Donohue to the effect that all such requests for data should be referred to your good self. I am sure that you will agree with me that in view of the meagerness of the information Mr. Olson wanted and in view as well of the fact that he was already in possession of the general data, publicly known, described above, it might, if anything, have produced adverse results if I would have refused in an outright manner to discuss the matter with him at all.

Please rest assured that if these people want to secure price lists from us, or information about costs and f.a.s. values, etc., I shall diplomatically remain mum while referring the case to your office.

With kindest regards,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

VENEZUELAN PRICING SITUATION

[Strictly personal and confidential]

AUGUST 14, 1959.

RNS-1890
Mr. CONRAD G. HURLIMANN,
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mexico
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

I ain't going to pull any punches in this memo as this is the only way I can give you (and New York through Conrad) a picture clear enough on the above subject. Naturally, you and Conrad may even wish to destroy this piece of correspondence for obvious reasons.

BACKGROUND

Back in 1944 drug prices were frozen at the retail level; it was also established (no provisions were made re locally made items) about new pharmaceutical dosage forms that would thereafter be imported into Venezuela, the importer could make a 25 percent markup over his warehouse costs (C.i.f. and landing charges and transportation from port of entry to warehouse) when selling to the wholesaler, the latter 15 percent when selling to the retailer and this one 30 percent when selling to the consumer; no provisions were made as to what should be the case when the importer would sell directly to the retailer. In 1952 antibiotic preparations were regulated on a special basis, i.e., the same as above except that the markup levels were set at 12, 10, and 15 percent respectively. These regulations had fallen into disuse and the wholesalers and the retailers were having a somewhat merry time, but, said regulations have never been revoked, and, therefore, legally they continued to be very much mandatory. One firm acted very wisely, and that was Biogen (the Lederle distributors) that, in connection with the Lederle products, made up price structures so that their selling prices to wholesalers were basically tagged at the 25 or 12 percent markup depending upon whether the items involved were nonantibiotic ones or not. When I came here with Pfizer in 1956, I found out that we were completely ignoring such regulations; in the spring of 1957, practically over the dead body of Price-Waterhouse and against the reluctance of some New York executives, I proposed and obtained that billing prices to Venezuela be revised to conform with the above regulations and we made accounting adjustments so that we would appear to be good boys retroactively to December 1, 1956. During the past few years a very strong boisterous campaign has been conducted against the pharmaceutical industry in Venezuela, accusing the trade of making outrageous profits, when making and/or selling drugs at all levels. The background of this campaign, which I have—I believe—described to you people before, is outlined in the attached aide-mémoire which I'll explain about hereinafter. Late in 1958 we all importers and local manufacturers were asked by the Ministry of Development to submit a listing of our prices to retailers, something which we did ignoring the confidential discounts generally in use throughout this market, and on this basis the Director of Commerce of the Ministry of Development made it compulsory that human pharmaceuticals should carry stamped on each package the respective prices to the public which were arrived at, in most instances, by allowing the retailer a 30 percent markup over the price levels by us submitted.

Meanwhile too the same Ministry of Development has been conducting an exhaustive investigation of the drug prices in general, initially with particular emphasis on human antibiotic preparations. Legal opinion is to the effect, unanimously so, that the Ministry of Development has the power to request from us any type of local data that may be wanted; consequently we have had to turn in many kinds of information on landing and operational costs, etc. AFIDRO, the national association of pharmaceutical manufacturers and distributors—we are one of its members—has been most helpful in trying to help solve the situation in a manner that we would come out not too badly beaten. The Ministry of Development is under very strong pressure on the part of socialistic-minded M.D.'s of Sanidad, of the Seguro Social, of the Venezuelan Medical Federation and others. I have been of late acting as chairman of a 4-man committee appointed by AFIDRO to discuss with Fomento the whole problem; furthermore, I have been leaving of late, in consideration of the seriousness of the situation, no stone unturned (please excuse my apparently praising myself) and I have taken the initiative of making a series of contacts, of propitiating a series of private agreements within the trade, etc. The brdspctrm importers (only Lederle and Pfizer have consistently been complying with the 12-percent antibiotic markup; Bristol, at my suggestion, took advantage of their setting up their branch here to do likewise) agreed to give Fomento warehouse costs at certain levels,

Lederle's being the highest and Lepetit the lowest. Many a cloakish approach has been made taking advantage of personal and/or official means of contacting the people involved in both sides. Mr. John E. Finch (Squibb's manager here) and myself took the matter up with the commercial attaché of the U.S. Embassy who, much to our surprise, said that the Embassy had poor contacts with Fomento (imagine this * * * Fomento controls protection to the local industry, import licenses, prices and other basic functions of economic nature), that the Embassy would prefer to wait till the blow would take place before taking any action; please be assured that Mr. Finch and myself were most careful about what we said to that Embassy official. To go on record as having pointed out to the Embassy that this situation is nothing to laugh about, I have sent, with just my card clipped onto it, the attached aide-mémoire (unsigned and on plain paper) to the commercial attaché and to the Ambassador himself. AFIDRO, inasmuch as it seems that the issuance of a decree on human antibiotic prices is only a few days away, voted in favor of my proposal that AFIDRO, upon finding out that the Government no longer wishes to discuss the matter with the industry, should go on record too by sending a white paper official letter to the Minister of Development outlining the problem, outlining the gist of what has transpired in conversations held between AFIDRO and the Government, and going down on record as to what the consequences would be if the Government does what apparently it is going to do; I have been appointed one of the three members whose responsibility will be early next week to draft the communication in question.

FUTURE

The governmental decree in the making—I found out this morning through a close friend of the incumbent Director of Commerce at Fomento—will establish new retail prices for all imported human antibiotic preparations presently in the market. They are going to apparently use a formula to arrive at said prices by computing over the individual warehouse costs a 20-percent markup for the importer, a 20-percent one for the wholesaler and a 30-percent one for the retailer; this formula, however, will not be made public. If the formula would lead to a higher retail price for a given product of a given firm than the one presently authorized since late in 1960, then the retail price will not be changed. If the formula, on the other hand, gives a lower retail price, then this one will be adopted.

The consequences are likely to be the following:

(a) The Lederle and Pfizer retail prices would be the same as now. In all likelihood the same would apply to Bristol and Squibb.

(b) The Lepetit and Hoochst retail prices are in all probability going to be much lower.

(c) The national industry (Venezuelan and foreign-owned alike) could not manufacture locally the respective products at a cost that would permit matching the lowest retail prices of the respective imported equivalents. The Government, on the other hand, could not give protection to the national industry re those items because it would result in costly drugs.

(d) Pfizer, Lederle, and other American houses would then face a puzzling sitation. If we go down to the lowest competitive levels, how could we explain then our previously submitted costs? And how could we afford to have from the States billing prices much lower than the ones used stateside with the U.S. Government? If we don't go down, how can we sell? Maybe the solution might be, as suggested recently here in Caracas by two visiting Squibb executives, that of dumping into Venezuela products made in Italy, Japan, or some other low-cost country. As for local production, many factors would have to be considered, in the light of the present situation and in the light particularly of what is about to happen, before one could say that that is the solution.

(e) Prices to the Government, presently not under discussion, are likely to sharply go down accordingly.

(f) The wholesalers and retailers are likely to quarrel with us over who makes what and on what, as the Government is apparently not going to say anything other than fixing retail ceilings.

(g) As a period of grace during which to make the price adjustments is apparently going to be granted, sales are likely to go down and our customers are likely to attempt to return to us higher priced units.

The Venezuelan Government is investigating billing prices of foreign firms to other countries. In this respect Ecuador appears to gloomily loom on the horizon, as Lepetit is selling the Ecuadorian Government, c.i.f. Guayaquil, in U.S. dollar values, tetracycline, 259 mgm. capsules 100's at $15.10, 100 mgm., IM at $.49 and 250 mgm., IV at $1.05. Our Government is investigating antibiotic prices in Chile and in Colombia. Our Government feels on the other hand, that Cuba should not be taken into consideration as prices there were forced down dictatorially.

So, Houghie, goes the story. I have omitted many a detail so as to try to get this memo out today. I am afraid, though, that before long we might have to revise the 1960 Venezuelan budget.

With kindest regards,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

AIDE-MEMOIRE

The Venezuelan Government, through the Director de Comercio of the Ministerio de Fomento, seems to be about to take pretty drastic steps re prices to the public and to pharmaceutical wholesalers and retailers in connection with antibiotic preparations for human use.

The background is as follows. There has been in this market a very active, boisterous, and effective public relations campaign, chiefly through the press, quietly drummed up by a socialistic-minded, very influential physician in governmental and medical circles, Dr. Armando Castillo-Plaza, presently the Director de Asuntos Socialos of the Ministry of Health and Public Welfare, who is a disgruntled former employee of the local distributors of Lederle Laboratories. Dr. Castillo has in the past, through the Venezuelan Medical Federation, tried to exact outrageous tributes from the pharmaceutical trade toward the funds of said professional association. Having failed in his efforts, he is trying to cause the Venezuelan Government to establish a national laboratory to monopolize the supply of pharmaceutical products in general as much as possible that governmental entities, including the social security, consume in very appreciable quantities, and to eventually sell such products through regular trade channels as well. At present, these efforts seem to run in the direction of the creation of a National Institute of Antibiotics, taking advantage of the fact that narrow-spectrum antibiotics (penicillin and streptomycin in particular) are cheaply available in bulk from Western European sources and that broad-spectrum antibiotics (tetracyclines in particular) are also cheaply available in bulk from sources behind the Iron Curtain in violation of U.S. patents that would be very difficult to enforce in Venezuela if the Government itself would become involved in this type of trade. As it would be probably impossible, for a number of reasons, to directly come out and practically put the entire pharmaceutical manufacture and commerce in the hands of a Government-owned-and-run monopoly, efforts are being made in a different direction but that would in the end lead to the same destination. This is how. The Ministry of Development has been conducting a drug price investigation chiefly with reference to the importers and distributors of antibiotics for use in human medicine, said investigation and the resulting measures to be gradually broadened to cover all drugs brought into the country. Owing to requests that may not be legally unheeded, the respective firms have had to supply all kinds of data to Fomento including income tax returns, importation costs and whatnot. The Government is apparently planning to issue very shortly a decree allowing each importer of human antibiotic products a very limited markup only. This measure would, if enacted, make it impossible for the respective products of U.S. origin to be sold in Venezuela, as there are a number of factors that enter into the picture. One such factor is that most such antibiotics, Fomento knows, do have European equivalents that are being brought into and sold in Venezuela on the basis of very low warehouse costs; true, presently the respective importers from European sources do sell such products here at prices roughly equivalent to the American ones in this market, but if the price regulation is to be based upon equal markups, percentagewise, then the American firms would be unable to operate in this field of human antibiotic products, with the exception of some such products for which there are no European equivalents and that accounts for only a very small share of this particular business field.

It is suggested that the U.S. Embassy would, in an unofficial, casual, private and friendly manner, bring to the attention of the respective Venezuelan Government officials the impact which the contemplated measure about to be enacted would have upon the U.S. pharmaceutical industry operations in Venezuela. Several points could be brought forth such as the fact that retail prices of U.S. antibiotic preparations for human use are generally lower in this country than they are in the U.S.A. owing to price control regulations in existence in Venezuela since World War II times; the respective U.S. manufacturers bill said drugs to Venezuela at prices basically similar to the billing prices applicable to the U.S. wholesalers, and these antibiotic products coming into Venezuela duty free in most instances and being of light weight, and the Venezuelan wholesalers and retailers having limited markups, this is why said retail prices tend to be lower here than in the U.S.A. Another factor to consider is that the U.S. drug firms are making tremendous contributions to the welfare of mankind through costly and well-directed research work—the local officials seem to shrug off this matter. A good point too is that U.S. firms make some other products available at no profit and even at a loss for good will reasons and because such products are essential for the practice of medicine.

Governments of other Latin American countries, such as has been recently the case of Mexico, have tackled the problem of the high cost of drugs through friendly conversations with the industry, and have not adopted, Cuba being the exception, steps that, one way or the other, would be discriminatory against the American interests.

Once the Venezuelan Government would come forth with a new measure, it would be difficult for said measure to be rectified. Moreover, if what appears to be in the making takes place, the local pharmaceutical industry, regardless of who owns what, would be unable to manufacture to any extent the respective products in the country because of the local production costs being higher for a number of reasons. This would be a point where, as the Castillo Plaza-headed medical clique aspires, it would be quite easy for the Government to justify the creation of a

Government owned and run pharmaceutical drug lab to make antibiotic preparations and gradually but swiftly broaden its activities into other drug fields.

More data, chiefly about specific detailed ideas and/or names, would gladly be submitted upon request. The main points are, however, that it would be best to take action right now rather than later, and that, should the contemplated measure be enacted as expected, this would constitute a heavy blow to the U.S. pharmaceutical international trade not only in Venezuela but with international repercussions as well, mainly in other Latin American countries. Furthermore, if the U.S. pharmaceutical firms are forced, for economic reasons, to withdraw to a large extent from the Venezuelan market, publicly they would be considered as doing something detrimental to the welfare of the country, etc.

Respectfully submitted.

CARACAS, *August 13, 1959.*

[Private and confidential]

CARACAS, *August 7, 1959.*

Mr. H. F. BLISS,
Cyanamid International,
30 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR HARRY: I wish to inform you about the latest developments as to the price regulation which is being proposed by the Dirección de Comercio (Commerce Secretary) of the Ministry of Development.

On Saturday, August 1, Dr. Thula Campos, Secretary of Commerce, called a meeting of the members of the board of AFIDRO (laboratory association). This meeting I was unable to attend. There Dr. Thula Campos informed them that he would not only address them as Secretary of Commerce and Assistant to the Minister but also under precise instructions from the President of the Republic. That it had been decided to make a drastic reduction of the prices of medicines because the Government considered, after having studied the reports submitted by the laboratories, that there definitely existed speculation. This regulation would commence with the imported antibiotics and vitamin products (among which are antianemics, geriatrics, etc.). But, that at the same time the Government was willing to reduce the cost of living of the population, it did not want to damage the pharmaceutical business and therefore suggested to the Directors of AFIDRO that they propose to the Secretariat of Commerce the percentages with which the prices to the public should be reduced.

In the case that AFIDRO should not propose a substantial reduction in antibiotics and vitamins, there would be proceeded with a drastic and immediate regulation of all medicines.

As an outcome of these words by the Secretary of Commerce, a meeting of the members of AFIDRO was held Tuesday 4th inst. wherein the president of the association reported on the happenings and proposed to the assembly that they consider the alternatives put forth by Dr. Thula Campos. In this meeting the majority voted for a price regulation of imported antibiotics and vitamins. Unfortunately the representatives of Pfizer, Hoechst, and Lepetit did not attend the meeting. The representative for Squibb, an American newly arrived in Venezuela who speaks very little Spanish, voted against his own interests, which he realized after the meeting was over. Only the representative of Bristol and myself voted against a regulation of the antibiotics. Although the vote was 2 against 26 I managed to get the voting annulled arguing that it was an intervention of foreign companies in our enterprise and that I was not willing to accept even if I had to resign my place as director and founding member of that association. At the same time I suggested that AFIDRO accept a 10-percent regulation on the retail price of all medicinal products sold in the country which total amount is calculated at Bs450 million annually. Furthermore, that it also be suggested to the Ministry of Development the no intervention in the price scale and discounts which we grant in the different distribution channels, that the frozen-price decree passed last October be repealed and that starting from this new price-regulation order, the price to the public be fixed annually according to the index of cost of living which the Banco Central de Venezuela publishes in its annual report.

The majority of the importing firms were in accordance with this proposal, however, not so the national laboratories. In view of this a final decision was postponed to a new meeting which will be held this afternoon.

Yesterday morning I was called to the Secretariat of Commerce were I was met by Dr. Thula Campos and he informed me that he knew that North American manufacturers were very smart and that they had prepared themselves by modifying invoices to make ineffective any action which the Venezuelan Government might take, wherefore he considered false the information on the price of antibiotics submitted by Laboratorios Biogen. As you know some days ago we handed that office all the details of costs, cost of importation, orders to you, etc., on the antibiotics. Dr. Thula Campos added, that the costs submitted by us were too high, that he was sending a representative of the Government of Venezuela to the United States to verify these costs and that if his doubts were confirmed I would have to face a Bs200,000 fine plus a jail sentence. To such strong words I replied with like firmness until achieving that this person adopt a more reasonable attitude.

This interview or inquisition lasted 3 hours and from it I reached the following conclusions:

1. The Secretariat of Commerce does not accept a 10-percent reduction on the price to the public, although this means a yearly savings to the consumer of Bs 45 million, that is, a sum far above that of the total sales of tetracyclins in Venezuela.

2. Dr. Thula Campos considers that any price reduction of the tetracyclins less than 30 percent on the retail price would not be accepted by that office.

3. They showed me the cost index's presented by our competitors. Among them there is one which makes a 60-percent benefit above cost, but unfortunately I was unable to read his name (see letter of Mr. R. Pagan Torres dated July 7, 1959).

4. The Secretariat of Commerce will proceed, after decreeing the regulation of the price of antibiotics with the vitamins, and so on successively with all imported products.

5. The possibility of avoiding any reduction exists only with the locally made products.

That same afternoon the representatives of tetracyclins, whom I had called, met in my office, with the purpse of discussing the developments of the meeting of AFIDRO on the 4th inst., and to reach a unanimous proposition on our part, seeing as we are the most affected. Present at this meeting were Dr. Silva, of Pfizer, Dr. Finch, of Squibb, Messrs. Rubio and Ayala, of Bristol, Mr. Kust, representative of Remedia, which represents Hoechst and who excused himself for not having the authority to take any decision, Dr. Mason representative of Lepetit did not come to the meeting.

There we decided not to accept in this afternoon's meeting that the firms which do not represent tetracyclins intervene or give their opinion as to the regulation of these products, wherefore this meeting is of no consequence to the facts of this letter. In this meeting, also, I informed them of those points I considered prudent they should know about my meeting with Dr. Thula Campos. It is obvious that only a European manufacturer could have such benefits and so it was acknowledged by the American manufacturers present.

If the regulation which Dr. Thula Campos wishes to make with a rebate of 30 percent on the retail price is carried out, the price scale of acromycin on this market would be as follows (on the basis of the 250 mg. bottle x 16 capsules):

Retail price	Bs16.10
Pharmacy price	12.38
Wholesale price	9.90

In view of this Mr. French of Squibb said that naturally this wholesale price of Bs9.90 would be below the cost of the American manufacturers, that Squibb is not willing to give this market to the European manufacturers and as they will soon finish their manufacturing plant in Japan, where costs are below even those of Europe, he would possibly receive tetracyclins from that country.

Now I wish to underline that we have presented our costs based on the f.a.s. price of $4.04 which is the price at which Lederle sells to all the countries of the world. So I demonstrated it to Dr. Thula Campos in my interview with him, showing the list of prices of the representatives and distributors of Lederle in Latin America, invoices of Cyanamid Inter-American to oil companies which operate in Venezuela and invoices of Cyanamid Great Britain, Ltd., to Sheel Petroleum Corp., for use in Venezuela. I do not know whom the representative of the Venezuelan Government is going to get in touch with, or whether he is leaving or has left for the United States. Naturally he will pay a visit to Lederle, where I hope you will be able to prove that our prices are $4.04 f.a.s. (on the basis of the 250-mg. bottle by 16 capsules). As to this the ball is in your court.

Here it is now very little what we can do. Next week my father and I shall call on the Minister of Development to complain about the attitude of his Secretary of Commerce and try once more to warn him as to the consequences which such regulation as that which this gentleman is trying to carry out, informing him that contrary to the rest of the Latin American countries where regulations have been carried out of late, specifically in the case of Mexico last week, where it is only intended to equal the prices to those of the American domestic market, here where the prices are much less, the intentions are to make the manufacturing and distributing firms lose money.

I understand that the price scale in the United States on the basis of the 250x16 bottle is the following:

Retail price	$8.50
Pharmacy price	5.10
Wholesale price	4.25

I consider it would be convenient to our mutual interests that you send me immediately by air mail a product description catalog and a salesman product and package manual, which I understand include the whole scale of prices for the domestic market.

I take this opportunity to urge once more to send us the information for the manufacture of your products in Venezuela. My correspondance on this subject has not been replied to, although I well know that the New York office has the best of intentions and wishes in this respect, it seems that Pearl River does not send the necessary information to New York. If we at this date had been manufacturing the products here we would have nothing to fear as to price regulation of pharmaceutical products.

With my best regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

LABORATORIOS BIOGEN, O. A.
LUIS H. BALL M.

VENEZUELAN PRICING SITUATION

[Strictly Personal and Confidential]

RNS–1893.

AUGUST 17, 1959.

Mr. CONRAD G. HURLIMANN,
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

Further to my memo RNS–1890 of 8–14–59, I should like to make the following comments:

1. Said memo was written in very great haste. Therefore, please excuse some transcription errors such as "likehood" instead of "likelihood."

2. As you know it already, we, the brdspctrm importers, got together when Fomento was inquiring about our warehouse costs, and exchanged information as to the respective billing prices from abroad taking as a basis 250 mgm. caps 16's. Biogen was the highest at US$4.04 although it's quite possible that part of the confidential commissions and allowances Biogen receives, this outfit may enter into the local books a 10 percent commission from ACCO which would bring down that price to about US$3.64. Next were Pfizer & Bristol averaging US$3.40, this value being the correct one from the point of view of the local selling prices and the markups allowed by the price regulations presently in effect. Hoechst was at about US$2.80 and Lepetit at about US$2.66, Squibb being in the order of US$4.32 (this last figure, though, applies to the tetracycline-nystatin combination which is sold at a premium here). It was agreed that Lepetit and Hoechst would maneuver the matter so that their costs would be declared as being more or less equal to the Bristol/Pfizer level

Two things then happened. Luis Henrique Ball, of Biogen, was called in by the Director of Commerce who threatened Luis Henrique with jail and a fine of Bs200,000 for allegedly giving the Government false information. Luis Henrique, fortunately, and because of the consistent pricing policies of ACCO specially with regard to brdspctrm items, was well equipped with all kinds of supporting documents, including domestic and international ACCO price lists, copies of ACCO invoices to innumerable countries, etc., with which documents he was able to show that his costs were real ones. He even invited the Director of Commerce to have someone examine the Biogen books and to have someone also go up to New York and examine ACCO billing documents there. The Lepetit case was an entirely different one; to begin with I understand that the Lepetit plant in Milano is being moved for which reason this firm was incapacitated till October to effect quick shipments to Venezuela at higher billing levels so that the local people would have complete evidence including that of the respective shipping documents. The local Lepetit distributor, being a former prison fellow (for political reasons) of the incumbent Director of Commerce, was able to get by with incomplete evidence but, in order to keep Fomento from growing too suspicious about his costs, decided to declare costs at about 10 percent or so lower than the Bristol/Pfizer ones.

Fomento, in the face of the cost discrepancies existing in the information presented by the various importers, took the cunning decision outlined in the first paragraph of page 3 of RNS–1890.

3. Now then, as I tried to outline it in RNS–1890, the situation is likely to be a very puzzling one.

If we stay at our present f.a.s. levels, we are going to have selling prices higher than the respective European ones. If so, our sales will suffer the impact of the price difference.

If our f.a.s. levels are lowered, then the Venezuelan Government will conclude that there is a cat in the bag with God only knows what results. And, what about the repercussions in the domestic market?

If Pfizer decides that we could get shipments from low-cost countries at lower billing levels, as Messrs. Rehm (from New York) and Ellis (from Mexico) intimated that Squibb would do, what are then going to be the financial repercussions on the general P. & L. of the whole company as this solution might have some implications that escape my limited knowledge of the company's general operational picture?

If we go for local production, what about the respective higher costs in Venezuela, and, what about the respective billing prices from abroad to us re the raw materials? As a matter of fact, the local industry would be unable to make and sell similar products at prices competitive with regard to the respective European ones. The Government could not give tariff/import quota protection, for the Government has foolishly committed itself to lower drug prices.

As you can see, Houghie, there is nothing concrete I might propose at this stage, specially right now that the contemplated decree hasn't come out yet. Furthermore, the fact and figures we would then be in a position to submit on the basis of our local limited knowledge, would have to be analyzed and decided upon with the much broader view that the general Pfizer management has at headquarters about the international operational picture.

In conclusion, we'll have to wait till the expected measure is enacted by the Government. Meanwhile, renewed efforts are being made to prevent said measure from being taken although the consensus of opinion is to the effect that things had gone too far already.

I shall keep you posted, and, if necessary, I shall not hesitate to visit with you in person (with your prior knowledge and consent, of course) if events call for it.

With kindest regards.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

TENTATIVE REACTION

AUGUST 19, 1959.

RNS–1903.
Mr. CONRAD G. HURLIMANN,
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas:

This is with reference to my memos to you, RNS–1890 and 1893, of which Conrad was sent copies.

It is expected that the Government decree re antibiotics will be issued very shortly. When that happens, we the American houses will get together on a local basis to review the then newly created situation. In all probability we shall also have to meet with our European counterparts and at least with the wholesalers as well. As far as I am concerned, I don't think we shall be able to come to any definite agreements here till the situation is also reviewed and decided upon by our respective home offices, and accordingly I may have to go to Mexico and/or New York for this purpose as my colleagues also plan to do with their respective headquarters.

It would be very helpful, though, if feasible, that you and/or Conrad should want to give me a tentative reaction to RNS–1890/3, because it might give me an idea as to what is the possible course of action that the company might wish to pursue in the future if the expected takes place as hopelessly expected now.

Please refer particularly to (d) on page 3 of RNS–1890 and to 3 of RNS–1893.

With kindest regards.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

P.S.—If you use garbled, personalized language, I think I'll get the point. Thank you.

PFIZER MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 1, 1959.

To: Mr. R. N. Silva, Caracas.
From: Frank P. Wilson, New York.

We have recently been advised in New York that several changes have taken place within Afidro itself and that the group is now split into three factions—the local labs, the ones with antibiotics as major items, and then those without major antibiotics. Also, that governmental pressure has been brought to bear on the group as a whole indicating that a 30-percent reduction across the board is the Government's objective and that as a counteroffer Afidro has now suggested a 10-percent reduction in major antibiotic prices.

Will you please advise us whether or not this information is correct as we are being queried in New York as to our position and also our intentions as to the future. Since we know neither, it puts us in an embarrassing position.

FRANK P. WILSON.

PFIZER FOREIGN TRADE SUBSIDIARIES,
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

August 25, 1959.

To: Mr. Rafael N. Silva, Venezuela.
From: Mr. M. C. Hough, Mexico.
Subject: Prices.

DEAR RAFAEL: Based upon your various memos concerning the above subject, it appears that there is nothing that can be done at the moment except to await the final decision of the Government. I discussed the matter with Frank Wilson yesterday and he advised me that he has some information from other companies which would seem to indicate that the Government is interested in applying a formula other than that which you have mentioned. We are assuming, however, that your information is more accurate.

If the formula which you mention should be used then it would appear that the decrease in prices to the commerce would be slight, but that because of the competitive situation prices to the Government would come down drastically. With the information which I have at hand it would be my suggestion that we meet competition Government-wise, but to try to obtain a premium on sales of sigmamycin and terramycin to the commerce. We would, of course, have to discuss the feasibility of this idea before putting it into effect, but I would guess that the effect upon prescriptions from consultorios would not be serious if there were slight difference in price between our products and the tetracyclines.

I have asked Frank to write to you and will await further information from you concerning the Government's action. Subsequent discussions on the matter should be held before actually changing our present price structures.

Kindest personal regards.

M. C. HOUGH.

PRICES

AUGUST 31, 1959.

RNS–1932.
Mr. FRANK P. WILSON,
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mexico.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

I have received your courteous memo of August 25, 1959, on the above subject.

Yes, I would very much like to hear from Frank. Needless to say, as indicated before, we would not change our present price structures without fully clearing the matter up with headquarters.

From what you tell me I understand that Frank has received different information through other companies as to the formula that the Venezuelan Government is in all probability going to apply.

My only comment is that whatever information I have passed on to you gentlemen is, to the very best of my knowledge, based upon the fullest appraisal of everything that has been going on here. Recognizing the paramount importance of this matter, I am keeping myself completely abreast of the local developments even though, naturally, we shall not know anything final till the expected decree is actually issued, especially from the point of view of what are going to be the price differentials between the American products and their respective European counterparts. I have nothing further to report on the subject matter at this moment save the fact that the whole Venezuelan pharmaceutical industry and commerce are presently in the state of great anxiety waiting to see what are going to be the real steps that the Government is going to take re antibiotics and the repercussions of such steps. I may also add that one of my friends here, manager of an American pharmaceutical branch in this country, tells me that the reaction he has gotten from his New York headquarters suggests to him that apparently in New York the Venezuelan case has not been completely understood as in all probability some local branch managers and distributors have not accurately told their stateside headquarters what actually has been going on in Venezuela of late.

With kindest regards,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

[Strictly personal and confidential]

SEPTEMBER 3, 1959.

RNS–1947.
Mr. M. C. HOUGH,
Mr. FRANK P. WILSON,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas.

Yours of September 1, 1959.

My reply is the reaffirmation of mine to Houghie with copy to you, RNS–1932 of August 31, 1959.

However, as you probably know, I have sent Conrad copies of certain memos I had written to Houghie already. As AFIDRO groups together local labs, foreign firms with local manufacturing facilities, foreign firms like ourselves that do not manufacture anything locally, and, local distributors of foreign producers, it's only naturally that now and then certain dissensions should take place; furthermore. I did report to the Nola Headquarters last March 18 (RNS–1631), among other things, the "recent formation of an association (chamber) of strictly national pharmaceutical labs * * * of Venezuelan capital only * * * even with the exclusion of local labs that handle foreign lines as well * * * that will fight for the Government to enact laws making compulsory that at least 80 percent of the capital of pharmaceutical labs operating in Venezuela should be in the hands of Venezuelan nationals. * * * We don't think that these extreme steps will succeed but they are an indication of the nationalistic spirit presently infiltrating the country." True, the major group ones—even one non-AFIDRO member—get together to discuss affairs of mutual interest, but, the split you have been told about in New York is not exactly a reality. True, the press and some Government officials have spoken about great price reductions, but, the approach seems to be more in the order of what is described in the first paragraph of page 3 of RNS–1890 (Houghie/Conrad). True, at a given moment during the course of the countless conversations that had taken place between AFIDRO and the Government, it was informally mentioned (on AFIDRO's part) the possibility of a 10-percent reduction at the expense of chiefly the 6-percent discount that retailers in the human field enjoy below the so-called list price. Suggestion that was rejected on the ground that the Government wanted to make a thorough investigation re each product group (as it has been done with antibiotic preparations for human use—see page 2 of RNS–1890) to then consider the taking of more specific action; however, at no time has AFIDRO "suggested a 10-percent reduction in major antibiotic prices."

The expected decree hasn't been issued yet, and RNS–1914 (Houghie/Conrad) may have had something to do with it; nonetheless, the Government is committed to do something. One thing, though, that may happen is that, if the Government does what apparently is going to be done in connection with human antibiotic prices, the repercussions could be so great as to causing the Government—much to the misfortune of U.S. antibiotic producers—to be more cautious in the handling of price control measures relative to other pharmaceuticals.

Cordially,

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

INTERNATIONAL PFIZER SUBSIDIARIES MEMORANDUM

SEPTEMBER 17, 1959.

To: Dr. R. N. Silva, Caracas.
From: Frank P. Wilson, New York.
Subject: Local Prices.

I appreciate the thoughts reflected in your memo of September 3 and can well understand how the situation can become cloudy and confusing very easily with numerous individuals and companies all striving for different objectives, and some purposely and deliberately muddying the water. We have the above conditions as a permanent hazard in New York, therefore, the following comments are passed on in the sense that they have been received in the above atmosphere.

We understand that, insofar as broad spectrum prices are concerned, the Venezuelan Government has now said to all importers that there will not be any price adjustment required. However, they have copies of previous import prices and expect that these import prices will be the basis of future selling prices, and that the formula percentage buildup over landed costs, distributors margin, wholesaler and retailer markups will be observed. In this respect we will then have a selling price based on our imported cost, and Lepetit and others will have a selling price within the market based on their imported cost. Since their imported costs were substantially lower than ours, we will be forced to sell at a higher price, or in order to negotiate business (particularly with governmental agencies) reduce our prices substantially and thereby the Government will effectively have reduced prices without forcing any company to do so. Is this basically correct?

We have also been advised that governmental purchases will now be based on the application of these markups to the invoice prices which are in the hands of the Government. If this is also factual, we will then in the future not do any business with the Government because our quoting price will be substantially higher than some of our competitors.

Our future looks rosy.

FRANK P. WILSON.

PRICE CONTROL

OCTOBER 2, 1959.

RNS–2021.
Mr. J. C. HOUGH,
Mr. FRANK P. WILSON,
New York.
RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA,
Caracas:

Thank you for your memo of September 17, 1959. I understand the informational cloudiness in New York and I would like to make some clarifications.

No, It is not true that the Venezuelan Government has said to all importers that there will be no price adjustments required re broad-spectrum antibiotics. Please refer to previous correspondence.

Your assumption at the bottom of the second paragraph of your memo is correct.

No price controls re sales to the Government exist as yet. The only exception to this is that Federal Government entities have to have their purchase orders approved by the Federal Controller's Office; and the rule is that this Office, in connection with a given item, regardless of who sells it, will not approve any purchase orders except at the lowest price that may have been effectively quoted by any supplier. In other words, once in connection with a given product someone goes down pricewise, all suppliers of the same product also have to go down if they want to sell to the Federal Government.

Attached you'll find photostats of interesting local press publications of recent dates in connection with the subject matter.

With kindest regards.

RAFAEL NICANOR SILVA.

Enclosures.

P.S.—Apparently the Ministry of Development is now going to investigate veterinary antibiotic dosage forms. We'll see. Thank you.

[Translation from Spanish]

CARACAS, *May 31, 1956.*

(By Telephone)
BOGAN,
Cyinteram,
New York:

Manager Hoechst Distributors. At present in Germany. Price situation continues same way as I had reported to you. Writing greetings.

LUIS BALL BIOGEN.

For Biogen Laboratories Co.

[English translation]

LHBM–4154

CARACAS,
May 31, 1956.

Mr. E. T. BOGAN,
Vice President, Cyanamid Inter-American Corp., Lederle Laboratories Division, 49 West 49th Street, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

DEAR MR. BOGAN: As soon as I returned to Caracas, I informed my father of all the conversations we had about the price problem presented to us by the special discounts of Hoechst and of the possible solution at which we arrived in New York.

I am cabling you today as follows:

"Manager Hoechst Distributors. At present in Germany. Price situation continues same way as I had informed you. Writing greetings."

The assistant to Mr. Hartung, manager of Remedia which distributes the Hoechst products, is not a person with sufficient authority to warrant my discussing this problem with him.

In fact, I have found that our unfavorable position continues just as I left it on my departure to the United States, and I was informed that in May it was again impossible for us to sell a single bottle of acromycin to the Social Security Institute because that institute continues stocking only hestacycline owing to the special conditions which its distributors continue to grant it. My father, as well as Mr. Escendon and Mr. Osorio feel that Hoechst will hardly diminish these special conditions because (otherwise) social security would most certainly stop not only to buy hestacycline but all other products which it has been purchasing from them, especially penicillins, since, as you know, Hoechst is social security's only supplier of this product with whom it maintains a very large volume (business). As you will

remember, this argument came up in New York in our conversation about this matter.

So then, the prospects are that our acromycin sales will go down considerably, and, in the long run, the aureomycin sales will also suffer, as it is logical to think that this antibiotic will gradually be replaced by the superiority of tetracycline.

I am sure you will be interested in knowing that many of the U.S. laboratories are in a very difficult situation in Venezuela right now. We have had information to the effect that Pfizer sales continue to drop, that Sharp & Dohme is losing ground more and more, and, in addition to this, as I informed you in person, with reference to Wyeth, its sales had gone down from a monthly average of 360,000 to 100,000 bolívares.

I don't want to close this letter without thanking you again, both you and Mrs. Bogan, for all the courtesies and kindnesses which you so generously bestowed on us during the time Mercedes and I were in New York.

With cordial greetings, I remain, as always.

Very truly yours,

LUIS H. BALL, M.,
Assistant Manager
(For Biogen Laboratories Corp.).

INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

NEW YORK OFFICE,
February 21, 1957.

Attention of: Mr. B. C. Prieto.
Subject: Bulk Prices, Venezuela.

Confirming recent discussions, we submit the following information:

Code No.	Product	"93" price	Unit
0363	Diamox Pd	$194.19	Kilo.
1208	Miltown Pd	107.70	Do.
1846	Sulfadiazine Pd	22.85	Do.
4613-46	Porihemin capsules	27.97	1,000 capsules.
4351-46	Lederplex capsules	13.35	Do.
4245-46	Prenatal capsules	17.16	Do.
4333-46	Vi Magna capsules	16.18	Do.
4127-46	Delphicol capsules	18.48	Do.
3153-01	Ledinac	4.63	Kilo.

Above prices, with the exception of Sulfadiazine powder for which we indicated the fine chemical division's highest price, are "backed off" prices. The backed off price for Sulfadiazine powder contained in tablets is $27.50 per kilo. This should be sold by the fine chemical division.

On Miltown powder we submitted a price based on Carter's selling price of $2.60 per 50 tablets instead of ours to Venezuela of $1.59 for 25 tablets, as the latter will yield a price $114.27 per kilo of powder.

Prices for premixes on Rhinazine and Lederplex liquid will be submitted as soon as Pearl River foreign manufacturing and cost departments supply us with the pertaining technical and cost data.

T. PIAGET.

TM cap 250 mg. 16's.
P. lista (1.F).

P. mayousta (20 percent)	3.40
	13.60
Pto pago (2 percent)	0.2F2
	13.328
Fanu 1F (6 percent)	1.02
	1,598
	68
Con prorito pago	
Costo	13.328
Venta	15.98
Uhlid (19.90 percent)	2,652

Sin prorito pago

Costo	13.60
Venta	15.98
Uhlid (1F.50 percent)	2.38

JUAN FRANCO M.,
Sub-gerencia.

Hoticina
Grageas:
100 mgs. × 72 = 74.00.
100 mgs. × 24 = 25.00.
100 mgs. × 700 = 96.00.
Grageas:
200 mgs. × 12 = 23.50.
Pediatico:
× 60 cc. = 14.50.
1 × 250 = 9.75.
UT × ½ oz. = 3.50.
U opt. ⅛ oz. = 1.75.
Albamycin:
1 oz. 250 = 20.60—17.50—15.45.
Cathomycin:
16 × 250 = 21.00—2.50.

[Cablegram]

NEW YORK.

Idefra Caracas:

Plt advise reason higher fas your orders samje samfa samdy matag than comparable TM also require local schedules with compet info.

Samje: Sigma 250 × 8s.
Samfa: Sigma 250 × 16s.
Samdy: Sigma 250 × 100s.
Matag: Matro 250 × 100s.

JM-PD.

[BGP-166]

CYANAMID INTER-AMERICAN CORP.,
LEDERLE LABORATORIES DIVISION,
April 25, 1958.

Dr. R. R. BALL,
Laboratories Biogen, C.A.,
Apartado 741, Caracas, Venezuela.

DEAR DR. BALL: After discussing with our management the matter of prices of the products competing with Ledercort in Venezuela, the price FAS of US$5.60 was established for the 30-tablet 4 mg. container, as we informed you in our cable of yesterday which said: "Recable April 21 matter, price Ledercort discussed in detail with Mr. Vogan, Price approved $5.60 FAS. We feel this price will permit offer price to public of 35.75. Writing greetings."

Replying to your cable of April 23, we would like to mention certain points in order to clarify the situation of the Ledercort prices on the different markets.

Before Ledercort was introduced, a study was made of similar products of the competition. That study disclosed that the largest volume of products on the majority of markets was Meticorten, and it was decided to adjust our price as closely as possible to the price of that product.

We find, however, that Meticorten, instead of having equivalent prices on all markets, had very different prices from one market to another. Owing to this, it was necessary in some cases to reduce the price at which we would normally have offered our Ledercort, such as we are doing now in the case of Venezuela.

Later, the problem arose of the entry of Manacort into the market, with which product we must match our prices, since it competes directly with ours.

We trust that the price we have established for Ledercort in Venezuela will enable you to compete on equal terms with the Squibb product.

I would appreciate any comment you would care to make on this particular.

Very truly yours,

B. G. PRIETO,
Territorial Sales Manager.

JULIO 7, 1959.

PAGAN
CYANAMID
SANTURCE
(Puerto Rico):

Fracasso tuvo exito cinco centavos baja Bristol.

LUIS.

Es autêntico:
por Laboratorios Biogen, C.A.
VICTORIA ACOSTA D.

Lt. BIOGEN CARACAS:

Prensa ee uu ayer publico primera plana articulo de cargo de monopolio y fijáron precios hecho por gobierno ee uu a 6 principales companias drogas incluyendo cyanamid punto si prensa su pais les interroga o da mucha publicidad este articulo tenemos declaración hecha por.

Dr. MALCOLM REFUTANDO,
Los Cargos.

Punto favor cablegrafiarme si creen conveniente publicar declaracion punto hagan ninguna declaracion sin previa aprobacion, New York, punto.

ROLAND.

FECHAS DE REUNIONES DE FABRICANTES Y DISTRIBUIDORES DE TETRACICLINA PARA CONVENIR PRECIOS

17 de setiembre de 1956.
26 de setiembre de 1956.
4 de febrero de 1957.
8 de mayo de 1957.
10 de mayo de 1957.
14 de mayo de 1957.
15 de mayo de 1958.
2 de julio de 1958.
20 de agosto de 1958.
25 de junio de 1959.
2 de julio de 1959.
3 de julio de 1959.
13 de julio de 1959.
3 de febrero de 1960.
5 de febrero de 1960.
22 de febrero de 1960.
25 de marzo de 1960.
28 de marzo de 1960.
31 de marzo de 1960.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HART. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana for performing a valuable public service by calling our attention to what appears to be a highly questionable practice in the worldwide sale of broad-spectrum antibiotics. I believe it is reading that all of us should engage in in the next few days. I hope that the record made here this afternoon will be the subject of thoughtful consideration by all of us.

While much of the evidence which the Senator cites comes from past hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, many of the facts he reports shed further light on the problem and raise a serious question whether there is, as he suggests, a worldwide cartel among drug manufacturers to fix the price of wonder drugs at identical and excessive amounts.

The facts set forth by the Senator and the allegations he has made are extremely serious and are of great interest to me as chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee. For years this subcommittee has been concerned with problems of monopoly in the drug industry. We have also been actively concerned with

international business practices that may be monopolistic in nature. Indeed this year the subcommittee plans extensive hearings on foreign trade and the antitrust laws. For my part I have been concerned with prices of drugs and with the cost of medical care. Our hearings have caused me to introduce legislation that would help reduce the cost of medical care by forbidding doctors to profit from the sale of goods they dispense—S. 2568.

Our past interest in drug prices and in questions of monopoly in the drug industry, however, in no way reduce the importance of the material offered today by the Senator from Louisiana. He has placed the problem in a larger, international perspective. The facts he recites strongly suggest that a world cartel may exist. This may help explain even more adequately why drug manufacturers have traditionally sold drugs at identical prices in countries throughout the world.

The issues to which the Senator has directed our attention are, of course, complex. But they deserve careful study for the likelihood of antitrust violation is great. As the Wall Street Journal reports today—February 10—the Justice Department is investigating certain aspects of international trade in the sale of drugs by American companies. It has issued a number of civil investigative demands as part of its inquiry, partly in response to an earlier investigation by the Antitrust Subcommittee. Thus, we await the outcome of the Department's investigation. However, I can assure the Senator that the facts he has produced are of great interest to me. We will examine them closely to determine whether the subcommittee should take any further action of its own.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan. As the Senator knows, it is no particular fun in exposing these corrupt business practices. These corporations have executives who are fine men and highly regarded people. None of us likes to be the man who insists on exposing these kinds of activities. But when poor people are made to pay from 20 to 100 times what they ought to have to pay for medicine, not only in this country but all over the world—poor people who have to pay more for medicine than they make in a month in some of these unfortunate countries—it is time that someone called a halt.

We must do something about it. I am certain that we shall have occasion to discuss the subject later.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HART. Especially would I hope that we give some thought to the comments which the Senator has just made with respect to the generic-name prescriptions. There is much else in the speech but this is a sensitive nerve in the ethical drug-producer field. They jump up and insist that to change the generic prescription would be running the risk of exposing a patient to substandard unsafe drugs.

The Kefauver bill responded to that problem up to a point. It assures that there will not be produced and marketed in this country a drug that does not meet standards and open wide the doors of every producer for inspection. But more basic, and what has caused me over the past few years to suggest frequently the desirability to prescribe generically, is that many jurisdictions in this country require that a patient who is on welfare be given a generic prescription, and medical associations participate in this practice.

If it is unsafe for the fellow whose bank account is zero, it is unsafe for everybody. But it is not unsafe, apparently, to give the person who is receiving welfare benefits a generic prescription. Therefore, how can it consistently be argued that except for the welfare patient, a generic prescription is unsafe? It does not add up. All of us should bend every effort to persuade physicians to prescribe generically. Another feature of the Kefauver bill was intended to encourage this practice.

Now it is required that the generic name appear prominently on the label, even though the trade name be more conspicuous. This is an effort, again, to remind physicians that there is a way that they, in their role as purchasing agent for the patient—which is their role—can make life, if not healthier for the patient, at least easier.

Again, I salute the Senator from Louisiana for his comments on this subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, like myself, has had the experience of being chairman of a subcommittee on monopoly. I think he shares the frustration I have felt on occasions when we have tried to protect the public from some of the highway robbery and gouging that have occurred in some situations.

It is perfectly all right, so far as I am concerned, if manufacturers wish to spend huge sums of money to advertise a trade name, so as to make the product appear better. However, I recall, from my law school days, a case concerning the advertising of the Bayer Co., which sought to restrict the use of its trade name "Aspirin." Aspirin is nothing but monosalicylic acid. It is a good pain reliever. Anybody can make it. Once he knows the process, there is nothing to it. It has been in the public domain for a long time.

The Bayer Co. sought to prevent anyone else from using the name "Aspirin." If aspirin were sold, it must be called monosalicylic acid. One can imagine how many sales would be made if it were required that the product be called monosalicylic acid. That big name would scare anyone to death.

Bayer finally won the case; anyone else would have to call the product something other than "aspirin." If one buys Bayer aspirin, he buys himself a nice tablet with "Bayer" stamped on it. He is told that there is no better aspirin in the world—and that is correct. There is no better, and there is no worse; they are all the same.

If one goes to Dr. Calver's office in the Capitol and says he wants something to cure his headache, Dr. Calver will proceed to hand him a little box containing tablets that are not even marked. When one opens the box, he finds little pills. They do not have the name "Bayer" on them; they do not have the name "St. Joseph" on them. They are nothing but little pills. But if one takes them, they will do the same thing for his headache that Bayer aspirin or anybody else's aspirin will do. The Government buys these pills for far less than the price at which the company sells them under its trade name.

Other drugs that are in the public domain often have product trade names. For instance, reserpin is manufactured under the trade name Serpisil. When the doctor writes a prescription for Serpisil, rather than reserpin, it means that one has to pay several dollars instead of 47 cents for the product. Druggists customarily receive a 100-percent markup on drugs. I do not complain about that. I do not believe they are getting rich. I do not know of a druggist who became a millionaire selling drugs. But having paid 47 cents for the product, he could afford to sell it to the customer for $1 and be happy with the profit he made.

But no, the manufacturers are going around the country, brainwashing State legislators who do not understand what is taking place, seeking to have laws passed which would require purchasers to pay 165 times the actual cost of a product.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Louisiana will recall that we have not been very successful in persuading the industry to develop less complicated generic names. What is taking place is a minor part of the effort to deter the use of generic name prescriptions. I suppose that on occasions the effort is successful. A generic name should be simple. When a physician has busy days and many things to do, the more complicated a generic name can be made, the less easy it is to remember it, even if the physician would like to pass onto the patient a prescription which could be filled more easily.

During the delivery of Mr. LONG of Louisiana's speech,

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a moment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I regret very much that I must leave the Chamber. I am a delegate to the Mexican-American Conference and it is necessary for me to go to their meeting now. However, I wish it to appear in the RECORD that as a member of the Monopoly Subcommittee I appreciate very much the superb work the Senator from Louisiana is doing in the monopoly field. I would commend this subject to the attention of every Senator.

Again, I thank the Senator for his excellent contribution.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. The Senator has been a very strong advocate of competition and he has been an opponent of monopoly.

I would urge him to take a copy of my speech with him over the weekend and read all of the details.

I thank the Senator.

JOURNAL OF FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 9, 1966, be approved.

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

REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, 17, AND 18

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18, for the calendar year 1965 which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, relating to the special milk program for schoolchildren. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

H.J. RES. 16

Joint resolution relating to special mik program for schoolchildren

Whereas annually the U.S. Congress appropriates funds for a special milk program for schoolchildren, and

Whereas during the last session of Congress, the sum of $103 million was voted for for such purpose, and

Whereas millions of schoolchildren throughout the country greatly benefit from this program, and

Whereas the U.S. Budget Bureau has recently issued a directive, effective February 1. 1966, cutting $3 million from said program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Vermont General Assembly oppose such cutback of the milk program, and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State be directed to send a copy of this resolution to our congressional delegation.

Approved February 1, 1966.

PHILIP H. HOFF,
Governor.

RICHARD W. MALLARY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN J. DALEY,
President of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 2791. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 992).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2912. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2913. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Thurston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2914. A bill to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2915. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2916. A bill to provide for a weather modification program to be carried out by the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 2917. A bill to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census in the years 1967, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2918. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate a certain oil and gas lease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 2919. A bill to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 2920. A bill for the relief of Jean Meledain Auguste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 2921. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. BAYH, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2922. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. HART, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BAYH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 2923. A bill entitled "The Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2924. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot plant at Grand Forks, N. Dak., to carry out research relating to low ash coal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NUMBERED 1 OF 1966

Mr. JAVITS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 220) to disapprove Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1966, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 815

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to extend the provisions of Public Law 815 for another 2 years.

Public Law 815 provides construction funds for federally affected school districts which have problems of overcrowding caused by the construction of new military facilities, school population increases on Indian reservations, and the like.

This valuable legislation has, since its enactment by the 81st Congress, helped hundreds of hard-pressed school districts around the country to provide adequate facilities for the education of our youth.

Unless we of the Congress act promptly, Public Law 815 will expire on June 30, and I doubt that very many of us will want that to happen.

Schools in every State in the Nation have benefited from construction funds provided by Public Law 815.

Since its inception, New Mexico schools alone have received a total of $41,065,516 through Public Law 815. Last year, 11 New Mexico districts received a total of $3,610,230, and the estimate for the current year is nearly $2 million.

Throughout the country, Public Law 815 has financed $1,204,279,711 worth of school construction since 1951, and every dollar thus spent met an essential local need.

In recent years, annual expenditures have been about $50 million. The need will be as great next year, but unless we act, there will be no funds to meet the need.

Mr. President, I believe a number of Senators will wish to join as cosponsors

on this bill, and for that reason I ask that it lie on the desk until February 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 2914) to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE STUDY IN HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering. It is aimed directly at overcoming a severe shortage of experts in this field so vital to highway safety.

There are many important phases to any effective program of highway safety. All are important. If we are to end the tragedy of senseless slaughter on our roads we must move forward on all fronts with determination and aggressiveness.

The availability of trained experts in the field of traffic safety engineering is an important point in curbing accidents. Yet there is a shortage of these engineers authoritatively estimated at 1,400. This shortage will grow to 2,200 in the next 15 years at the current rate of training. There are only some 30 fellowships a year in highway transportation engineering now, supported by private funds. There is no indication that these will increase substantially.

According to a recent professional study of this problem, the shortage is much worse than we think and is bound to grow worse still. This comprehensive study was conducted by the Automotive Safety Foundation last year. I think the findings are important and I will summarize them:

First. There is a present need for an estimated 8,000 highway transportation engineers to effectively manage and operate our highway system. Only 6,600 trained engineers are now available. The current shortage of 1,400 engineers means 1 out of 5 positions cannot be filled.

Second. Despite efforts of the universities, not enough students are being trained to keep pace with the demand. Unless additional students are recruited, the current shortage of highway transportation engineers will increase to more than 2,200 by 1980.

Third. Universities offering comprehensive graduate programs in highway transportation engineering are presently operating at one-third to one-half of optimum capacity. These schools could adequately handle 100 more students per year without an increase in faculty or facilities. However, programs will have to be developed in other schools to help accommodate future anticipated needs.

Fourth. There is presently a shortage of students with interests in highway transportation engineering. This shortage results primarily from two causes: First, lack of motivation—highway transportation seems lusterless to most students when compared with new fields such as aerospace and electronics; and second, inadequate fellowship support as compared to competitive fields.

Fifth. Essentially all fellowship support in highway transportation engineering is provided by ASF and the Insurance Institute of Highway Safety. These programs have approximately 30 fellowships per year and there is no indication that there will be an increase in future years.

Sixth. More fellowships are needed to fulfill the demands for better trained highway transportation engineers.

Seventh. There should be more effort to stimulate greater interest in this field.

The idea of Federal fellowships in certain areas of training is nothing new, of course. The National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the U.S. Office of Education, the National Institutes of Health, and others administer thousands of fellowships. These previous programs were taken into consideration in drawing up the one proposed in my bill.

Right now, the Bureau of Public Roads does not have a specialized fellowship program for advanced training in highway transportation engineering, although this Bureau is obviously the Federal agency most involved with this problem. Mr. Rex Whitton, the Federal Highway Administrator, is extremely concerned with the shortage I have discussed.

Several conferences were held with the chief of the Bureau's training section. The mechanics for establishing a specialized Federal fellowship program in highway transportation engineering were discussed in detail. It was clear that enabling legislation would be needed.

My bill proposes a fellowship program to be administered by the Bureau of Public Roads for graduate students in highway transportation engineering. To meet minimum needs the program would initially provide 100 fellowships annually. There is authorization to expand to 200 fellowships the second year and to 300 the third year. This degree of support is required, certainly, to meet the anticipated demands for highly trained engineers.

Each fellowship, to be competitive with those offered by other Federal agencies, provides an annual basic stipend of $2,400, a $500 allowance for each dependent and instructional allowance of $2,500 in lieu of tuition and fees—an average of $6,000 per fellowship per year.

There should be two methods of applying this program. One would be a regular fellowship program with candidates selected by the administering agency. The other would be a traineeship program. Universities and qualifying institutions would submit proposals for fellowship grants and take the responsibility of selecting candidates.

These two approaches would not only insure a greater number of high quality students taking graduate study in highway transportation engineering but would permit an effective geographic distribution and encourage more colleges and universities to offer this type of training.

This proposal is of course but one of the many approaches needed to achieve effective traffic safety in our Nation. I pointed this out last month in an address to the National Asphalt Pavement Association convention in Las Vegas.

Many of my comments are appropriate to my discussion now. To save time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that significant portions of that address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the portions of the address will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2915) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to grant fellowships for graduate study in highway transportation engineering, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The portions of the address presented by Mr. BIBLE are as follows:

I submit we are building a monumental dilemma even as we are building a magnificent travel system. I submit further that we can no longer brush aside this dilemma. Otherwise our tremendous road construction will have a built-in flaw.

I'm speaking now of highway safety. That is the dilemma. And it is a dilemma that has accelerated with the speed and length of travel.

Don't misunderstand. I'm not merely going to preach safe driving practices or call for public awareness or quote slogans about highway safety. I want, for just a few moments, to talk plainly and clearly about what I consider a real and urgent crises in our Nation. And I want to suggest some real and effective action. I'm going to suggest that organizations such as yours have a direct interest in helping to solve this dilemma.

There is no question of the urgency. We know—but we prefer not to think too much about it—that highway fatalities are climbing toward 49,000 a year—that 20 to 40 million accidents a year cost our people and our economy $10 to $15 billion—that traffic accidents are now the leading cause of death among young adults.

And we know—but we prefer not to think too much about it—that the amount of attention and money we spend on highway safety is but a very, very small fraction of the amount we spend on highway travel.

Time has run out. Let's face that fact. We must realize now that all our highway safety efforts of the past, no matter how well intentioned, simply have not been adequate.

Now we need a major national effort in money and energy. It must be determined, continuing effort mounted at every level of American society and government. Nothing less will do the job. The alternative is surrender by default to a death and injury toll that will remain a national tragedy.

As Nevada's attorney general and as a U.S. Senator, I have long been painfully aware of this tragic and wasteful dilemma. I have sponsored programs and legislation dealing with it. But I, along with too many others, have not devoted enough serious attention to it.

The fact that highway safety is a formidable national problem has been recognized by President Johnson. He will propose to

Congress a broad legislative program on this issue. I cannot tell you the specifics of it now. But it will be hard hitting—doubtless controversial—and it will recognize the need to spend money to save lives.

If we can spend billions on highways and cars, if we can budget nearly $70 million to beautify the highways, then it seems both urgent and compelling to me that we can afford to spend significantly more to save human lives.

The President's Committee for Traffic Safety, in studying this highway safety dilemma, has recommended an action program. It embraces the time-tested principles of engineering, laws, traffic accident records, education, motor vehicle administration, police supervision, traffic courts, public information, research and public support. You've heard of all of them. You may point out that they haven't been too effective. Singly, they haven't. Collectively, they can. But there must be one more principle—money. Money will supply the action to the action program. I'm not talking solely of Federal money. I'm talking about money from local and State governments, from organizations, from individuals.

You recall I mentioned engineering as one phase of traffic safety. A survey conducted 2 years ago by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, a professional society, revealed there is a shortage of some 1,500 traffic engineers in our Nation now. One out of every five positions cannot be filled. To attack this one problem I intend to support the introduction of legislation in the near future calling for a Federal program of scholarships to promote and expand graduate study in highway transportation. To meet the minimum needs, this plan will initially provide for 100 scholarships annually with authorization for expansion to 200 in the second year and 300 in the third year.

This program would be administered by the Department of Commerce. It would, I hope, encourage more universities and colleges to offer graduate programs in this field.

This is but one phase and one approach. It will be my purpose in the 89th Congress to work consistently on other developments in traffic safety. In all instances I will adhere to the belief I have maintained throughout my 30 years in public life. That is, that these matters should be handled and developed mainly at the State and community level. But we must also recognize that with the complexity of the problem as it has developed, the great resources of the Federal Government must also be brought to bear. Our National Government must offer maximum aid and encouragement consistent with the overall effort.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table until the close of business on February 23 so that any Senators who may wish to cosponsor this bill will have that opportunity.

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

PROPOSED WEATHER MODIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for a weather modification program and ask that the bill lie on the table for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

Public Law 510 of the 85th Congress gave broad authority to the National Science Foundation to initiate and support a program of study, research, and evaluation in the field of weather modification. That was in 1959. The prime need then was for intensive basic research. The National Science Foundation has performed that task in a commendable manner. One of their finest achievements is support of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo.

In 1966, the art and science of weather modification present a different picture. The need for basic research is still great, but there are other needs too. The Science Foundation has recognized and reported on these needs. The NSF Special Commission on Weather Modification has urged that an agency of the executive branch be assigned the overall responsibility for the national weather modification program. I agree with the Commission that now is the time to take action. Accordingly, I am introducing a bill which will assign such a mission to the Department of Commerce. This bill in no way derogates from the splendid performance of the National Science Foundation, and will not interfere with their support of the National Center for Atmospheric Research.

Many other Federal agencies are conducting programs in the field of weather modification. My bill takes cognizance of these programs.

I recognize that this bill will serve only as a beginning point of discussion. I invite debate so that Congress can come up with the best possible legislation consistent with present scientific achievement.

The Committee on Commerce began hearings on weather modification in Nevada last year. Hearings are now scheduled to begin before the committee on February 21. It is our desire to examine this bill, the general subject of weather modification, the sociolegal economic considerations, the interrelationship of weather prediction, and S. 23.

The report of the National Science Foundation as well as the excellent report by the National Academy of Sciences will serve as a beginning point for these hearings. These reports indicate the need for a comprehensive legislative program. This is not a time to consider fragmenting responsibility. Weather modification and weather prediction are intimately related. The Department of Commerce is therefore ideally suited to have this overall responsibility. Other agencies having mission-oriented programs have a legitimate interest in carrying out their programs, but not in the overall direction.

Scientific weather modification is a comparatively new subject. Accordingly, the Congress has the unique opportunity to develop complementary laws as the science develops. This is no modest undertaking. Weather systems are nationwide and worldwide. Our approach to constructive legislation must be as comprehensive as the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2916) to provide for a weather modification program to be carried out by the Secretary of Commerce, introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROVISION FOR A CENSUS IN THE YEARS 1967, 1975, AND EVERY 10 YEARS THEREAFTER

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and the very able and distinguished minority whip, Senator KUCHEL, of California, a bill to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census of population, housing, and unemployment in the years 1967, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter.

The effect of this legislation will be to establish a reasonably complete national census every 5 years in place of our present program of decennial censuses combined with special surveys and estimates.

The need for a full and accurate periodic inventory of the American people has been recognized from the founding of our Republic. The Constitution of the United States requires a census once in each decade, and since 1790, we have taken 17 such head counts. From the information they provide, lawmakers and administrators at every level of government conceive and execute a broad spectrum of programs, ranging from educating our young to building the highways that span the continent. Business and industry analyze census statistics when arriving at decisions involving the investment of billions of stockholders' dollars. Historians and social scientists trace and record the ever-changing population patterns of our Nation and reach conclusions about where we have come from and where we may be headed.

Mr. President, with the passing of each year, the demands for detailed, up-to-date data on America's most vital resource, her people, are multiplying.

Since 1960, it is estimated that the United States has gained over 16 million new residents. Between April 1960 and July 1964, Nevada's population is said to have shot up 43 percent; Arizona's, 21 percent. Among the metropolitan States, my own State of Florida, has gained nearly 18 percent. Last year, approximately three-quarters of a million more people enjoyed the benefits of our sunny climate as permanent residents than did in 1960.

Furthermore, growth has not been the only characteristic of the dynamic American population. Demographers tell us that one American in five changes address at least once a year. Although there are those who move three or four times in a year and others who are born and die in the same home, on the average, 100 percent of the national population moves within a 5-year period. The impact of this migration is most keenly felt in those States which are rapidly absorbing new citizens. State and local governments must provide expanded public services such as more schools, police and fire departments, highways, and the other facilities necessary to the life of every community.

To give an indication of the magnitude of the problems posed by restless Americans, one need only note that between 1950 and 1960, the State of Florida added 1,617,000 new residents through migration from other areas. Similarly, New Jersey during the same period, gained

approximately 600,000 persons who had formerly made their homes elsewhere.

Probably the single most significant fact concerning the statistics on growth and mobility which I have just cited is that only those figures for the decade between 1950 and 1960 are known to be precise. The others, based on sample surveys and projections, may not be accurate and cannot be proven—under present law—until 1970. According to statistical experts, the farther we move away from 1960, the more woefully inadequate our census data will become.

Yet, it is from this data that decisions affecting the lives of every American and involving billions of dollars must be made. State and local governments, recognizing the necessity for more up-to-date information concerning their citizens, have had to request special censuses from the Census Bureau. In the 6 years that have elapsed since 1960, more than 550 of these special inventories have been made in 23 States. However, they have involved only about 12 million people in a Nation of 195 million.

Such special censuses are an invaluable aid to State and local administrators, but they cannot give us an overall, national picture. They cannot provide the U.S. Congress or Federal administrators with exact statistical knowledge on all areas of this vast land. Thus, for instance, such legislation as the Economic Opportunity Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Library Services Act Amendments of 1964, and many others which provide for fund allocations according to need, must be administered with reliance on 1959 income figures—figures that are now 7 years out of date.

Because we have tied ourselves to a census program devised when the entire population of this country did not equal the population increase between 1950 and 1960, we are currently distributing billions of dollars to State and local governments using population and income data collected over 5 years ago.

Mr. President, already the United States takes a quinquennial census of agriculture, and it is a sad commentary that today we have a more accurate count of our pigs than we do of our people. We know exactly how many cattle there are in Nebraska, but not exactly how many people there are in New York City.

In the decade between 1945 and 1955, 20 nations, including Japan, West Germany, Sweden, Norway, Australia, and New Zealand took more censuses of population than we did.

We cannot lag behind these countries in this vital statistical field. If we are to keep pace with the growing needs of our changing society, we must be able to trace precisely the changes that are taking place.

For instance, as Chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging, I have a particular interest in the problems of our elderly citizens. We know that daily 3,800 people reach the age of 65 in the United States, and that today approximately 18 million of our citizens are 65 or older.

And, we also know that our current methods for counting these people between census years are totally inadequate. Yet, without good census data, the administration of such programs as medicare is made more difficult, and the conception of new programs must be based on conjecture.

Mr. President, I am confident that the adoption of a quinquennial census will do much to strengthen our Nation's statistical program. It will aid business and government in making the vital decisions that will keep our Nation moving forward. I sincerely hope that the committee to which this measure is referred will act promptly and favorably so that its enactment into law can be achieved in this session of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2917) to improve the statistics of the United States by providing for a census in the years 1967, 1975, and every 10 years thereafter, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment to Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas.

My amendment would extend Public Law 815 for 2 years, making its expiration date consistent with Public Law 874, the second impacted areas bill which authorizes funds for operation and maintenance and teachers' salaries in school districts in which a substantial number of children of servicemen and other Federal employees attend school.

Since their inception in 1950, the Federal impacted areas laws have been the model of wise and efficient Federal cooperation in our Nation's educational endeavors.

Public Laws 815 and 874 are special programs of education assistance with special reasons behind them. They may be said to have a dual purpose: to compensate for the weakened tax base which results when much of the real property in a school district is federally owned, and thus not subject to local property taxes; and to help local districts to manage the increased outlay necessary for making good schools available to the children of Federal employees.

The Congress took action last year to extend the provisions of Public Law 874 until 1968. This was a wise decision and illustrated the support of the Congress for the principle of requiring the Federal Government to meet its obligation to those school districts which have the burden of educating dependents of Federal workers, many of whom do not pay the property taxes the district must have to meet the rising costs of operation and maintenance and teachers' salaries.

As the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] stated earlier this week:

> The theory behind impacted area aid is just as valid in 1966 as it was when the original legislation was passed by Congress.

The amendment I offer today, Mr. President, is needed by thousands of school districts throughout the United States which have increased school construction requirements. It is consistent with action taken by Congress last year in extending until 1968 the impacted areas law dealing with operation and maintenance and teachers' salaries.

And it is consistent with the words of President Johnson last month when he told us we were mighty enough, healthy enough, strong enough so that pursuit of our goals abroad need not curtail our progress here at home.

Extension of Public Law 815 is imperative to the continuation of our national goal to provide every child the best possible education, and I urge my colleagues to give this bill their strongest support.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2919) to extend for 2 years Public Law 815, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance for school construction in federally impacted areas, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2919

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 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 633), is amended by striking out "1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out "1966" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1963–1964" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965–1966".

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am, today, introducing a bill for myself and Senators MCGOVERN, HART, TYDINGS, YARBOROUGH, and KENNEDY of New York, which is designed to extend and make permanent the special milk program for children and to make the program available for the benefit of all children among our growing population.

The Congress of the United States has supported nutrition programs for many years. It has recognized the value of good nutrition among children as a means of improving the health and strength of the Nation. Programs of this type also serve to strengthen agriculture by expanding markets.

The special milk program for children was first enacted in 1954.

The special milk program for children has been a very popular program among

parents and school officials. It has expanded the market for fluid milk for farmers throughout the United States through regular commercial outlets which serve the schools, but most important are the nutritional benefits derived by participating children.

The special milk program for children is not a compulsory program. It encourages children to drink more milk by making it available at a price that most children can afford and at no cost to those children who are unable to pay for the milk.

The special milk program for children has grown with each succeeding year, limited only to the extent that growth was inhibited by the appropriation of insufficient funds or through limitations due to the allocations of funds among the several States. The growth of the program has been accomplished through increased participation of schoolchildren, increased enrollment in schools, and increased numbers of schools and child care institutions participating in this program.

The program was originally designed for the school, but later was expanded to make milk available to children at summer camps and nursery centers and other child care institutions.

The special milk program for children is scheduled to expire June 30, 1967. The Congress should remove this termination date and make the program permanent. A program of such national importance should not be temporary. It should be done now, so that the schools may properly plan their activities for next year and for succeeding years.

The special milk program for children is a modest investment in the health of the Nation and should not be limited for lack of funds. Although program growth indicated a need for more money, the present budget limits expenditures for the 1965–66 fiscal year to $103 million. The Department of Agriculture, moreover, has indicated that it would hold expenditures to no more than $100 million. This seriously hampers the program and places an unwarranted burden on the schools, which are maintaining the program on behalf of children. After announcing the rates of payments to schools, the Department of Agriculture last year reduced its reimbursement rate to 95 percent of its obligation and has announced that it will further reduce the reimbursement rate to schools and child care centers to a level of 90 cents on the dollar beginning February 1 of this year in an attempt to save money. Sacrificing the health and welfare of our children is certainly a poor way to effect savings.

These moves prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the present appropriation is insufficient to provide opportunity for all schools, summer camps, and day care centers to participate in the program as Congress intended.

In view of the nutritional benefits of this program and its popularity, I was greatly disturbed by the proposed budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, which for all practical purposes will eliminate the special milk program for children. The budget proposes a reduction in funds from $103 million to $21 million or a cut of over 80 percent in the program.

My bill will overcome these deficiencies by making the program permanent and by committing Congress to the provision of sufficient funds so that all children can participate and so that there will be adequate funds for program growth in succeeding years.

The special milk program for children is perhaps one of the most popular pieces of legislation among the consuming population and America's dairy farmers' and the whole dairy industry that has been passed in recent years. It is a program that must receive the support of each and every Member of Congress and I feel that it will.

I introduce the bill at this time to allow for necessary hearings and so that it can be enacted this year. It would be a gross injustice to our children and to the schools if we were to postpone consideration of this need until 1967. Furthermore, we just cannot let the matter stand in view of the slash in appropriations for this worthwhile program as provided by the proposed budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 3 weeks for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk for 3 weeks, as requested.

The bill (S. 2921) to provide a special milk program for children, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and Senators BAYH, CLARK, DIRKSEN, DOUGLAS, HARTKE, LAUSCHE, MCCARTHY, MCNAMARA, MONDALE, NELSON, PROXMIRE, SCOTT, and YOUNG of Ohio, a bill granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact.

The Great Lakes Commission which has its headquarters in Ann Arbor, Mich., has been in existence for 11 years. It is formed by representatives of the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. It concerns itself with promoting the orderly, integrated, and comprehensive development, use, and conservation of the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin.

Basically the Great Lakes Commission is a deliberative, consultative, and recommendatory body. None of its actions or decisions are binding on any State, and of course, none of them are binding on the Federal Government and/or its agencies. The sole and only purpose of the organization is to provide a permanent and continuing forum where the representatives of the Great Lakes States can come, discuss, and consider the problems that face these States in connection with the best utilization of this vast and common resource, and after such deliberation make recommendations as to the solutions which are proposed.

On two previous occasions legislation granting consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin Compact has passed the Senate. However, no action has ever been taken in the other body. In 1962, in response to a request for his views, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, then the Deputy Attorney General, expressed the opinion that this agreement among the States requires congressional consent under the compact clause.

Accordingly, the Commission is again seeking enactment of consent legislation and I hope that with the significant sponsorship in this body we may soon have favorable action by the Congress.

I ask appropriate reference of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2922) granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSFER OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today, the President of the United States sent to the Congress a reorganization plan proposing the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Commerce Department to the Department of Justice.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference, a resolution disapproving this reorganization plan, and reiterate my request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who is chairman of the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, to schedule early hearings on this matter.

As one who took an active part in the drafting and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which created the Service, I emphasize that it was intended as a mediation and conciliation service, not as an arm of the Federal prosecutor. In my view, the effectiveness of the Service could be seriously jeopardized if the element of coercion replaces that of conciliation.

Many Senators on both sides of the aisle have expressed to me their feeling that this transfer should not be effected. I welcome their support and express the hope that at the very least a full inquiry be had in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on February 10, 1966.

A REASONABLE SOLUTION: A 3-YEAR HOUSE TERM

AMENDMENT NO. 48

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, the other body has begun hearings on the proposal

set forward by President Johnson in his memorable state of the Union message to extend the terms of the Members of the House of Representatives and has focused the attention of the American public on this proposal, which I believe will rank as one of the most important issues to come before the Congress in recent years.

The President's proposal that House terms be extended to 4 years and that the entire House be elected at the same time as the President has been introduced in the Senate by my good friend, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH].

Mr. President, I have joined in sponsorship of that measure because I feel very strongly that if the democratic process is to survive and is to work with a reasonable degree of efficiency, we must free Members of the House from perpetual campaigning and the sometimes demeaning search for campaign financing that too often has characterized political life since the end of World War II. I have joined in cosponsorship to indicate how strong is my conviction that House terms must be extended.

However, when the time comes for deliberation on this issue in this body, I intend to submit an amendment which will mean a basic change in the proposal as now set forward in Senate Joint Resolution 126. The crux of my amendment is that the House term be extended from 2 to 3 years and that one-third of the House be elected each year.

Mr. President, I think that this plan would eliminate the vast majority of the arguments that have been presented in opposition to extension of the House term and would be a means by which that body could fulfill its historic responsibility, while at the same time giving the individual membership an opportunity to greatly increase their effectiveness as legislators.

There is validity in the argument that our Founding Fathers made the House term shorter than that of the Senate in order to give that body a chance to reflect changes in the attitude of the people regarding the issues facing the Nation. Under my proposal, each year one-third of the House will be chosen, thus giving ample opportunity for the voice of the people to make itself heard in Washington. On the other side of the coin there would be the continuity of having two-thirds of the body carry over so that there would not be a total disruption in plans, programs, and policies from year to year.

While it can be suggested that a 4-year term concurrent with that of the President would give him the support necessary to carry out the mandate of the people who elected him to the Presidency, I cannot help but feel that the disadvantages of this proposal outweigh its merit. Under my plan, there would be a reading at the end of each year which could be and should be very valuable to determine how well the public thinks the President has carried out its mandate. Furthermore, it would seem obvious that not all House Members would benefit from running with the President, whether he is of their party or of the opposition. A 3-year rotation of elections would eliminate the perpetual sharing of the platform with the added requirements and difficulties created by a national campaign. Each Member according to sequence would run in a national election year, but he would not be irrevocably sentenced to this type of candidacy.

I realize full well that by splitting the House into three parts that problems of division occur both in the House as a whole, and in individual State delegations, but these are merely housekeeping chores which can, I am confident, be solved with a minimum of problems. My amendment provides that the House after the first election following adoption of this amendment be divided by lot into three classes and that the number of Members from each State assigned to each class would be as nearly equal as possible. In the case of those States which lose or gain representation following a census, all Members' terms would end at noon on the third day of January after the election which next follows since in that election a new slate of Representatives would have been chosen. Immediately these newly elected Representatives would be divided into terms in in the same manner as the original division. This latter point is put forward as a possible solution to the reapportionment problem, but it is entirely possible that during our deliberations improvements can be made.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that there are significant strengths in this proposal that make it a logical and suitable means of dealing with the problem and making the Members of the House of Representatives more efficient without lessening their responsiveness to the public will. This problem is not new; indeed, Senator MCGEE took over the job from Professor McGee who had for some years before carried on research and ruminations toward the goal of a responsive and responsible House of Representatives.

It should also be noted that this solution has been reached after long and varied consultations with politicians and political scientists across the country, and I am pleased to say that I have received considerable support from many people who represent a wide divergence in political opinion and academic attitude.

When the Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution and for many years after that, a House Member was in Washington only a few months out of any year and the problems he faced were, in comparison with today's world, few and far between. To cite the extremes—the First Congress met March 4, 1789, considered fewer than 150 bills and each Member of the House of Representatives spoke for 45,000 people. Last year the 1st session of the 89th Congress considered 16,882 bills and resolutions, and each Representative spoke in behalf of 450,000 constituents. From this sheer volume of work it is obvious that some respite is needed and that the quality of a legislator's work and the desirability of a legislator's job can only be improved by extending the length of his term.

Indeed, it seems fair to comment that because of the advances in communications and travel, a 6-year term is more responsive to the will of the people—in terms of contact with the constituency—that a 2-year term was in post-colonial times. What we are seeking to do in this amendment is to keep the constitutional principles of representation intact, while updating the system to the space age.

There are those who suggest that the present 2-year term is still adequate to the needs of the space age, as there are always those who prefer the status quo. But I sincerely believe that if the Nation is to expect a first-class job from its Congress—and such a job is necessary for our survival—it must provide first-class working conditions. My proposal would give the needed relief from continual campaigning and still preserve the vital role of the House in reflecting changes in public opinion and providing a continuing review of Government policy by the electorate. By dividing the House into three groups we assure that this review does not totally disrupt the legislative process, but takes place within the context of continuity.

We face a challenge in this issue of providing leadership for the strongest Nation in the world. We have a dual responsibility to represent our constituencies and to represent the general interests and welfare of the Nation. I believe this responsibility would be best served by an extension of the term of House Members to 3 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my proposed amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 126 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 484) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S.J. RES. 126

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Except as otherwise provided in this article, the terms of office of Representatives shall be three years.

"'SEC. 2. The Representatives shall be divided by lot into three classes. The number of offices assigned to each class shall be as nearly equal as may be, and the number of offices from each State assigned to each class shall be as nearly equal as may be.

"'SEC. 3. The first division of Representatives into classes shall be made immediately after the House of Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of the first election of Representatives to whom this article applies.

"'A further division of Representatives into the three classes shall be made immediately after the House of Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of each election of Members which next follows a reapportionment of Representatives among the several States. Such further division shall apply only to those States the representation of which has been increased or decreased by such reapportionment. The term of office of all Representatives from such States shall end at noon on the third day of January after the election which next follows such reapportionment.

"'The offices of the Representatives from any newly admitted State shall be assigned to the three classes immediately after the House of Representatives shall be assembled in consequence of the first election of Representatives from such State.

"'SEC. 4. In order that, as nearly as may be, one-third of the Representatives will be chosen in each year, the term of office of Representatives whose offices are assigned to the first class at the first division shall be one year, and the term of office of Representatives whose offices are assigned to the second class at the first division shall be two years. The term of office of any Representative whose office is assigned to one of the three classes at any subsequent division shall expire at the time of expiration of the term of the other offices assigned to that class.

"'SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 6. No Member of a House of Congress shall be eligible for election as a Member of the other House for a term which is to begin before the expiration of the term of the office held by him unless, at least thirty days prior to such election, he shall have submitted a resignation from such office which shall become effective no later than the beginning of such term.

"'SEC. 7. This article shall first apply in the case of Representatives elected for terms beginning on January 3 of the first year which begins more than one year after the date of ratification of this article.

"'SEC. 8. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be three years.'"

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] be listed as additional cosponsors of Senate bill 2911, the next time the bill is printed.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 2857, my distinguished colleagues, Senator JAVITS and Senator BAYH, be included as sponsors of this bill, which would increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution. I believe I should say that both Senators indicated their desire to join in sponsoring this bill on Wednesday of this week, and according to the request I made when I introduced this legislation on February 1, the bill was to be at the desk through Wednesday, February 9. Through an error in notation, the bill was printed a day earlier than the request noted, so I want to be sure that the record is clear that the sponsors include Senator BAYH and Senator JAVITS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 19th of January, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 71. Some 53 Senators joined with me as cosponsors of the resolution. Since that date and since the printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, a number of other Senators have called asking to be listed as cosponsors. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that further printings of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71 include as cosponsors the following Members of the U.S. Senate:

LISTER HILL, GEORGE A. SMATHERS, GEORGE D. AIKEN, CARL T. CURTIS, PHILIP A. HART, GEORGE MCGOVERN, FRANK J. LAUSCHE, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, EDWARD V. LONG, JOHN O. PASTORE, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HARRY F. BYRD, CARL HAYDEN, JACOB JAVITS, GAYLORD NELSON, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, ALBERT GORE, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, WAYNE MORSE, RUSSELL B. LONG, LEE METCALF, GEORGE MURPHY, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, JOSEPH S. CLARK, RALPH YARBOROUGH, JENNINGS W. RANDOLPH, JOHN SPARKMAN, ROMAN L. HRUSKA, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, MILTON R. YOUNG, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, B. EVERETT JORDAN, THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, THRUSTON MORTON, HERMAN TALMADGE, JOHN MCCLELLAN, NORRIS COTTON, CALEB BOGGS, and THOMAS DODD.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues for this expression of support for the U.S. Olympic Committee in its selection of Utah as the nominee of the United States for the site of the 1972 winter Olympic games. When the International Olympic Committee meets in Rome, Italy, in April of this year, the U.S. delegation will be fortified in its bid for the winter Olympic games by this strong expression of support of the U.S. Senate.

I hope that our colleagues in the other body will act promptly and with equal unanimity to make the expression of the Congress complete that the United States urges the holding of the 1972 winter Olympic games in Utah.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 3, 1966, the names of Mr. CLARK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2872) to encourage private enterprise in the establishment and development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities for public use, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and other Senators) on February 3, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1522, TO REMOVE ARBITRARY LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN ATTORNEYS' FEES

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on February 28, 1966, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will hold a hearing on S. 1522, a bill to remove arbitrary limitations upon attorneys' fees for services rendered in proceedings before administrative agencies of the United States. This bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

Numerous agencies of the Federal Government now impose limitations upon fees which attorneys may charge clients for services rendered in administrative proceedings. S. 1522 would abolish all these provisions of law or agency regulations, and would allow each administrative agency to pay attorney's fees in an amount equal to the reasonable value of the services rendered by the attorney concerned.

We hope to hear from all witnesses who are desirous of testifying on any aspect of S. 1522. Such persons who would like to testify should contact Mr. Benny L. Kass, assistant counsel to the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, room 3214, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-5617.

NOTICE ON HEARINGS ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce that the hearings on electoral college which were to be held on February 7 through February 10 and were rescheduled for February 14 through 17 have necessarily been postponed.

Since the subcommittee does intend to consider this question at the earliest possible date, I suggest that interested persons or organizations who wish to be heard on this subject contact the subcommittee staff in room 419, Old Senate Office Building, phone extension 3018.

POPULATION HEARINGS SCHEDULED FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, AT 10 A.M., IN ROOM 3302, NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate will be in recess from the conclusion of business today until noon of Wednesday next, February 16, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures will continue hearings on S. 1676 on Wednesday, February 16. The public hearing will be held in room 3302 in the New Senate Office Building, starting at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM J. LYNCH TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been rescheduled for Thursday, February 24, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William J. Lynch, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Illinois, vice Michael L. Igoe, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, February 10, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1698) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. DE LA GARZA, of Texas, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group, to fill the existing vacancy thereon, vice Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 706. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final; and

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 706. An act to amend the Railway Labor Act in order to provide for establishment of special adjustment boards upon the request either of representatives of employees or of carriers to resolve disputes otherwise referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and to make all awards of such Board final; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 12563. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 194 of title 14, United States Code, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries appointed Mr. LENNON of North Carolina, Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GROVER of New York as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries appointed Mr. DOWNING of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of New York, and Mr. MOSHER of Ohio as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1698) to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

OHIO STUDY SHOWS SCHOOL MILK NEEDED FOR ALL CHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been speaking daily on the floor of the Senate to protest the action of the Bureau of the Budget in withholding $3 million in appropriated funds from the special milk program for schoolchildren. The Federal share of the expenses of providing milk for schoolchildren has, as a consequence, been cut by 10 percent from last year's levels. The President's budget for fiscal 1967 indicates that the program is headed for virtual extinction. It would be cut from $103 to $21 million and redirected only to those children who can qualify as needy with some sort of a means test. None of this will save money because the CCC must buy milk under price support laws that the schoolchildren do not drink.

I invite the attention of Senators today to a pamphlet published by the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station entitled "Recommendations for More Effective School Milk Programs." On page 3 the pamphlet states, under the heading "Keep the Price Low":

Without exception, studies show that one of the most important ways to get more children to drink more milk in schools is to keep the price as low as possible. This price will depend upon the amount the school pays for milk, the margin it takes to cover the expense incurred in handling and serving milk, and whether it receives partial reimbursement for that milk by participating in one or both of the Federal programs (school lunch and school milk).

Obviously the administration's attempts to slice school milk funds by 80 percent will make the price the child must pay high, resulting in a dropoff of milk drinking all the way from preschoolers to high school seniors. This is evident from the pamphlet's statement that "research shows that average milk consumption per pupil is generally higher in schools that serve milk under the Federal programs than in schools that serve milk outside these programs."

Mr. President, I particularly emphasize the following advice given on page 5 of the pamphlet, under the heading "Having Milk Available":

Studies have indicated that children drink more milk when they can obtain it at various times during the day. A minimum goal is to have milk available at least three times a day, at midmorning, at noon, and at midafternoon. Some schools report that large quantities of milk are drunk by children as they arrive or leave, especially by those who must walk or ride long distances to school.

This statement deserves serious consideration because the Department of Agriculture seems to hold the view that when milk is served at the noon meal as a part of the school lunch program, it is not needed in midmorning or midafternoon. I believe this assumption is one of the underpinnings of the move to cripple the program in fiscal 1967. All the evidence I have been able to gather indicates the school milk program will be curtailed only in those schools having a school lunch program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

URGENT NEED FOR BIG INCREASE IN EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND FARM AID TO VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to ask for a prompt and vast stepup in educational, health, and agricultural assistance and land reform in South Vietnam.

In the last few years we have increased our Vietnam military effort more than a hundredfold.

We have often talked about the necessity for making a comparable economic, educational, and health effort; but we have done far less than we can do, than we should do, or—if we are going to have any chance to achieve our objectives—we have done far less than we must do.

Today we have less than one American in Vietnam working for all nonmilitary

purposes combined for every 200 American soldiers and marines.

Today we spend $1 on schools, health, agricultural assistance, and land reform in Vietnam for every $400 we spend on military action.

Now listen to the words of Gen. Edward Lansdale, a distinguished American and a recognized expert on subversion and revolution:

> The harsh fact, and one which has given pause to every thoughtful American, is that, despite the use of overwhelming amounts of men, money and materiel, despite the quantity of well-meant American advice and despite the impressive statistics of casualties inflicted on the Vietcong, the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and in size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will in the very areas of Vietnam where Vietnamese and American efforts have been most concentrated.

As Lansdale further said:

> The Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam. It will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

THE VIETCONG PITCH

What is that idea? There is not one, but three. They are powerful. And the Vietcong has suited their action to the triple pledge. Here they are:

"Land to the tiller."

In a nation teeming with landless tenant farmers, the Vietcong has given the tenant the local authority and the military power.

"The soldier helps the peasant."

The Vietcong soldier tortures and terrifies the peasant. He helps him—physically helps him—when the peasant cooperates.

"The government exists for the people."

This Vietcong slogan is given believability precisely because the Vietcong helps the landless tenant.

WEAPON NEEDED TO KILL VIETCONG IDEA

What is our answer?

We have an answer—a brilliantly proven answer.

We know how to make farms thrive as no people in history ever have before. And we know what the family-owned, family-operated farm means to a people's will to fight and sacrifice for their nation. We know how to make it work as a marvel of efficiency.

American medical achievements are the envy of the world.

In Medicare we have just given a great national example of how to put that medical know-how to work for millions.

American education is our real glory. And this President, this Congress has shown how we can advance education to bring the abundant life to all of our people.

Can this education, health, farm know-how help us in Vietnam? It can. It has.

Indeed, in Vietnam itself we have over the years a great and proud record of achievement through American assistance.

It is not a question of whether more educational, agricultural, and health aid will work in Vietnam. We know it will.

Last March I spelled out the details of that great story on the floor of the Senate. Today I bring it up to date.

1965 AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION TO VIETNAM

Since last year, the 9 two-year trade schools financed by the United States have increased to 20, more than doubling this vital area's capacity.

Three million textbooks had been published a year ago. Today, the total stands at 6 million for elementary school use, 500,000 for secondary schools and 40,000 for university use.

American aid supplied five dredges to augment the eight at work last year in developing ports and harbors.

We completed a modern microwave telecommunications system. This links Saigon with the principal towns of the Mekong Delta provinces.

American medical know-how gave 83 percent of the population protection against malaria. The incidence rate rose, however, from .77 percent in 1962 to 1.57 percent because medical teams still are barred from some Vietcong-controlled areas.

We have helped build more than 45 bridges and culverts, over 400 miles of secondary roads, and almost 220 miles of major highways.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

The National Institute of Administration, built and staffed with American funds, now has 450 students training for administrative leadership in the Provinces. This is a 55-percent increase over last year.

We have increased the 21 Provincial training centers for village officials to 27. Five more are scheduled for completion by June 30 and another 12 are planned for the following year.

Eleven Provincial training centers now provide basic instruction and refresher training to all members of the national police.

VIETCONG HARASSMENT

The Vietcong have hindered the fresh water well project. In spite of this interference, we helped drill 208 more sanitary wells, bringing the total to 1,608. This particular program is geared for rapid expansion once conditions permit.

The rising number of refugees seeking haven in the cities of South Vietnam has gravely overtaxed the municipal water supplies. While awaiting the day when the countryside is stable enough for orderly development, most of the well drills are at work in many of the 65 cities of the south.

The Vietcong have also hit the electric power supply hard. Last May they sabotaged a 160-megawatt transmission line in Saigon from Danhim in central Vietnam.

As work was rushed on a 33-megawatt powerplant, financed through a $12.7 million U.S. loan, we helped the Public Works Ministry design, construct, and equip a 22-megawatt plant near Saigon.

In the countryside, we helped install diesel generating units in 32 towns and villages. The United States helped organize three rural electrification cooperatives and made plans to begin work on electrical projects early this year. We already have shipped the equipment for these projects.

Stronger transmitters and better broadcast facilities improved the 7-station Radio Vietnam network. We supplied 85,000 low-cost radios for the public and 11,000 for the armed forces and other groups.

These radios supplement 6,000 community listening centers already established, and almost 5,000 radios supplied through Australian and Japanese aid.

INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

The United States financed 8 new industrial plants and 51 expansions of existing plants in 1965. These projects represented more than $7 million in imported equipment.

Two teams of Vietnamese industrialists came to the United States and an American team went to Vietnam to explore investment possibilities. We opened up some 40 such possibilities as a result of these visits.

Some 70,000 jobs in textile manufacturing were made available because of plant expansion. These goods provide vital business and consumer income and meet 90 percent of South Vietnam's cotton textile requirements.

Between 1954 and 1961, America helped rebuild the country's transportation system almost completely. This included a mainline railroad from Saigon 700 miles north to the 17th parallel.

Rice production surpassed by 40 percent South Vietnam's prewar annual average output of 3.5 million metric tons.

American assistance helped build many small- and medium-sized factories. We doubled the hydroelectric power supply. We helped begin land reform.

I wish to comment on the extent to which we have started on these programs, how they have been interrupted, and how the programs in all cases have shown that they work, that they work out well, that it is possible, even in a country at war, even in a country suffering the instability and the many difficulties that Vietnam does suffer, it is possible to make these investments productively, but that we have not begun to do nearly enough.

As I say, we helped begin land reform. The South Vietnam Government, with American assistance, authorized almost 300,000 peasant families to receive title to land or to homestead on abandoned land.

We spent more than $2.1 billion on economic assistance between 1954 and 1964.

REAL GOAL OF VIETCONG ATTACK

It was exactly this progress toward orderly, stable development that the Vietcong had to stop. Ho Chi Minh as well as Mao Tse-tung must have known that progress like this would make a Communist South Vietnam impossible.

So along this road to orderly development, the Vietcong stepped up their attacks and subversion.

Prof. Wesley R. Fishel is certainly one of the leading American experts on Vietnam. He has spent many years in the country. He has written a brilliant, scholarly analysis of our aid program in current history.

Fishel, incidentally, served as adviser to the Prime Minister of Vietnam in 1955

and chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon from 1956 to 1958. Fishel reports that the emphasis of our aid program changed in 1958.

At that time we replaced economic assistance with counterinsurgency programs designed to support the war directly in rural areas. U.S. dollars went to commodity imports instead of public works, education, and public health.

Professor Fishel wrote last fall:

> A smaller percentage of American aid went into purely technical assistance, intended to create the human and institutional resources needed to sustain Vietnamese freedom through the training of Government workers in the fields of education, health, public administration, public works, and the like.

The military struggle claimed among its victims the impressive gains made in the mid-1950's, a promising social welfare program, especially in education.

Civic action or self-help projects were undertaken but Communist insurgency grew so active that, as Professor Fishel said:

> By the spring of 1965, less than 50 percent of the Vietnamese countryside was generally available for aid operations, and in many areas token assistance at best was all that could be undertaken.
>
> By 1965, the emphasis was once more on measures of an emergency nature. Survival once more became the primary objective.
>
> Fundamentally, it is now accepted doctrine that elementary social justice is an element that has frequently been lacking in Vietnam, and that this gap must somehow be repaired.
>
> At the same time, the dynamic political activity that is necessary to the achievement of social justice requires corollary economic and social assistance. But if any or all of these measures are to be effective or sustained, there must be continuing physical security against the Vietcong.
>
> The vicious circle is a continuing dilemma for U.S. officials as well as for the Vietnamese themselves. Yet without some resolution of this dilemma, a successful outcome to the struggle in Vietnam is hard to visualize.

NEEDED: MONEY WHERE MOUTH IS

We have not yet resolved this dilemma.

President Johnson said only a few days ago:

> We must make it clear to friend and foe alike that we are as determined to support the peaceful growth of southeast Asia as we are to resist those who would conquer and subjugate it.

In discussing his plans for American foreign aid, the President also said:

> Our response must be bold and daring. It must go to the root causes of misery and unrest. It must build a firm foundation for progress, security, and peace.

I admire the President's words. I applaud him.

But last year, we had only 700 Americans working with the nonmilitary assistance program in South Vietnam. This year there are only 100 more.

As I have said, we have less than 1 American working for AID in the entire nonmilitary effort in Vietnam for every 200 American soldiers.

The total proposed American aid for schools, health and agricultural development in Vietnam for all three is only $31.7 million. We will spend 400 times as much in the strictly military effort in Vietnam.

I am not one of those who believe that we can do without military force. We must have it. It is essential. In fact, I support it without reservation. But I should like to add two things: First, we should keep in mind that our military effort has a single purpose, and that is to achieve negotiations in order to bring a just peace to this troubled nation. Any time our military effort can be interrupted or limited because it might possibly give rise to negotiations—we should certainly do so.

In the second place, it seems to me that all the firepower in the world cannot kill the idea that the Communists are on the side of the landless peasant.

And yet we do have the weapon that can destroy that basic source of Communist strength in Vietnam. We have the ability to improve the lot of the Vietnam little man swiftly and decisively.

Between 1955 and 1964 we helped increase the school attendance in South Vietnam from 300,000 to more than 1,500,000, an amazingly heartening achievement. I do not believe that there is a country in the world which has had a fivefold increase in school attendance in 10 years, whether in peace or in war. In South Vietnam it has been done under most difficult circumstances with American assistance.

But this year we plan to devote only $5.3 million to Vietnam schools.

The ratio of population to doctors in Vietnam is several hundred times what it is in America. Where we have brought our marvelous medical capacity to bear in Vietnam—for example, to counteract malaria—it has been a smashing success.

Yet this year we plan only $20.5 million for public health in Vietnam, which is substantially less, as I calculate it, than what we spend in one day in our military effort.

URGENT NEED FOR LAND REFORM

Most conspicuous of all, we have permitted the Vietcong to win the support of the majority of peasants who are landless with the Vietcong theme: "Land to the Tiller."

Only the landless are given miliary and local governmental authority by the Vietcong.

And in these tenant farmer areas, American military and civilian observers agree there are more Vietcong today than there were a year ago.

Why? Because too often we have permitted ourselves to be identified with South Vietnamese policy that has done just the opposite: give the power and authority strictly to the landlord.

The Ky government has modest land reform plans. But they are strictly limited and inadequately financed.

Best estimates are that an approximately $200 million program of buying some 2 million acres of Mekong Delta land would permit a 5- to 7-acre per-farm-family redistribution to landless peasants.

Similar attempts by the Diem regime foundered on a patently inadequate financing program.

The $200-million program I am suggesting represents a costly investment but in comparison with the military effort it would equal the cost of just 1 week of the Vietnamese military effort.

It could have a dramatic effect on the attitude of Vietnamese farmers who are now caught between the Vietcong and bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents.

In Long An Province, one of South Vietnam's most fertile districts, more than 85 percent of the peasants are tenant farmers.

This Mekong Delta province was considered a showcase project of a combined Vietnamese and American miiltary and economic pacification effort to defeat Communist subversion.

Long An's tenant farmers heard "Land to the Tiller" often from the Vietcong. What is more, the Vietcong show they mean what they say. They have directly alined themselves with the landless.

What has been the countermove of the South Vietnamese Government? Appeals—until recently—were almost exclusively to the 15-percent landlord class. These are the same people who occupy virtually every position of authority and power in the army and in local government.

The 85 percent landless have been practically ignored.

LAND REFORM: A BARGAIN OPPORTUNITY

We are spending $250 million a week on the military effort in South Vietnam. From 1961 to 1965 nothing was spent for land reform.

For the current fiscal year, $1.1 million was allocated for land reform. For all agricultural purposes, we are spending only $5.9 million.

An investment of $200 million in land reform would undermine the Vietcong's peasant support in the Mekong Delta.

Only 260,000 farms out of 1.2 million in the delta are owner operated. The rest are operated by the tenants who do not own the land. More than 500,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented. Some 3,000 rich families in Saigon are the big landlords.

Long An Province, according to an official U.S. survey made last July, has 65 rich landlords, 3,000 farmer-owners and 28,000 tenant farmers.

What a bloodless victory awaits a really vigorous and adequate land reform program on our part.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that the military effort in Vietnam is a tragic but, in my judgment, essential action. Without military security against the Vietcong, the best social program in the world can make little progress.

Indeed, the fact that the Vietcong control half the countryside obviously slows down schools, health, land reforms, or any other action until the Vietcong are driven out.

But how many times do we have to learn the lesson in Vietnam that military conquest evaporates and blows away, if the mind and the heart of the peasant and villager are on the side of the Communists? Again and again the Viet-

cong are welcomed back in when the successful South Vietnam and American troops move on.

When we do win a rural area, we need to be prepared to do a far more ambitious job of schooling, health, and land reform than the $1 we are spending for these purposes for each $400 we spend to do the essential military job.

The President has wisely acknowledged that we should spend more on education, more on health, and more on agricultural assistance in our foreign aid program and less on large capital investment. And yet in this most crucial of areas—Vietnam—we are making a pitifully inadequate effort to do just that. If we are to win the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people, we must do better—and I mean far better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these important documents:

First. A brilliant analysis of the history of American aid to Vietnam during the past decade. It was written for Current History by Prof. Wesley R. Fishel, a former adviser to the Prime Minister of Vietnam and former chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon. Professor Fishel speaks with authority and his credentials to do so are without question.

Second. A thoughtful and penetrating, but apparently little-noticed, discussion of Vietnam and revolution by retired Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale. General Lansdale, once again a member of the U.S. mission in Vietnam, is our country's leading expert on counterinsurgency. His views, written for Foreign Affairs, deserve the consideration of everyone concerned with our role in southeast Asia.

Third. Detailed analyses of the pacification program and nonmilitary effort in Vietnam by two veteran New York Times reporters, Charles Mohr and R. W. Apple, Jr. Both speak with the authority and clarity of on-the-scene observers.

Fourth. A thought-provoking account of the need for land reform in Vietnam written by Richard Critchfield, the informed and articulate Asia correspondent of the Washington Evening Star.

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

[From Current History Nov. 1965]

AMERICAN AID TO VIETNAM

(By Wesley R. Fishel, professor of political science, Michigan State University)

(Wesley R. Fishel was an adviser to the prime minister of Vietnam in 1955, and chief adviser to Michigan State University's Vietnam project in Saigon in 1956–58. In 1961–62, he was a Guggenheim Fellow. From 1952 to 1956, Mr. Fishel was a consultant to the Foreign Operations Administration. He is the editor of "Problems of Freedom: Vietnam" (New York: Macmillan, 1961) and author of other works on Asia.)

NOTE.—Because of "Communist subversion of the South Vietnamese Government," as this author sees it, "By 1965, the emphasis [in United States foreign aid] was once more on measures of an emergency nature." Once more, economic development is not so important as measures of an emergency nature aimed at survival for South Vietnam. In the words of this specialist, "* * * American aid appears * * * to have come full circle."

In the strictest sense, American aid to Vietnam might be said to be in its 16th year. For it was in May 1950, that the Griffin Mission was dispatched to the Associated States of Indochina, recommended assistance to the French in their war against the Communist-led Viet Minh, and prepared the way for the expenditure of our first $44 million in aid money to that area. Now, a full 15 years and $5 billion later, the American aid program in Vietnam has become this country's largest and most critical involvement of its type in the world.

Foreign aid is an instrument of foreign policy. This simple fact has been at the core of many controversies and misunderstandings concerning the United States aid program. For in its initiation and its implementation since the early days of the Marshall plan in 1947, foreign aid has been seen variously by different people as an act of humanity, a measure of reconstruction, or an instrument of national interest.[1]

In the case of Vietnam, it has been all of these. Begun initially in 1950 with funds left over from the huge postwar program of assistance to Nationalist China, American aid has carried the complexion of humanitarian relief in that much of it was given for immediate assistance to people suffering from the ravages of war. At the same time, since it was given through the French rulers of the three colonial territories of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, and included a significant measure of military support, it also partook of a quality of national interest and was clearly related to United States foreign policy as a whole. For this was the period in which open conflict with Communist states began. On June 25, 1950, Communist North Korea had invaded the Republic of Korea to its south, and American armed forces, acting in the name of the United Nations, had come to the defense of the South Koreans.

Even as the fighting mounted in South Korea, the United States was aware that along the frontiers of North Vietnam, mainly in the Province of Yunnan, some 250,000 Chinese Communist troops were stationed and (it was then feared) poised for imminent attack toward the south. Although the threatened invasion never occurred, Communist China did lend important assistance to the Viet Minh forces in Indochina, with major shipments of material and substantial technical assistance as well. The United States, whose interest in the French colonies of Indochina had at first been of purely secondary character and had leaned toward support for the anticolonial nationalists fighting under Communist leadership in the Viet Minh, shifted sharply to full military and economic assistance to the French. For while American policymakers had severe misgivings about the purity of French motives and considered that the only real solution to the conflict in Indochina lay in granting independence to its subject peoples, the presence of Communist power on Vietnam's northern frontiers loomed ominously in their minds and came finally to dominate their thinking and their planning.

By 1953, what had begun in a haphazard fashion and without plan 4 years earlier had become a major and costly program of military assistance and economic aid. In its Activity Report for 1951–53, the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Associated States of Indochina stated the United States purpose for being there as stemming from the fact that Indochina constituted "the key to all of free Asia." It then continued:

"It is in the interest of the United States to prevent by all available means these states from falling to the Communist bloc, since defeat here would foreshadow defeat in surrounding areas and undoubtedly engender the loss of southeast Asia. In such eventuality, it is probable that all of Asia would succumb."[2]

One may discern in this statement an early and simplistic rendering of the "falling domino" concept, later enunciated publicly by President Dwight Eisenhower. The report continued, however, with a second paragraph which is especially striking given the problems and solutions which have regularly been discussed since that day.

"The tremendous struggle in Indochina has been going on for more than 6 years. It is becoming increasingly apparent that, in order to achieve a decision, it will be necessary not only to strengthen the military effort of the Associated States and the French, but further to develop in the Indochinese peoples the will to fight and to support their governments. Thus the problem is not purely a military problem. The solution is not purely a military solution. What is needed here is simultaneous military, political, and economic action."

To this end, STEM saw its responsibility in five areas:

1. To increase government effectiveness and broaden popular support;

2. To help create a political, economic and social atmosphere which would "appeal to the individual and fire his self-interest in support of his government";

3. To assist military action by economic support;

4. To increase production, particularly in agriculture;

5. To maintain supplies by bringing in items for which foreign exchange was short.

The major difficulty, however, lay in the fact that France, while desiring American aid, did not wish partnership. Thus, the United States accepted a contributory role in a French colonial war (with whose objectives it was scarcely in sympathy) to prevent the achievement of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Laotian national independence, but did not at any point prior to the final defeat of French arms secure even a minimum voice in deciding how that war should be fought or might be won.

GENEVA, 1954

By the time that the conference of great powers met at Geneva in April 1954, it was painfully clear to all that France had to all intents and purposes lost the war and was seeking a way out. The Geneva agreements of July 20–21, 1954, brought a temporary cessation of hostilities to the war-torn lands of Indochina and terminated 90 years of French domination of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The legal achievement of independence for these peoples did not come, however, until December 1954, when France formally conceded that status to them.

The U.S. position in the Geneva negotiations was at best equivocal. Participating, yet firmly determined not to agree to a "Munich" type of agreement, the American delegation refrained at the close of the conference from signing the accords. U.S. policy at this time was twofold; to deny control of southeast Asia in general and of South Vietnam in particular to the Communist world, and to attempt to develop a viable and friendly government in that part of Vietnam which remained attached to the free world. The area was considered then, as now, to be one of vital interest and major importance to the United States, and while the United States had no specific formal

[1] A useful symposium on the "why" of overseas assistance is Robert A. Goldwin's (ed.), "Why Foreign Aid" (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1962).

[2] Special Technical and Economic Mission to Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam (STEM), "Cumulative Activity Report to June 30, 1953" (Saigon, 1953), p. 6.

commitments to Vietnam at that time which bound it to the defense of Vietnam's political or territorial integrity, there were a number of explicit and implicit American commitments which bore upon this assumption of responsibility and consequent involvement. In addition, the United States had made a major financial contribution to the French prosecution of the war in Vietnam ($4.2 billion) between 1950 and 1954, and was loathe to see this stake lost unless the situation were indeed irretrievable—which American policymakers were reluctant to concede.

A NEW ADMINISTRATION

With the close of the Geneva Conference, a new administration in Saigon, under Catholic nationalist Ngo Dinh Diem, faced a galaxy of seemingly insoluble problems: housing, feeding, clothing and rendering self-sustaining some 860,000 refugees from the Communist areas in the north; governing with a bureaucracy that had been virtually paralyzed by the confusion and chaos of 8 years of civil war; reasserting central government authority over vast stretches of territory which had been ruled for years by the Communists or which were even at that moment under the sway of the Cao Dai and Hoa Hao sects; coping with the problems of economic dislocation resulting from the wartime flight from the southern countryside to the cities of more than 1 million peasant families; reorganizing the national army and provincial defense forces, which had been defeated along with the French; finding funds (at a time when the national income had virtually disappeared) so that governmental programs could go forward and services be brought to the population. The tasks were enormous, and the means at hand were slight.

With the end of French colonial rule, the Vietnamese turned to the United States for both aid and support. STEM, which had worked modestly and cautiously through the French, was at this point transformed into a large U.S. operations mission (the designation for aid missions representing the Foreign Operations Administration of the U.S. Government), and after January 1, 1955, it dealt directly with the Vietnamese. French influence over Vietnamese affairs diminished thereafter, and American responsibility began to assume substantial dimensions.

GOAL: SURVIVAL

Given the absence of technical, financial, and military wherewithal on the part of the Vietnamese, the mere act of survival became an objective. More than that, survival was a major challenge to the combined resources of the new regime in Saigon and to its American ally, as well as a vital prerequisite to any program of development which might be contemplated. American aid thus became a primary instrument in South Vietnam's struggle for survival, filling as it did the vast gap between the Vietnamese Government's capacities and its needs.

Apart from assistance in the restoration of internal security, through technical, financial, and economic support of the Vietnamese National Army and the national police and security services, which has at all times been the largest component of American aid programs in South Vietnam, the major preoccupation of the United States during the early days of the Diem period was the reception and resettlement of the refugees from Communist North Vietnam. Skilled advice and financial assistance was proffered and accepted gratefully by the Vietmanese Government, which thus was enabled to plan and program effectively for the resettlement of refugee families in hundreds of new villages across South and Central Vietnam, to aid them in the construction of new homes and villages, and to find gainful employment or otherwise develop self-sustaining economic programs. The Vietnamese Government at this time organized its refugee programs under a Commissariat General for Refugees, bringing together under one coordinator all administrative operations of a relevant nature.

This temporary administrative agency became a model of efficiency in a generally apathetic and tradition-bound bureaucracy. The handling of the refugees, furthermore, gave a psychological shot in the arm to the Vietnamese Government, and many observers consider that it was the stimulus needed to keep the Government alive and to enable it to begin treating more routine kinds of problems with effectiveness.

The accomplishment of Vietnam independence from France was one of Ngo Dinh Diem's first acts. A slow and complex process, this involved transferring military, legal, economic, and monetary authority from the French to the Vietnamese and was completed in December 1954. Nonetheless, financial independence was not matched in the military sphere until April 1956. France continued to subsidize the private armies of Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and Binh Xuyen (then opposing the Saigon government) until March 1955, and the French High Command in Vietnam continued to operate until a year after that.

With independence came new problems, some of emergency character, some of more lasting nature and import. Most were dealt with on an ad hoc basis during those early years, for the United States at that time still had no expectation that it was going to be involved in the little southeast Asian republic over a period of many years. Planning was not a concept that was then acceptable to the Foreign Operations Administration (nor its successor agency, the International Cooperation Administration). Such industrial growth as did occur resulted from occasional spurts of initiative, prompted by recognition of the fact that an independent Vietnam had different economic and industrial needs and problems than had been the case when the land was a colonial possession of France.

ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Some noteworthy economic steps were, however, taken between 1954 and 1961, principally through American aid cooperation. The transportation system, for example, was almost entirely rebuilt, including a main railway line running 700 miles north from Saigon to the demarcation line at the 17th parallel, and a reconstructed highway network. Rice production was stimulated to the point that South Vietnam exceeded by 40 percent its prewar annual average production of 3.5 million metric tons of paddy. Rubber production exceeded prewar totals. A number of small- and medium-sized manufacturing plants were built, forming a modest base for planned industrial growth and bringing into the Vietnamese economy a mixed cluster of Vietnamese and foreign investors linked in their enterprises by participating Vietnamese Government capital. An extensive agrarian reform program was undertaken by the Vietnamese Government, which ultimately resulted in nearly 300,000 peasant families receiving titles to land or being authorized to homestead on abandoned land. Japanese reparations provided a large hydroelectric plant on the Ca Nhim River in South-Central Vietnam, which has more than doubled Vietnam's electric power capacity.

SOCIAL WELFARE

Social welfare, too, received a substantial share of American aid attention. Teacher-training was a fundamental area of Vietnamese-American cooperation, as was the building of classrooms, with the result that between 1954 and 1961, school enrollments increased from about 400,000 to nearly 1,500,000, while the number of primary schoolteachers was increased from 30,000 to nearly 90,000. Public health measures involved the establishment of more than 12,500 village and hamlet aid stations and maternity clinics throughout the country, and a malaria eradication program which sprayed systematically and repeatedly more than 2 million homes and succeeded in bringing down the incidence of this endemic disabler from 7.22 percent in 1958 to 0.77 percent in 1962.

Over the years, as American aid committed more than $2.1 billion in economic assistance to Vietnam between 1954 and 1964, the number of American personnel in the country steadily increased until, by 1965, there were nearly 700 aid personnel directly employed in Vietnam. "Economic assistance" ceased to be the principal category of aid, after the resurgence of Communist subversive warfare after 1958. In its place, counterinsurgency assistance programs were formulated, to support directly the war and security efforts of the Vietnamese in rural areas. And commercial import programs, which provide funds for the purchase of essential commodities such as medicine, machinery, trucks, steel, fertilizer, and cement, played a major role. A smaller percentage of American aid went into purely technical assistance, intended to create the human and institutional resources needed to sustain Vietnamese freedom through the training of government workers in the fields of education, health, public administration, public works, and the like.

The much discussed and criticized strategic hamlet program (renamed the new life hamlet program after the overthrow of the Diem government in November 1963) was a principal focus of American technical assistance from 1962 on. Communist insurgency had created acute conditions of insecurity in the countryside of South Vietnam, and a program was organized to create as many as 11,000 defended hamlets for protection of the peasantry. Unfortunately, it was overzealously and clumsily administered by the Diem government, and ultimately failed to achieve its purpose.

It was in this context, however, that American aid first began to be delivered to the Vietnamese peasantry without passing in all cases through the intervening Vietnamese Government hierarchy. Carefully planned projects were developed between Vietnamese and American authorities for integrated pacification efforts, involving security activities, administrative arrangements, psychological efforts, and economic and social programs. Civic action (self-help) programs were undertaken on a large scale. Yet so great was the strain imposed by growing Communist-directed insurgency, and so intrinsically weak was the central Vietnamese Government, that advisers representing American aid programs in the rural provinces found during 1963 and 1964 that their geographical horizons of activity were becoming increasingly restricted. By the spring of 1965, less than 50 percent of the Vietnamese countryside was generally available for aid operations, and in many areas token assistance at best was all that could be undertaken.

Disastrous floods in central Vietnam in the autumn of 1964 brought tens of thousands of peasants into the cities and towns of central Vietnam seeking refuge. This influx coincided with and was followed by an even larger movement of humanity. In the presence of ever-intensifying Vietcong terrorism, and the concomitant trauma of war, nearly 600,000 peasants and their families fled villages and isolated hamlets in the hinterlands, and sought shelter and help in the cities and towns of the central Vietnam plain. This second major mass uprooting of Vietnamese peasantry has brought grave political, administrative, economic, and social problems to the Government of Vietnam. It offers a major challenge to that Government and its American ally which, if successfully dealt with, could redound to the

credit of Saigon, but which is also fraught with the most serious of consequences in the event that it is not dealt with effectively.

Although long-range economic planning had never been a significant feature of the American aid effort in Vietnam, after the Diem regime had consolidated its control in 1956 some thought was given to the problems of economic development. It was understood that Vietnam's agricultural base was, by Vietnamese and American agreement, a priority area for systematic development. A number of new crops, including kenaf and jute fibers, were introduced and added a degree of supporting sustenance. Some 700 factories of varying sizes were established. Improved municipal water systems and a number of thermal- and diesel-powered electric installations were provided. And in all, an encouraging start was made on the development of what would become, hopefully, a viable economy.

This promising start, however, was rendered virtually meaningless by the onset of the Vietnamese Communist subversion of the South Vietnamese Government. By 1965, the emphasis was once more on measures of an emergency nature. Survival once more became the primary objective. Restoring Government services, which had been terminated because of insecurity and war hazards, was once more a high priority target. And American aid appeared at the time this article was written to have come full circle. An enormous augmentation in American military strength in Vietnam (from approximately 700 advisory personnel in 1960 to more than 130,000 advisory and combat troops by September 1965) has changed the nature of the war in that country and the character of the aid effort.

The war in Vietnam is now clearly understood to be an essentially political struggle in which the support of the people is a principal objective for both sides. Consequently, aid to the peasantry has become a prime element in the U.S. approach. The deterioration of the military situation during the years from 1960 to early 1965 brought serious reverses, loss of territory, and persistent political instability which prevented the attainment of many physical and political objectives of American aid. Although the military side of the war occupied much of the attention of United States and Vietnamese officials dring this period recognition of the political lacunae in the struggle caused increasingly vigorous efforts by aid officials in particular to achieve a satisfactory balance between military, economic, social, and political measures.

Fundamentally, it is now accepted doctrine that elementary social justice is an element that has frequently been lacking in Vietnam, and that this gap must somehow be repaired. At the same time, the dynamic political activity that is necessary to the achievement of social justice requires corollary economic and social assistance. But if any or all of these measures are to be effective or sustained, there must be continuing physical security against the Vietcong. The vicious circle is a continuing dilemma for U.S. officials as well as for the Vietnamese themselves. Yet without some resolution of this dilemma, a successful outcome to the struggle in Vietnam is hard to visualize.

[From Foreign Affairs, October 1964]

VIETNAM: DO WE UNDERSTAND REVOLUTION?

(By Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale)

Whatever course the long struggle in Vietnam finally takes, short of nuclear holocaust, one thing seems certain: the people of Vietnam still will be there. This is a reminder that war in Vietnam is a "people's war." As such, it is a constantly recurring phenomenon of this period of man's history. How it is fought and what happens to the Vietnamese people as a result have meanings, therefore, far beyond today or the boundaries of Vietnam itself. "People's wars" elsewhere will also make demands on the American people to help solve them. Thus, although the hour is late in Vietnam, terribly so, there is time yet for Americans to consider the war in Vietnam in its "people" nature, especially as regards what American assistance in these critical months will come to mean to the Vietnamese people in their own future, and to us in ours.

Nearly 4 years ago now, on December 20, 1960, the Communists set up the political base with which they hoped to win Vietnam by revolutionary struggle. The base consisted of an idea and of an organization to start giving that idea reality. Both the idea and the concept of the organization were foreign, having traveled the distance in time and space from Lenin in the Soviet Union via Mao in China.

The Communist idea was to gain control of the 14 million people living in South Vietnam by destroying their faith in their own government and creating faith in the inevitability of a Communist takeover. The organization to do this through a phased series of disciplined actions was called the "National Liberation Front of South Vietnam." It had a central committee to direct its operations for political-psychological-military actions, and a wide assortment of member "fronts" manned by small cadres, to appeal politically to mass groupings of Vietnamese people: the farmers, the workers, the youth, the intellectuals, and even the civil servants and military.

Ever since the creation of a Communist political base in Vietnam, the successive governments of Vietnam and their supporters and counselor, the United States, with the approval and sometimes the help of other free-world peoples, have given their substance and made their sacrifices to prevent a Communist win. The harsh fact, and one which has given pause to every thoughtful American, is that, despite the use of overwhelming amounts of men, money, and materiel, despite the quantity of well-meant American advice and despite the impressive statistics of casualties inflicted on the Vietcong, the Communist subversive insurgents have grown steadily stronger, in numbers and in size of units, and still retain the initiative to act at their will in the very areas of Vietnam where Vietnamese and American efforts have been most concentrated.

Most American reactions to this stark fact have fallen within three general categories. Some believe that we should disengage in Vietnam, preferably by setting up means to end the struggle and bloodshed through international accommodation. Some believe we should plainly identify the struggle as a war and make use of our military proficiency to force the Communist regime in Hanoi to cease its adventure in the south. Some believe we should continue along the present course, but greatly increasing the quantity and effectiveness of what is done so that it eventually smothers and kills the Communist insurgency. The anomaly in these reactions is that each falls short of understanding that the Communists have let loose a revolutionary idea in Vietnam and that it will not die by being ignored, bombed, or smothered by us. Ideas do not die in such ways.

A fourth belief, admittedly in a minority in the free world at present, is to oppose the Communist idea with a better idea and to do so on the battleground itself, in a way that would permit the people, who are the main feature of that battleground, to make their own choice. A political base would be established. The first step would be to state political goals, founded on principles cherished by freemen, which the Vietnamese share; the second would be an aggressive commitment of organizations and resources to start the Vietnamese moving realistically toward those political goals. In essence, this is revolutionary warfare, the spirit of the British Magna Carta, the French "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité" and our own Declaration of Independence.

For American consideration, this fourth belief might be put another way. It is this. In trying to help the Vietnamese, the United States has been contributing in generous measure those things which it so far has felt most qualified to give and which the Vietnamese may lack—money, equipment, and technical advice. In general, though, the United States has felt inhibited about trying to make a contribution in areas in which it feels that the chief responsibility must rest with the Vietnamese themselves, particularly in finding the motivation for conducting a successful counterinsurgency effort. The thesis of this paper is that, due to the extent of our involvement, and because everything depends on that motivation, Americans cannot escape responsibility in this area either.

It will be stanchly maintained by some that no nation can endow another nation with the will to be free, that only an indigenous movement can have genuine popular appeal, that Americans should not interfere in the domestic affairs of another nation, and that the Vietnamese war is now in such a state that political innovations could invite disaster. This makes it necessary to examine the revolutionary solution in some detail.

Two near neighbors of Vietnam offer examples of countries which were successful in maintaining their freedom when attacked by Asian Communist subversive insurgents. True, the circumstances were not the same as in Vietnam today. Yet in each case the insurgencies were conducted as "wars of national liberation" by native Communists using a revolutionary political base, and these insurgencies were defeated.

The unconventional methods which were developed and used in the successful campaigns in Malaya and the Philippines are the lessons most often studied and adapted for use elsewhere, including in Vietnam. They have their importance. However, both of these successful campaigns had one great lesson in common, which the leaders recognized as the single most significant and vital factor in victory. The great lesson was that there must be a heartfelt cause to which the legitimate government is pledged, a cause which makes a stronger appeal to the people than the Communist cause, a cause which is used in a dedicated way by the legitimate government to polarize and guide all other actions—psychological, military, social and economic—with participation by the people themselves, in order to bring victory. In Malaya, the cause was to safeguard the impending national independence from seizure by Communist neocolonialism. In the Philippines, the cause was to safeguard the Constitution whose true value came to be appreciated as it was made a working document for the people, so that appeals by the Communists to the people to join them in overthrowing the constitutional government by force actually made the Communists a minority against the people's best interests.

These necessarily brief descriptions of two causes cannot convey the strength of their tremendously moving appeal to the people on the two battlegrounds. As with most fundamental truths, their concepts were plain to understand once they were explained correctly. After they were discovered and made effective, they seemed so natural and obvious that many people who had not shared the deep emotions of the insurgent battlegrounds tended to overlook them or underrate their vital significance, looking elsewhere for more romantic or technical foundations from which the victories might be supposed to have been started.

Of specific interest to those concerned with the problems of Vietnam, and as a commentary on the frailty of human perceptions, it should be noted that the vital causes which became the rallying points in Malaya and the Philippines were disregarded during years of tragic struggle in those countries. Once they were recognized and given dynamic use by leaders such as Templar, Magsaysay and others, even though this was done after there had been years of indecisive fighting, the climax of each campaign came quickly. If it can be expressed by a formula, the lesson might be stated as: When the right cause is identified and used correctly, the anti-Communist fight becomes a propeople fight, with the overwhelming majority of the people then starting to help what they recognize to be their own side, and the struggle is brought to a climax. When the propeople fight is continued sincerely by its leaders, the Communist insurgency is destroyed.

This concept of revolutionary warfare seems to lie close to the heart of American beliefs. In the President's June 23, 1964, press conference, in which he restated our southeast Asian policy, he said, "This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity." The month before, the Secretary of Defense explained to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that "the mission of our men in South Vietnam is the same as of those Europeans (he named Kosciusko, Von Steuben, and Pulaski) who came to assist us in our fight for liberty."

Now as already mentioned, the concept that the United States should give advice and counsel on waging revolutionary warfare in the form of a pro-people fight involves exporting American political principles, and some see such an export as something improper, or even immoral. Such an inhibition deserves close scrutiny when it is applied to a life-or-death struggle, such as the one in Vietnam, since it rules out or at least weakens American help in providing the attacked country with a dynamic political answer with which to meet and overcome the foreign ideas introduced by the Communists as the political base of their attack. Lacking such a dynamic answer, the country is left to make do with its own political resources—which, as we have witnessed time after time, often evolve into a one-man leadership with strict control over all national resources, in order to save the country. Americans see this result as a dictatorship and feel a moral inhibition against giving it assistance; some well-meaning people go so far as to attack it. Not surprisingly, the United States thus comes to be looked upon abroad as immature or callous or self-righteous.

Admittedly, great wisdom and sensitivity are required if the United States is to help in the internal political problems of foreign peoples. It would be a drastic change for most U.S. officials to try to satisfy the hesitantly expressed desires of leaders and peoples of sovereign states for political advice with a higher content of American idealism in it. Some might do the task badly, lacking the required perceptivity and understanding of the political backgrounds of either the host country or our own.

Yet the United States has undertaken political tasks of this sort in foreign nations in the past, and the results have brought it considerable honor and prestige. The two most recent examples were Japan and West Germany, defeated nations with which it somehow became "correct" to share the best possible American political thinking. Another example was the Philippines. We tutored the Philippine people and encouraged them in self-government in the same brotherly spirit which elsewhere today could make all the difference in struggles between freedom and Communism. While the Philippines, Japan and Germany are primarily examples of U.S. Government efforts, others which have been most useful were private or semipublic, such as the work of American lawyers abroad in helping establish the legal foundation of government. It is not surprising or unseemly that the Constitution of India contains so many provisions based upon decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, that the 1955 Constitution of Ethiopia recognizes so many of the same rights as does the U.S. Constitution, that the 1940 Constitution of Cuba remains the very antithesis of Castro and the eventual return to its observance one of the great hopes of the Cuban people.

The great cause in Vietnam which last united the overwhelming majority of Vietnamese, both North and South, was "independence." For many of the Vietnamese, including nearly all the Vietnamese leaders with whom we work today in South Vietnam, "independence" was a goal to be won by revolutionary means against a colonial power. In this aspect, Vietnam's revolutionary spirit was close to that of the American Revolution.

The tragedy of Vietnam's revolutionary war for independence was that her "Benedict Arnold" was successful. Ho Chi Minh, helped by Vo Nguyen Giap, Truong Chinh, Pham Van Dong, and a small cadre of disciplined party members trained by the Chinese and Russians, secretly changed the goals of the struggle. Instead of a war for independence against the French colonial power, it became a war to defeat the French and put Vietnam within the neocolonial Communist empire. When they discovered the truth, those patriots who could escaped. It is worth remembering that, after the Geneva Accords were signed in 1954, Vietminh troops were stoned by the population in Qui Nhon, the farmers of Ho Chi Minh's home province of Nghe An revolted against their Communist overlords, and a million Vietnamese fled from Communist territory.

The national revolution was reborn in South Vietnam when Ngo Dien Diem placed the fate of the new nation in the people's hands in 1955. Their secret ballot elected him almost unanimously to become their President, with the mandate to hold further elections for a constitutional assembly which would establish a government to govern with the consent of the governed. This was a revolutionary act, and the Vietnamese people rallied to the cause. Again, it is worth remembering that soon after this election, which had so roused the people to the cause of freedom, the Soviet Union sent representatives to London to meet with the representatives of the other cosponsor of the Geneva Accords, Great Britain. The two sponsoring parties agreed to call off the plebiscite which the accords had scheduled to be held in 1956. An internationally supervised secret ballot in Vietnam might well have gone heavily against the Communists at that time.

Unlike the American Revolution, the reborn national revolution in Vietnam lost its momentum. The spirit of revolution began to be replaced by the spirit of "business as usual," and Diem became more and more shut off from the people. The Communists kept up unceasing psychological pressure to weaken the bonds between government and people, both through character assassination of government leaders and by means of terror. (Informed observers estimate that more than 6,000 minor Vietnamese officials, such as village elders, rural police, and their families, have been murdered by the Vietcong since 1959.) The forcible overthrow of Diem last November and the later coup in January were revolutionary acts in themselves, but appear to have been outside a national revolution at the rice-roots level, since they put the government largely into the hands of the army and the bureaucracy. While these are sizable, organized groups, they still are not the majority of the Vietnamese, the people among whom the Vietcong hide and get support for their operations.

Widely shared feelings about revolution were summed up ably in a document written by the patriot, Dan Van Sung, addressed to other Vietnamese nationalist leaders in July 1963. He wrote:

"Emergent nations like Vietnam are in the midst of a political revolution. They are groping toward a new political and social order. In the process, many ideological schools may be fighting one another. On the one side are the Communists; on the other side are grouped the Nationalists of various tendencies, each of which is still in need of development. Whether the United States likes it or not, the aid program has to take the local revolution into account because American aid is bound to affect the revolutionary course and direction in one way or another, for the benefit or the damnation of the recipient people. This gives rise to a new responsibility which, while not propounded in the implementation of the Marshall plan, must be dealt with realistically. Within the framework of American foreign policy, anticommunism now has a revolutionary context. The American respect for the recipient people's self-determination can no longer be guaranteed by a negative policy of nonintervention which, practically speaking, may lead to just the contrary. In order to make sure that an emergent people really control their own destiny, the United States is expected to make positive efforts helping them develop control of themselves. In other words, American aid ought to be devised so as to help their legitimate aspirations come true through the achievement of their political revolution. This cannot be done without getting to the bottom of the revolutionary situation and taking sides in it, not only for anticommunism but also for democracy. * * * By emphasizing anticommunism rather than positive revolutionary goals and from lack of a better adaptation to the local situation, the United States has reduced its anti-Communist efforts in Vietnam to the maintenance of an administrative machine and of an army. * * * The way out, to our mind, is not by an abandonment but, on the contrary, by going deep into every local revolutionary problem and helping solve them using principles of justice and freedom, and perhaps in fusing them with the revolutionary spirit of 1776."

The foregoing leads to the final question of the feasibility of American help in banding the leaders, the military, the civil servants, and the people of Vietnam into a united force for freedom. This was tried by edict in the emergency national mobilization of August 1964. Yet, the sovereign Vietnamese people, even in such a time of stress, are unlike the defeated Japanese and Germans who had no choice but to submit to a rule by edict, supported by massive American advisory help throughout all echelons of government. In a revolutionary or people's war, such as the war in Vietnam, where the enemy is embedded within the population, the lasting quality needed for a win is the voluntary action of the population in joining together with the government forces, and with the American influence coming from respect and trust earned by the spirit in which individual Americans give their help.

There is no shortcut, no magic formula, to be used in engineering a great patriotic cause led by some universally loved Vietnamese of American selection. This type of puerile romance should not be attempted in real life. Nor does it seem probable in the light of Vietnam's recent history, despite the cheering urban crowds in all too brief moments of great emotion, that the Vietnamese themselves will find quickly and easily any revolutionary solution which will carry them all the way to victory.

At this point in time and experience, perhaps the most valuable and realistic gift that Americans can give Vietnam is to concentrate above everything else on helping the Viet-

namese leadership create the conditions which will encourage the discovery and most rapid possible development of a patriotic cause so genuine that the Vietnamese willingly will pledge to it their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor. Among the attributes of such a cause are that it shall give hope for a better future for each Vietnamese, that it shall provide a way for all Vietnamese to work for it, and that it shall have such integrity that it will induce Vietnamese leaders to start trusting one another. A number of actions can be undertaken, step by step, to create the conditions required. Some of them will now be suggested.

Foremost among the specific actions open to the United States is one to help the Vietnamese stabilize their government, even in its caretaker status, so that its leaders can afford to pay less attention to protecting their backs and more to the future. It is reported that there are several Vietnamese proposals about how to do this among the present leadership. It should not be too difficult for the United States to influence the adoption, as a matter of urgency, of the proposal most acceptable to Vietnamese leaders. Its success should be insured through American advisers counseling individual Vietnamese on how to make the project work most harmoniously for the good of all, while being alert to curtail intemperate moves toward a coup or studied disobedience.

Another important need is to help the Vietnamese make the present caretaker government just that, a temporary caretaker, in accord with the government's own expressed desire. It would seem premature to set a precise day to hold elections, such as those announced for late in 1964. The Vietcong subversive insurgents dominate too many villages for truly free universal elections. It would seem more realistic to say that an election will be held on the date when a simple majority of the population can vote by secret ballot, free of any threat.

If democracy is ever to become established in Vietnam, as Vietnamese patriots hope, then political leaders and political parties need encouragement to gain experience and strength. They cannot do this on the political sidelines. Some new place should be found in the government for political leaders not now included, perhaps in a new Assembly of Notables which would fill the void left by the abolition of the consultative Council of Notables. A truly practical task for such an Assembly might be for it to send out committees to check on the situation in hamlets and villages, to certify when conditions become favorable for holding a free popular election for hamlet and village officials, and then to help organize such an election. As a next step, similar procedures could open the way to elections for district chief, then province chief, and, when a majority of provinces are freed, to national elections. This program would provide a practical short-range political goal, give hope that a longer range goal is attainable, stimulate a healthy growth of political parties and start giving people their own government at the rice roots in direct confrontation to the Communist idea.

Americans could add to the attractiveness of these political goals by designing our local aid program to increase social and economic progress at a more rapid pace in villages where elections have been held. The incentive of a system of reward of visible material benefits along with the political benefits of freedom should be a dynamic instrument for accelerating progress. If rewards are given when conditions are stable enough to merit them, rather than in an attempt to buy the loyalties of the people, word of this will spread rapidly throughout the country; and they will not only become a brake on Communist recruiting efforts but also put the American presence in a most favorable context.

A Vietnamese provincial official told an American friend in August that the country would be saved if each of Vietnam's leaders "acted as though each day were his last day to live." Some form of spirited and selfless motivation for all Vietnamese in positions of authority does seem to be required. Perhaps it could be achieved through a Declaration of Liberty or other pledge to serve the country, signed in blood and providing strong penalties for failure to honor it. In any case, American advisers in all echelons, who are in daily association with Vietnamese in positions of responsibility, can encourage loyal patriotism by paying them proper respect. When American advisers express contempt for the fighting quality of the Vietnamese, as reported in our press this summer, it is a sign of the failure of such advisers to help develop the inherent quality of the Vietnamese. They might note and remember that the well-motivated "Sea Swallow" troops of Binh Hung, under Father Hoa, have fought against great odds, and that in almost constant engagements from the end of 1960 to the summer of 1964, 189 of them have been killed in actions in which 2,272 Vietcong were killed.

The most urgent military need is to make it the number one priority for the military to protect and help the people. When the military opens fire at long range, whether by infantry weapons, artillery or air strike, on a reported Vietcong concentration in a hamlet or village full of civilians, the Vietnamese officers who give these orders and the American advisers who let them "get away with it" are helping defeat the cause of freedom. The civilian hatred of the military resulting from such actions is a powerful motive for joining the Vietcong.

If American leaders in Vietnam are to make this war "a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity," and if the Americans with them are to become today's Kosciuskos, Von Steubens and Pulaskis in spirit, they should keep fresh in mind what happened in the hamlets of Tay Ninh province earlier this year, as an affront to every American doctrine, civilian or military. In Tay Ninh province, which is on the Cambodia border and not far from Saigon, two Vietcong battalions had entered a cluster of six adjoining hamlets. They fought their way in, overwhelming and destroying the civil guard post, whose men stood to the last in defense of the hamlets. Once inside, the Vietcong announced that they were going to stay for 72 hours. Then at noon the next day, ARVN, the Vietnamese Army with its American advisers, arrived. ARVN deployed along a half perimeter and for 18 hours poured into these six hamlets all the firepower it could, from the ground and from the air. Meanwhile, of course, most of the Vietcong had slipped out of the unguarded part of the perimeter, not waiting to become targets. Many of the men, women and children of the hamlets had to stay there and take it. Afterwards, survivors said they were grateful to the Vietcong, who had made them dig foxholes.

American bounty, whether in the form of military-civic action or economic aid by U.S. civilians, cannot make up for such mistakes. Nor can it buy the friendship of the Vietnamese people. However, the U.S. military can give a major boost to the political effort simply by upgrading the importance they assign to military-civic action and to guiding the Vietnamese military into accepting it as a basic soldierly quality in this war, just as the Vietcong do. Civic action means more than giving economic help; it is an attitude of behavior, an extension of military courtesy, in which the soldier citizen becomes the brotherly protector of the civilian citizen. The Vietcong practice it, under severe penalties for misbehavior, as point nine of their military oath of honor, which General Giap adopted from the 8th Route Army code of Mao Tse-tung known as the "Three Rules and the Eight Remarks." This code implemented the concept of the people as the water where the troops live as the fish. It must be puzzling to Communist observers to note that Americans in Vietnam usually initiate "civic action" in the form of public works by special ARVN units and not as a performance expected of every soldier. Observers who are most experienced in insurgent warfare believe that the Vietcong will not be defeated until ARVN catches the spirit of civic action and practices it through all ranks.

Vietnam is predominantly an agricultural nation, and what happens in the countryside may well determine the outcome of the war. The Communists are short of food, and the countryside is the prize which they seek above all. When American fertilizers increase by 100 percent the rice production in one season in one region, the prize becomes all the more tempting to the Communists (however galling must be the comparison with North Vietnam, where Chinese agricultural advisers have had so many failures). But this must not impede the process of economic development. The Americans have also introduced a rudimentary cooperative method in pig raising in the northerly provinces of South Vietnam; if it is recognized and developed to its fullest politico-economic potential, it could be the start of one of the biggest changes in Vietnamese life yet seen. The pig-raising project has brought about the formation of farmers' associations, to handle the paddy-farm end of agrarian credit from the government as well as the distribution of piglets and feed. These farmers' associations are a new form of social unit in Vietnam. If they are encouraged to grow, and become an economic success, and begin having a voice in national affairs, strong bonds will have been created between people and leaders. This operation deserves the attention of the best American political thinking, along with American economic help.

The foregoing are just a sample of actions which Americans can undertake to create favorable conditions for the emergence of a powerful Vietnamese "cause." If devotion to a true revolutionary cause can bring the struggle in South Vietnam to a favorable climax, its revolutionary appeal might eventually spread to the people of North Vietnam, wounding communism at its most vital point—communism's control of the masses.

Whatever course the war in Vietnam takes, Americans will do well to remember the importance of "Nguoi Thuong Dan," the symbolic Vietnamese. It is the name the Vietnamese give to "the man in the street," the rice-paddy farmer, the shopkeeper, the artisan—the citizen. He is the key piece in the whole war in Vietnam, both its subject and its object, the pawn, and in an ultimate sense the decider. There is still time for Americans to help him determine rightly the fate of his country.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1966]

SAIGON'S "PACIFICATION" PLANNERS AWAITING THE PEASANT'S VERDICT—REPEATED FAILURES CAST A LONG SHADOW AS NEW RURAL PROGRAM IS BEGUN UNDER MORE AMBITIOUS CHIEFS

(By Charles Mohr)

SAIGON, JAN. 23.—Although the South Vietnamese Government has given its highest priority this year to a new plan for "rural pacification," some old Vietnam hands express doubt that this is the year when pacification will achieve much.

One official said: "1966 is not the year for pacification. This is going to be the year when the peasant is going to want to sit on the fence more than ever and not choose

sides. He will want to see who is winning this war."

But a number of equally hard-bitten veterans of past disappointments in politics and pacification suggest that there is reason for realistic optimism this year.

History seems to be on the side of the cynics. Pacification—the campaign to drive the Vietcong out of the countryside and implant programs that will win the peasants' support for Saigon—has never worked in the past.

"POISONOUS FISH"

As Premier Nguyen Cao Ky said in a major speech recently, all previous governments have had plans "to win the hearts of the people and to remove the poisonous fish from the pure rural waters."

"What about the results?" he went on to ask. And caustically he answered his own question: "There is no need to repeat the results."

On the other hand, those who are more optimistic also marshal some strong arguments. The Ky government appears to mean what it says when it gives "rural reconstruction" its highest priority. And most American officials suggest that the South Vietnamese and U.S. leadership of the program has vastly improved.

GENERAL PUT IN CHARGE

Last fall, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Duc Thang was appointed Minister of Rural Construction. He got his budget prepared on time for the start of the fiscal year, on January 1, and, in the words of one American official, "has shown an administrative drive and determination to get things done that haven't been seen before in pacification work."

Col. Nguyen Van Chau, chief of Kienhoa Province and an admired innovator of psychological warfare and pacification techniques, was placed in charge of the corps of rural reconstruction teams to be sent into the field.

Edward G. Lansdale, a former Air Force major general who holds the intentionally vague title "senior liaison officer" of the U.S. Embassy, has been the chief adviser to the Government and to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge on pacification.

Mr. Lansdale has had a long career advising Asian governments on combating Communist subversion. He has critics, but his admirers tend to admire him fervently.

The concepts of pacification to be followed this year are not new to the art of counter-insurgency, but many officials describe the overall plan as more coherent, creative, and exciting.

One goal is to put 42,000 rural construction workers, organized into 80-man teams, into the field. These teams are to carry out agitation and propaganda work, set up economic development plans and try to form functioning locally elected hamlet governments.

They will also carry out "census grievance" work, interrogating each peasant in the hamlet once every 10 days. The project will work something like a dental clinic: the peasant will be given his next interrogation appointment as he ends his first session. The work is aimed at identifying the real grievances of the population, correcting them and eliciting intelligence information on the Vietcong secret organization in the countryside.

Meanwhile an effort will be made to see that each person becomes a member of at least one Government-sponsored organization to link the peasants to some disciplined group.

Rural construction teams will train local residents to continue the work after the hamlet has been "pacified."

SOME PROBLEMS EASE

Perhaps it is too early to say that the situation in Vietnam has fundamentally changed in the 7 months of the Ky Government, but some changes appear to have taken place. Some of the problems that doomed past pacification programs may no longer exist, officials say.

One reason for past failures is that from the middle of 1963 to the middle of 1965 the military situation in South Vietnam steadily deteriorated.

Increasingly strong bands of Vietcongs guerrillas made the countryside so dangerous that pacification workers could not operate or in some cases survive.

The military situation is still serious. There are, in fact, more Vietcong troops than ever before. But almost 200,000 American ground troops are in the country, and the weary South Vietnamese armed forces have begun to rebuild battle-torn units and to grow in size.

Officials voice hope for a new military situation in which regular allied troops will harass and pursue full-time guerrilla units in their stronghold areas, creating a shield behind which pacification groups and militiamen can try to root out local part-time guerrillas and the Vietcong political organization.

If such a military situation does not develop, officials say, the 1966 pacification plan will be unlikely to achieve significant results.

Another reason that past pacification plans did not work, officials add, is that the efforts were given lip service by everyone from U.S. Cabinet members to junior military officers but were never given real priority.

"We talked about it and drew graphs," an American official has remarked, "but we concentrated on conventional military actions."

Vietnamese province chiefs, for example, tended to expropriate any really effective pacification workers and use them as emergency military reinforcements, informed sources say.

[From the New York Times]

VIETNAMESE WAGE BATTLE ON INFLATION

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON.—There are two wars in South Vietnam.

United States and South Vietnamese soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen are fighting the more dramatic one—sweating under the tropical sun and risking their lives against an unconventional enemy in a rugged country.

Their struggle may be no more important than that of the American economists who, with their South Vietnamese counterparts, spent last year and will spend this year struggling to hold back economic chaos that could wreck this country as quickly as the Vietcong could.

The chief economic enemy is inflation, and the fight against it was a dominant theme in South Vietnam's life last year.

WOES FOLLOWED SHAKEUP

Until the fall of President Ngo Dinh Diem in November 1963, South Vietnam's economy was rudimentary, and its expenditures were relatively small. Then Government spending jumped, putting more money into circulation, and the armed forces swelled, curtailing the work force.

Other developments were equally unhealthy: the enormous influx of American personnel (200,000 servicemen are here now, and no end is in sight); the "taxes" levied by the Vietcong on goods that merchants brought to market; the tendency of many frightened merchants to hoard, and the relatively unskilled management of national economic policy. In such a situation, inflation was inevitable. Money was plentiful; goods and services were scarce.

RICE PRICE SOARS

For the Saigon housewife shopping in the public marketplace, 22 pounds of rice went from 80 piasters in January to 110 in August, to 125 in October (A hundred piasters may be worth 55 cents to $1.67, depending on the exchange circumstances.)

Two pounds of shrimp went from 60 to 80 to 120 piasters, a loaf of bread from 6 to 7 to 8, a pedicab ride from 10 to 12 to 15.

Government spending, which totaled 25 billion piasters in 1964, approached 50 billion piasters last year.

In some areas, such as construction, wages have kept pace with costs. But for those on fixed incomes, such as civil servants, white-collar workers and taxi drivers, inflation has meant hardship.

"The only way to put up with the prices," a Saigon woman said the other day, "is to manage somehow to live off the Americans—sell them something, rent them something or work in their offices. They pay well."

U.S. diplomats fearful that a sharp rise in prices would bring blame on the Americans and might undercut the government of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, have taken extraordinary steps to combat the pressure.

By importing rice to replace the portion of the Vietnamese harvest that is seized each year by the Communists, and by airlifting rice from areas where there are surplus stocks, economic planners have prevented great leaps in the rice price. In fact, the price of 22 pounds of quality rice on the Saigon market dropped from 150 to 125 piasters in the final 8 weeks of last year.

This victory was important because the demand for rice is—in the language of economics—extremely inelastic: each peasant must have his portion every day, and he will pay steep prices for it if necessary.

To put the matter another way, rice prices are extremely susceptible to inflation.

Another major step was the Americans' adoption of a system of military payment currency, or scrip. Since its introduction in September, the system has limited the circulation of dollars in Vietnam. Servicemen must exchange their scrip for piasters before shopping or eating in Saigon.

In the last 3 months of 1965, about $6 million worth of scrip a month was exchanged for piasters. Before the institution of scrip, roughly this amount in dollars was finding its way onto a flourishing black market here.

DOLLAR FLOW CONTROLLED

The advantages of the innovation are dual: The dollars are kept off the black market to defeat corruption, and they provide foreign exchange to the South Vietnamese Government instead of ending up in Communist China or elsewhere.

The most important American anti-inflation effort remains the commodity-import program, under which Washington buys such goods as dentist chairs or paper-back books for dollars in the United States and sells them to private citizens here for piasters. This system creates a flow of goods to soak up excess spending power.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 24, 1966]

PEASANTS TOIL FOR THE EARTH, NOT FOR A GOVERNMENT

(By Richard Critchfield)

TAN AN, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"This earth which formed their home and fed their bodies and made their gods."

The Asian peasant's deep attachment to the soil he tills and in which his ancestors are buried, described in Pearl Buck's "The Good Earth," is strongly evident here in the Mekong Delta rice bowl of South Vietnam.

It is harvest time now. The golden fields of the great fertile plain between the Mekong, Bassac and Saigon Rivers are dotted with men and women winnowing the precious rice against tall, curved shelters of plaited bamboo so as not to lose a grain.

In black pajamas and pointed straw hats, barefoot, bronzed by the January sun, the

peasants have the sturdy look of men and women who can endure disease, natural disaster and war so long as they have some land to farm.

But very few have land of their own. In Long An, one of Vietnam's most fertile Provinces, more than 85 percent of the peasant population are tenants.

This landownership pattern may help explain why, despite a tremendous cost in lives and material, the war in Long An is no closer to being won than it was several years ago.

Last year, the heaviest fighting raged in the jungles and rubber plantations north of Saigon, the rain forests and grasslands of the high plateau and in the swamps and rice paddies of the narrow central coastal plain.

But if the main theater of war lay elsewhere, the rice-rich heartland of the Saigon region and the upper Mekong Delta, linked together by Long An, remains the prize for which the war is being fought.

Here, in less than 14 Provinces, live almost two-thirds of the 15 million South Vietnamese.

In June 1964, the summer before the Vietcong began massing multibattalion forces for pitched battles, Long An was held up as the showplace of how a combined Vietnamese-American military and economic pacification effort could defeat a Communist insurrection.

Visitors went to Long An if they wanted to see how the protracted, guerrilla war was going in the countryside.

But now, 18 months later, little has changed.

There has been no dramatic turn in the guerrilla fighting; the government has won some villages and lost some.

There are no signs of any serious deterioration. But there has been no real improvement either; since it is primarily a war of subversion in Long An, the creeping Communist initiative simply has crept further.

Other peasants have replaced the hundreds of Vietcong killed in battle, and American military and civilian advisers agree there are many more Vietcong than a year ago.

OPPOSING SIDES

Most important in Long An, however, the government and the mass of peasantry still seem to be on the opposing sides of the fight.

None of the successive Saigon governments, has succeeded in analyzing the peasants' grievances and then tried to right these wrongs, though there are signs Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's regime is moving in this direction.

Land is of such paramount importance here that the Vietcong allow only the landless or very poor farmers in the delta to command guerrilla units or qualify as party members.

The provincial government's social order is the exact reverse. Most of the military officers, civil servants, and community leaders come from the landowning gentry.

The same is true in Saigon where only one of the 10 generals now sharing power has any rapport with the masses. He is central Vietnam's erratic Maj. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, who also is the only one of peasant origin.

The traditional Mandarin ruling class fell from power with Ngo Dinh Diem, but their political heirs are the nonpeasant urban middle classes and their relatives.

LODGE PUSHES REFORM

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and his top aids have made it clear that the United States regards major land redistribution as essential in successfully prosecuting the war.

Ky recently announced a land reform program that will initially convey 700,000 acres to 180,000 peasants.

Eventually, the program will be expanded to encompass over 500,000 acres of land formerly owned by the French, 660,000 acres now farmed by "squatters" and 300,000 acres where free titles will be awarded in resettlement areas.

The crux of the problem, however, has yet to be tackled. This is the redistribution from big to small owners of more than 2 million acres in the Mekong Delta.

Good delta land is worth about $50 an acre; it is roughly estimated by the South Vietnamese generals that it would cost between $150 and $200 million to carry out equitable reform programs here.

Land reform under Diem left a bitter aftermath, since 2,279 dispossessed landlords were paid only 10 percent in cash as compensation and given low-interest, nontransferable, 12-year bonds for the rest. The bonds since have plummeted in value.

UNITED STATES GENERATING MONEY

The United States could solve this problem by generating $150 million in local currencies so that an outright compensation could be made.

It already is generating piasters to pay for the Vietnamese share in the war—to the tune of $350 million this year—by giving the Saigon government imported commodities to sell to local merchants.

Both North Vietnam's Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap and the U.S. commander Gen. William C. Westmoreland describe the Vietnam conflict as "a people's war," and not "a war of attrition."

Since the emphasis, first, is on converting and, second, on killing, the investment of $150 million in land reform to undermine the Vietcong's peasant support would seem like a bargain in a war that is costing $16.5 million a week.

During the early days of the Diem regime, the United States spent $4 million on land reform. From 1961 through 1965 nothing was spent. And $1.1 million is budgeted for the current fiscal year.

PROBLEM NOT UNIFORM

The problem is not uniform throughout the country. With the exception of the Saigon area, the upper Mekong Delta and a thin, populated strip along the coastline, South Vietnam is mostly empty terrain. More than 85 percent of the land total is covered with jungle, swampland or dense foliage.

Along the overpopulated coastal fringe, now heavily burdened with refugees, most farms are small and owner-operated and there is real land hunger.

In the highlands, the problem could be solved simply by giving the Montegnard tribes clear title to land they have farmed for centuries.

The real problem is in the delta.

Out of 1.2 million farms, only 260,000 are owner-operated; 520,000 are rented and 330,000 more are partly rented.

There are 71 farms of more than 250 acres and 85,000 more over 12 acres (though all one peasant family can reasonably handle is 5 to 7 acres).

Some 3,000 rich Saigon families still are the big landlords.

In Long An, the pattern is even more lopsided. According to one official U.S. survey made last July, 65 rich landlords, 2,000 farmer-owners, and 28,000 tenant families comprise the population.

COULD INFLUENCE ELECTION

The land-ownership pattern probably would significantly influence the outcome of a free election, such as envisaged in the 1954 Geneva agreements.

Lodge has observed the Communist promises of land to the tiller is "perhaps the greatest appeal the Vietcong have."

Why there is so much opposition to sweeping land reform among some Saigonese is suggested by the tremendous wealth of a delta province like Long An.

In a good year, such as 1963–64, Long An produced 320,000 tons of rice (Saigon's annual requirement is only 600,000 tons.) It also sold that year 10,000 tons of pineapple, 70,000 tons of sugar cane, plus chickens, ducks, pigs, and other cash earners.

The legal land ceiling is 220 acres. Even so, a Saigon landlord who charges double the legal rental rate of 25 percent, as he can do if the land is fertile enough, stands to profit as much as $40,000 in a single year on 220 acres.

This compares with a Vietnamese policeman's monthly wage of $25, or the monthly cash allotment of a Vietcong guerrilla, which is 40 cents.

POLITICAL ATTITUDES AFFECTED

More important perhaps, is how this unequal distribution of land affects the political attitudes of the Vietnamese.

What seems to be absent here is the kind of political code that Theodore H. White has described as President Johnson's "grass roots liberalism":

"You get yours and he gets his and we all share what there is to share."

In Long An, this gets no further than "you get yours" and he, the peasant, can either lump it or try to get his by joining the Vietcong.

But most of the peasants have learned by now that under the Vietcong nobody keeps his.

This has created the kind of political vacuum where many Vietnamese peasants regard the war as a pointless slaughter. They still feel they stand to be the losers no matter who wins.

CAUGHT IN VISE

Caught between bloodsucking landlords, many of whom charge double the legal rents, and pitiless Vietcong tax collectors, who shoot first and talk later, the peasants appear ready to call a plague on both sides of this indecisive struggle.

Yet there is an appeal to the Vietcong's three main propaganda themes: "Land to the tiller," "The soldier helps the peasant," and "The government exists for the people."

These are novel and explosive ideas to a man who works knee deep in mud 14 hours a day, growing half his rice for somebody else, whose idea of government may be a venal local tax collector, and whose chickens and ducks may have disappeared when the last militia patrol passed through his village.

If his home has been destroyed or relatives killed by ill-directed bombs and shells, he might make a ready Vietcong convert without knowing what for.

U.S. MILITARY FRUSTRATED

Within the American military command in Saigon, there is widespread frustration over the failure of pacification efforts in the delta provinces like Long An.

One hears talk that the only way the Vietcong fish can be deprived of the water in which they swim is to make things so hot in Communist held zones that the peasants will come over to the Government side as refugees.

Others argue there is no substitute for thoroughgoing land reform.

One veteran American adviser in Long An said:

"These people have country that doesn't need a government. They could go back 2,000 years and they'd be happy, fish in every pond, crabs in every paddy, bananas, coconut, and ducks. All they need is a little land of their own to be happy. Five percent of the Vietnamese in this province are honestly pro-Government by their own personal beliefs and ideology, 5 percent are with the Vietcong for the same reason and the other 90 percent are right."

SENATORS FROM MAINE WHO HAVE SERVED AS CHAIRMEN OF THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this coming March 6 the Senate Appropriations Committee will have its 99th birthday, it having been established on that date in 1867 through Senate approval of a resolution submitted by Henry Anthony, a Republican from Rhode Island.

Of all the States, Maine has the most unique record with respect to the chairmanship of this great committee. It is a record of which I am very proud. Maine has had four Senators serve as chairman, an unusual record, since no other State can boast of having had more than one. In addition to this, a fifth chairman was born and raised in Maine although he served as chairman as a Senator from New Hampshire.

The four Maine Senators serving as chairmen of the Senate Appropriations were Lot M. Morrill, William Pitt Fessenden, Eugene Hale, and Frederick Hale. A fifth chairman, Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, was born in Pembroke, Maine, and attended the University of Maine.

The Maine story on the Senate Appropriations Committee is even more unusual and unique than Maine's championship in the number of chairmen. Senators Eugene and Frederick Hale constituted the only father-son combination in the history of the chairmanship of the committee. Eugene Hale was chairman of the committee from 1909 to 1911 and 2 decades later Frederick Hale served as chairman from December 8, 1932, to March 8, 1933.

Another strikingly unique aspect of the main story in the Senate Appropriations Committee is that of Senators Morrill and Fessenden, as Senator Fessenden succeeded Senator Morrill as chairman of the committee and then later Senator Morrill succeeded Senator Fessenden as chairman. If that sounds confusing, it is understandable because it runs counter to two basic aspects of the chairmanship—first, that the chairmanship ordinarily goes by seniority to the most senior majority member of the committee; second, that such State monopoly of chairmanship is unparalleled.

This is how it happened: Lot M. Morrill, of Maine, became the first chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee with its creation in 1867. He served as chairman for 2 years. He had been elected to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hannibal Hamlin when Hamlin resigned in 1861 and that year became Vice President of the United States.

Senator Morrill served in the Senate until 1869 when he was succeeded by Hannibal Hamlin whom he had previously succeeded. When Senator Morrill left the Senate in 1869, Senator William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, became his successor as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This was very unusual because Senator Fessenden had not previously served on the Senate Appropriations Committee when he was made chairman. He held the chairmanship from March 4, 1869, to September 9 of that year, the date of his death.

Former Senator Lot Morrill was then appointed to the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Fessenden—and contrary to present-day custom, he was again made chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, thus succeeding the man who had succeeded him as chairman of the committee. He held the chairmanship this second time from December 8, 1869, to March 4, 1871, when he left the committee. However, he returned to become chairman a third time on March 12, 1873, and held the chairmanship until July 7, 1876, when he resigned to become Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinets of Presidents Grant and Hayes. He has the distinction of being the only Senator to serve as chairman of the committee on three occasions.

Other Maine Senators who have had the privilege of serving on the Senate Appropriations Committee are Senator James G. Blaine, who once won the Republican nomination for President, Senator Wallace H. White, Jr., who was Senate majority leader during part of his tenure and who was my predecessor, and myself.

Among the historical highlights of these Maine Senators who served as chairmen of the Senate Appropriations Committee are the following facts. The Fessenden family had the unusual distinction of having three brothers in the Congress at the same time, with Senator William Pitt Fessenden's two brothers, Samuel and Thomas, both serving in the House of Representatives in 1863.

Senator Eugene Hale had one of the longest services in the history of Congress with total House and Senate service of 40 years. In his 30 years in the Senate from 1881 to 1911, Senator Eugene Hale had a longer continuous service than anyone then in the Senate, when he retired. He was offered and declined two Cabinet posts, one as Postmaster General in the Cabinet of President Grant, the other as Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Hayes. His son, Frederick Hale, was elected to the Senate 5 years after he retired and served in the Senate for almost 24 years.

Mr. President, I am, indeed, proud of Maine's contribution to the leadership of the Senate Appropriations Committee as provided by these great Maine statesmen who served as chairman of this great committee. As I view their historical accomplishments, I feel extremely fortunate to have served on this great committee for 13 years and since 1953.

ADMINISTRATION PLANS TO DESTROY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY—CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have learned that the Johnson administration is electioneering among private groups to gain support for its plan to destroy the Small Business Administration as an independent agency.

This explains why the President has failed to appoint a new Administrator of SBA.

This explains why the funds of the agency have been so dried up that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of small business loan applications are gathering dust in the regional offices of the SBA.

This explains why Eugene P. Foley, former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, has been transferred to the Department of Commerce.

Perhaps we are seeing a new trend in politics that first became manifest when the Democratic leadership in the Senate opposed the efforts of Republicans to give the Senate Small Business Committee legislative authority. This "small business be damned" attitude, which destroyed the attempt to give the Senate committee the power it should have, has now been unleashed again and may bring about the undoing of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency.

Yes, we are witnessing a strange development in American politics—a development that will see the President embrace big business with his right arm while clasping big labor with his left. And woe unto any force that stands in the way of this great triumvirate.

Before reaching their present exalted status, both Lyndon B. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke with passion about the need for an independent agency to give small business an effective voice in government, but it seems that times have changed and each has remained silent about the proposal to put small business under the heel of the Department of Commerce.

Why is all this happening, Mr. President? No one really knows, but perhaps some speculation is in order. The special report of the Congressional Quarterly for the week ending January 21, 1966, may provide the clue we are seeking. That report points out that of Democratic individual contributions, in the last presidential campaign, 69 percent were in sums of $500 or more, whereas the bulk of Republican contributions came from the truly small giver.

"Put up or shut up" used to be a gambling expression but it may soon become the password of the Democratic administration.

One wonders what will happen to the small entrepreneurs of America if they must come as supplicants to the Department of Commerce.

Will a department long accustomed to dealing with corporate giants care much or know much about the problems of the small firm? Can such a Department understand how difficult it is for a small businessman to stand up to the competition of his powerful competitors?

Mr. President, I think we all know the answers to these questions.

Lyndon Johnson was right years ago when he supported the establishment of the Small Business Administration as an independent agency. He is wrong now if he plans to let this agency slip down the drain of the Department of Commerce.

Let all the facts come out, Mr. President. Those of us who want small business to survive are ready for a fight.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I congratulate my distinguished friend the Senator from Vermont on his remarks with respect to the Small Business Administration.

Many of us have been interested for a long time in making the Small Business Committee of the Senate a committee which would have legislative authority. As the Senator from Vermont has so well pointed out, this has been supported in the past, when those gentlemen were Members of the Senate, both by the President and the Vice President of the United States.

What the Senator from Vermont has called attention to is something which should demand the attention of everyone in the Senate. He, in doing it today, has been extremely timely, with the steps which are being taken, I am afraid, to degrade the Small Business Administration.

I think it would not be inappropriate, at this point, to make a few remarks about an experience that the Senator from Colorado had with the Small Business Administration during the floods which afflicted the State of Colorado in 1965, during the month of June.

As everyone knows, the part played by the Small Business Administration is quite great in disaster areas. At that time, Mr. Foley, who has since been transferred to the Department of Commerce, was the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. Over a period of a month, I called Mr. Foley's office, I do not know how many times, and finally, through the assistance of other people in the Government, was able to get a call back from him when he was in California. He seems to be one of the most peripatetic men in the whole administration, and that is saying a great deal. At least, I could never find him in his office, and was able to talk with him, in a period of 30 or 45 days, on only one occasion; and I had to talk with him from California that time.

The only way I could get any action or any answer out of the Small Business Administration, administered by Mr. Foley, was to go through the Office of Emergency Planning, the office directly under the President, which is charged with the planning of aid and assistance following major disasters.

If the Small Business Administration should be moved, as perhaps some people plan, to the Department of Commerce, I am afraid it might go back to this unable administrator who was formerly the Administrator of the Small Business Administration; and if that should happen, the small businessman in this country might as well give up the thought of being able to get a fair and equal shake in the economics of this country under the legislation we have passed to help him.

These days we hear much about prosperity and unemployment. But, Mr. President, as I go throughout my own State and throughout the country, I cannot but observe that while it may be that the big businesses of this country are prosperous, as their financial records seem to indicate, one cannot walk up and down the streets of the cities of this country, whether they are big cities or small towns, and find many small businesses which are prospering—one out of a hundred, or perhaps fewer.

It is time for those of us who are charged with legislative authority to start thinking seriously about what we can do to preserve the small businessmen in this country, because they are suffering in a hundred ways, under the tax yokes and other burdens and restrictions under which Congress and, more so, the regulatory agencies, have put them.

NEW HONOR TO JOSEPH A. BEIRNE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a very pleasant bit of news came to my desk this morning. It means yet another honor to a dedicated worker in the field of communication. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Communications this is an area well known to me. And I know and appreciate both the friendship and endeavors of the worker—Joseph A. Beirne, president of the Communication Workers of America AFL–CIO.

The news comes from the biennial conference of the United Community Funds and Councils of America meeting at Toronto.

Joe Beirne was named today as volunteer president of the Association.

All of us are thrilled in our own communities by these organizations that promote practical charity, social justice, personal service, organized agency programs and institutional services in many fields of human need.

We applaud their voluntary effort and sense of individual responsibility which becomes more important as it seems easier to surrender to Government invasion of the social welfare field.

Perhaps it is only natural that good hearts and able minds enlisted in the American labor movement should become deeply involved in the social justice and social welfare obligations of the whole community.

Indeed, labor leaders have given direction and valuable support and example to the public concern with human relations.

At first hand, labor leaders have developed ideals in health, leisure time activities, education, pension and welfare services out of their own immediate problems and obligations.

Therefore individuals in the labor movement have acquired an experience, expertness and devotion to altruistic service that community fund organizations are eager to draft for duty if their purposes are to be realized.

Joe Beirne is such an individual and the United Community Funds and Councils of America is the acme of organization in the public welfare field.

The organization is an old hand at correcting the ancient weaknesses of community existence. It has been finding the remedies for 57 years. Its labors have been monumental and its leaders have been mighty to meet the challenge.

For the first time in its 57 years the organization will be headed by a labor union officer—Joe Beirne.

To be sure, they did not have to look far for Joe. He has been a board member and officer of the national association for 10 years—chairman of the executive committee for 5 years.

In 1963 he received the National Community Service Award for outstanding national volunteer service for the advancement of the United Way in community health and welfare services.

Today he moves up to the presidency from the vice president's chair.

The presidency of the association is no small honor and no mean responsibility; for it embraces 2,200 community members.

But Joe Beirne brings to his added duties a record of some 30 years of responsibility in organization where the human element creates the dominant theme.

Mr. Beirne began his official union life in 1937 as president of his local and president of the union which represented all Western Electric Co. workers. He became principal officer of CWA in 1943, a post to which he has been reelected every 2 years. His first job in the communications industry began in 1928 at a Western Electric plant in New Jersey, at Jersey City, where he was born in 1911 of Irish immigrant parents.

He fortified his early education with night studies at Hudson College and New York University.

In 1946 he was named one of the 10 outstanding young men of America by the junior chamber of commerce. In 1949 he was elected a vice president of the CIO which CWA had just entered.

Intensely interested in international affairs, Mr. Beirne was the principal figure in establishing an alliance for progress for Latin American workers which developed into the American Institute for Free Labor Development cosponsored by labor, business, and government.

For the late President Kennedy Mr. Beirne served on a number of advisory boards including the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and the Committee on Youth Development. Under President Johnson he serves on the Automation Commission to meet the great economic challenge of our time, automation.

I get inspiration as I quote from Mr. Beirne's philosophy. He says:

> Successful adjustment to change will permit American labor in the years that lie ahead to fulfill its responsibility not only to its members but to the whole nation. With courage we can surmount the present challenge of change. We can, if we fully realize labor's creative intelligence, help make not only America but the entire free world more interesting, a more satisfactory, a more wholesome environment for our children and for our children's children.

I speak today with the thought that when labor may be a topic in this Senate Chamber we may reflect on the lives and labors of men dedicated not only to that movement but to America.

Such a man is Joseph A. Beirne.

I congratulate both him and the association as he ascends to its presidency.

CIGARETTES AND LUNG CANCER—IT DOESN'T ALWAYS HAPPEN TO THE OTHER GUY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] has brought to my attention a thoughtful article which appeared February 1 in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. The article is by Mark Waters, a longtime reporter on military and business affairs for the paper. The following is his final bylined story. It is his own obituary, for he died from lung cancer the day it appeared. Despite his physical weakness, he worked hard to leave behind this document that it might help others to avoid his fate.

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:

REPORTER MARK WATERS MET HIS KILLER 42 YEARS AGO—THIS IS HIS OWN STORY

(The byline of Mark Waters has long been known to Star-Bulletin readers. He was always an enterprising writer, able to tackle any story. For some time, he was the military reporter and most recently, handled the business beat. Today the Star-Bulletin prints his final bylined story. It is his own obituary. He wrote it last Thursday and made final corrections yesterday. He died today in Queen's Hospital of lung cancer.

(Despite his physical weakness, he worked hard to leave behind this document in hope it might help others, particularly the young. Mass will be offered at 10:30 a.m. Thursday in Our Lady of Peace Cathedral on Fort Street, followed by burial with military honors in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl. Friends may call at Borthwick Mortuary after 9:30 a.m. Thursday.)

(By Mark Waters)

Cigarettes were the death of me.

I became acquainted with my killer when I was about 14 and began stealing several Camels a day from my father's pack.

Inhaling caused some nausea at first but persistence conquered.

I was born in a miniature Hell's Kitchen in Davenport, Iowa, on June 2, 1909.

For economic reasons I've seldom admitted I was 56 and my continued bush of hair allowed me to sometimes get away with being 10 years younger than I actually was.

At 16, my family, including two sisters, Dorothy and Edith, moved to Baltimore, a city which I loved greatly and adopted as my hometown.

It was still no problem getting cigarettes.

I got odd jobs after school to buy them and tried all sorts of queer brands, such as Melachrinos, a scented Violet cigarette, Omars and English Ovals.

I felt quite sophisticated but I can't recall now that I enjoyed smoking them.

In 1928 the coming depression cast its shadow before us and odd jobs for youth became nil.

My father, a beautiful person who never hit me in his life, began counting his Camels.

A chum and I then took to picking butts off the street, toasting the soggy tobacco in the oven, and rolling them into rice paper cigarettes. They were horrible.

Things were very bad so I decided to join the Navy—a mouth removed from the table and I could send money home.

The night before I left, a warm summer's night, I found my father weeping on the back porch in sad frustration because he couldn't help his son enough to keep him from joining the Navy.

Now cigarettes became no problem at all. I think they were $1.20 a carton. If you were at sea, they were 40 cents a carton.

The 20-year Navy tour ended and I went to the University of North Carolina, where I was graduated.

Nearby Durham makes cigarettes by the billions and the whole town smelled like the wet weed.

I got a job after college with the San Diego Union.

One night while walking to my car, I had a slight stroke and staggered to the left.

I had been smoking one cigarette after the other that night and I felt that was what caused the stroke.

Muriel, my wife, and I tried to quit. We lasted 8 days only.

It wasn't that I got any real pleasure out of smoking. Except for the cigarette in the morning with my first cup of coffee, I never enjoyed smoking.

My mouth always tasted like a bird cage. It took away my appetite. It brought on emphysema that made it hard to breathe. My chest colds were real dillies—all because of cigarettes.

It's pure addiction. I guess there's a deep-seated psychological reason why people smoke, but I don't know what that is.

My wife smokes two packs a day, although she doesn't inhale. I've always smoked two packs a day, inhaling most of the smoke.

In 1956 I came to Honolulu to work for the Star-Bulletin, still smoking more than ever.

In June 1965, I accepted Dave Eyre's offer as assistant public relations director at Castle & Cooke.

I made the pressure and put it on myself. There is no grander boss than Dave or finer company than Castle & Cooke.

I smoked incessantly. My stomach began to hurt and I would get up every hour or half hour during the night to drink milk and smoke a cigarette.

In September 1965, I came down with a horrible cough. I was hoarse and there was a nasty soreness in my left lung.

I went to my doctor for my bad stomach.

The doctor listened to my chest and ordered an X-ray.

"You have a lung tumor," he said.

How could this be possible? I had had a thorough physical exam only 3 months before.

Figure the odds against your getting lung cancer.

Impossible.

But, a bronchoscopy by my lung surgeon confirmed it.

Four days later, he took out a left lobe.

A month later, I was back at work. I hadn't smoked since the day before my operation.

It wasn't hard to quit for one simple reason—motivation.

I came along fine, gained 10 pounds, and really felt good.

Then, on January 3, I thought I had caught a cold.

I stayed home for a day and then went to my surgeon who tapped a quart of burgundy fluid from my left chest cavity.

I went back several times and my surgeon said: "The time is drawing closer."

Later, my wife told me he had told her that after the operation I had less than a year to live. But she wouldn't believe it and didn't tell me. I find no fault with that.

The American Cancer Society's propaganda, I don't think tells the whole story because they try to soften the blow.

For instance, there are four cell types of lung cancer and the type seems to have a lot to do with the rate of growth.

My doctor told me this, as he should, but the American Cancer Society's publications for the public don't mention virulence.

We need more honest lay facts on cancer.

The American Cancer Society indicates I had at least a 50–50 chance—the figure for all cancers—when I scarcely had any chance at all.

My doctor said out of every 10 lung cancer cases, only 1 survives. The other nine die.

That's the survival rate for lung cancer, taking into consideration all forms of treatment available to medical science.

There is no 50–50 chance for this type of cancer.

My doctor has understandable missionary zeal about getting people to quit cigarettes.

He walked in the other day and said he just did surgery on another lung cancer case—another heavy smoker.

He points out that there's no question of the relationship between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. The statistics are overwhelming. One in every seven males who've been smoking heavily (20 cigarettes or more a day) for 20 years get lung cancer.

It's like playing Russian roulette with yourself.

He points out that in Hawaii the incidence of lung cancer has increased twofold in the last 10 years and will keep going up because the population is getting older.

The bad effect of cigarettes doesn't end with lung cancer. Smoking doubles the chances of coronary artery disease and the chances of getting emphysema are 14 times greater among smokers than nonsmokers. Then, there's cancer of the mouth, larynx, esophagus, and all the rest, too.

I think doctors get to feeling pretty helpless at times. They keep warning people—like me—but their warnings go unheeded.

And there's all that cigarette advertising in the papers, magazines, television and what have you.

As my doctor was saying the other day: "Millions of dollars of advertising in all forms are unleashed on the public and they're all aimed at giving the image that cigarettes can make up for a number of shortcomings."

The doctor said that in Italy, they've passed a ban against all cigarette advertisements on TV. In Great Britain, the ban is on during the hours that youngsters are apt to be watching TV.

I think that's a beginning in the right direction because, as the doctor says, the big effort should be to stop kids from getting started.

Another idea he mentioned is for the Government to increase the tax on cigarettes—say, $5 for a carton of cigarettes and up. That should smoke cigarettes right out of the market—maybe.

When you're told you are going to die, there is momentary shock and grief. But they wear off.

Now I assure you, I do not fear to die.

I am survived by my two sisters, my daughter Marcia and my beloved wife, Muriel, who owns Waters World Travel in Kailua.

Whether this story will stop anyone from smoking, I don't know. I doubt it.

Not a soul I've preached to has quit smoking—not a single, solitary soul.

It's one of those things. You always think, it'll happen to the other guy; never to me.

When you get your lung cancer—God help you.

All you need to see is the shadow on your chest X-ray.

It's a real shocker. There's nothing you can do or say. You can't get out of it. You're stuck.

You tell your doctor: "Please, I can't stand up to that."

And all he does it point to the shadow in the X-ray.

At this point, I'm very comfortable. The nurses give me something without a question whenever there's pain.

I'm very short of breath. I can't take five steps without having to sit.

The cancer has gone into my liver and I don't know where else.

I don't have a ghost of a chance.

It's too late for me.

It may not be for you.

VIETNAM—"THE WHOLE THING WAS A LIE!" A MUCH DECORATED COMBAT VETERAN'S TESTIMONY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the February 1966 issue of Ramparts, there is published an article entitled "The Whole Thing Was a Lie!" written by former M. Sgt. Donald Duncan, holder of the South Vietnamese Silver Star, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Bronze Star, and the U.S. Army Air Medal.

The article illustrates Master Sergeant Duncan's disillusionment with the variance between what he was told about the situation in Vietnam and what he actually found there.

The article is well worth reading and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, certain statements in the article are worth underscoring. Master Sergeant Duncan makes the observation that:

> The whole thing was a lie. We weren't preserving freedom in South Vietnam. There was no freedom to preserve. To voice opposition to the Government meant jail or death. Neutralism was forbidden and punished. Newspapers that didn't say the right thing were closed down. People are not even free to leave and Vietnam is one of those rare countries that doesn't fill its American visa quota. It's all there to see once the Red film is removed from the eyes. We aren't the freedom fighters. We are the Russian tanks blasting the hopes of an Asian Hungary.

He further states:

> It's not democracy we brought to Vietnam—it's anticommunism. This is the only choice the people in the village have. This is why most of them have embraced the Vietcong and shunned the alternative. The people remember that when they were fighting the French for their national independence it was the Americans who helped the French. It's the American anti-Communist bombs that kill their children. It's American anticommunism that has supported one dictator after another in Saigon. When anti-Communist napalm burns their children it matters little that an anti-Communist special forces medic comes later to apply bandages.

These are important observations by a fighting man who served 18 months on active combat duty in Vietnam. The position of the United States in Vietnam and its future course of action should be judged in the light of these observations and the other matters discussed in this article.

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHOLE THING WAS A LIE

(M. Sgt. Donald Duncan left the U.S. Army in September of 1965 after 10 years of service, including 6 years in the special forces and 18 months on active combat duty in Vietnam. While in Vietnam he received the South Vietnamese Silver Star, the Combat Infantry Badge, the Bronze Star, and the U.S. Army Air Medal. He was nominated for the American Silver Star and was the first enlisted man in Vietnam to be nominated for the Legion of Merit. Both nominations are still pending. He participated in many missions behind enemy lines in war zone D, Vung Tao, and the An Khe Valley. Last March he turned down the offer of a field commission to the rank of captain. Instead he left Vietnam on September 5, 1965, and received his honorable discharge 4 days later.)

(By Donald Duncan)

When I was drafted into the Army, 10 years ago, I was a militant anti-Communist. Like most Americans, I couldn't conceive of anybody choosing communism over democracy. The depths of my aversion to this ideology was, I suppose, due in part to my being Roman Catholic, in part to the stories in the news media about communism, and in part to the fact that my stepfather was born in Budapest, Hungary. Although he had come to the United States as a young man, most of his family had stayed in Europe. From time to time, I would be given examples of the horrors of life under communism. Shortly after basic training, I was sent to Germany. I was there at the time of the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt. Everything I had heard about communism was verified. Like my fellow soldiers I felt frustrated and cheated that the United States would not go to the aid of the Hungarians. Angrily I followed the action of the brute force being used against people who were armed with sticks, stolen weapons, and a desire for independence.

While serving in Germany, I ran across the special forces. I was so impressed by their dedication and elan that I decided to volunteer for duty with this group. By 1959 I had been accepted into the special forces and underwent training at Fort Bragg. I was soon to learn much about the outfit and the men in it. A good percentage of them were Lodge Act people—men who had come out from Iron Curtain countries. Their anticommunism bordered on fanaticism. Many of them who, like me, had joined special forces to do something positive, were to leave because things weren't happening fast enough. They were to show up later in Africa and Latin America in the employ of others or as independent agents for the CIA.

Initially, training was aimed at having U.S. teams organize guerrilla movements in foreign countries. Emphasis was placed on the fact that guerrillas can't take prisoners. We were continuously told, "You don't have to kill them yourself; let your indigenous counterpart do that." In a course entitled, "Countermeasures to Hostile Interrogation," we were taught NKVD (Soviet Security) methods of torture to extract information. It became obvious that the title was only camouflage for teaching us other means of interrogation when time did not permit more sophisticated methods; for example, the old cold water-hot water treatment, or the delicate operation of lowering a man's testicles into a jeweler's vise. When we asked directly if we were being told to use these methods, the answer was, "We can't tell you that. The mothers of America wouldn't approve." This sarcastic hypocrisy was greeted with laughs. Our own military teaches these and even worse things to American soldiers. They then condemn the Vietcong guerrillas for supposedly doing those very things. I was later to witness firsthand the practice of turning prisoners over to ARVN for interrogation and the atrocities which ensued.

Throughout the training there was an exciting aura of mystery. Hints were continually being dropped that at this very moment special forces men were in various Latin American and Asian countries on secret missions. The anti-Communist theme was woven throughout. Recommended reading would invariably turn out to be books on brainwashing and atrocity tales—life under communism. The enemy was the enemy. There was no doubt that the enemy was communism and Communist countries. There never was a suggestion that special forces would be used to set up guerrilla warfare against the government in a Fascist-controlled country.

It would be a long time before I would look back and realize that this conditioning about the Communist conspiracy and the enemy was taking place. Like most of the men who volunteered for special forces, I wasn't hard to sell. We were ready for it. Artur Fisers, my classmate and roommate, was living for the day when he would "lead the first 'stick' of the first team to go into Latvia." "How about Vietnam, Art?" "To hell with Vietnam. I wouldn't blend. There are not many blue-eyed gooks." This was to be only the first of many contradictions of the theory that special forces men cannot be prejudiced about the color or religion of other people.

After graduation, I was chosen to be a procurement noncommissioned officer for special forces in California. The joke was made that I was now a procurer. After seeing how we were prostituted, the analogy doesn't seem a bad one. General Yarborough's instructions were simple: "I want good, dedicated men who will graduate. If you want him, take him. Just remember, he may be on your team someday." Our final instructions from the captain directly in charge of the program had some succinct points. I stood in shocked disbelief to hear, "Don't send me any niggers. Be careful, however, not to give the impression that we are prejudiced in special forces. You won't find it hard to find an excuse to reject them. Most will be too dumb to pass the written test. If they luck out on that and get by the physical testing, you'll find that they have some sort of a criminal record." The third man I sent to Fort Bragg was a "nigger." And I didn't forget that someday he might be on my team.

My first impressions of Vietnam were gained from the window of the jet while flying over Saigon and its outlying areas. As I looked down I thought, "Why, those could be farms anywhere and that could be a city anywhere." The ride from Tan Son Nhut to the center of town destroyed the initial illusion.

My impressions weren't unique for a new arrival in Saigon. I was appalled by the heat and humidity which made my worsted uniform feel like a fur coat. Smells. Exhaust fumes from the hundreds of blue and white Renault taxis and military vehicles. Human excrement; the foul, stagnant, black mud and water as we passed over the river on Cong Ly Street; and, overriding all the others, the very pungent and rancid smell of what I later found out was nuoc mam, a sauce made much in the same manner as sauerkraut, with fish substituted for cabbage. No Vietnamese meal is complete without it. People—masses of them. The smallest children, with the dirty faces of all children of their age, standing on the sidewalk unshod and with no clothing other than a shirtwaist that never quite reached the navel on the protruding belly. Those a little older wearing overall-type trousers with the crotch seam torn out—a practical alteration that eliminates the need for diapers. Young, grade school girls in their blue butterfly sun hats, and boys of the same age with hands out saying, "OK—Salem," thereby exhausting their English vocabulary. The women in ao dais of all colors, all looking beautiful and graceful. The slim, hipless men, many walking hand in hand with other men, and so misunderstood by the newcomer. Old men with straggly Fu Man Chu beards staring impassively, wearing wide-legged, pajama-like trousers.

Bars by the hundreds—with American-style names (Playboy, Hungry 1, Flamingo) and faced with grenadeproof screening. Houses made from packing cases, accommodating three or four families, stand alongside spacious villas complete with military guard. American GI's abound in sport shirts, slacks, and cameras; motorcycles, screaming to make room for a speeding official in a large, shiny sedan, pass over an intersection that has hundreds of horseshoes impressed in the soft asphalt tar. Confusion, noise, smells, people—almost overwhelming.

My initial assignment was in Saigon as an area specialist for 3d and 4th Corps tactical zone in the special forces tactical operations center. And my education began here. The officers and noncommissioned officers were unanimous in their contempt of the Vietnamese.

There was a continual putdown of Saigon officials, the Saigon government, ARVN (Army Republic of Vietnam), the LLDB (Luc Luong Dac Biet—Vietnamese Special Forces) and the Vietnamese man in the street. The Government was rotten, the officials corrupt, ARNV cowardly, the LLDB all three, and the man in the street an ignorant thief. (LLDB also qualified under "thief.")

I was shocked. I was working with what were probably some of the most dedicated Americans in Vietnam. They were supposedly in Vietnam to help "our Vietnamese friends" in their fight for a democratic way of life. Obviously, the attitude didn't fit.

It occurred to me that if the people on "our side" were all these things, why were we then supporting them and spending $1.5 million a day in their country? The answer was always the same: "They are anti-Communists," and this was supposed to explain everything.

As a result of this insulation, my initial observations of everything and everyone Vietnamese were colored. I almost fell into the habit, or mental laziness, of evaluating Vietnam not on the basis of what I saw and heard, but on what I was told by other biased Americans. When you see something contradictory, there is always a fellow countryman willing to interpret the significance of it, and it won't be favorable to the Vietnamese. This is due partially to the type of Vietnamese that the typical American meets, coupled with typical American prejudices. During his working hours, the American soldier deals primarily with the Vietnamese military. Many (or most) of the higher ranking officers attained their status through family position, as a reward for political assistance, and through wealth. Most of the ranking civilians attained their positions in the same manner. They use their offices primarily as a means of adding to their personal wealth. There is hardly any social rapport between GI Joe and his Vietnamese counterpart.

Most contact between Americans and Vietnamese civilians is restricted to taxi drivers, laborers, secretaries, contractors, and bar girls. All these people have one thing in common: They are dependent on Americans for a living. The last three have something else in common. In addition to speaking varying degrees of English, they will tell Americans anything they want to hear as long as the money rolls in. Neither the civilian nor military with whom the American usually has contact is representative of the Vietnamese people.

Many of our military, officers and enlisted, have exported the color prejudice, referring to Vietnamese as "slopes" and "gooks"—two words of endearment left over from Korea. Other fine examples of American democracy in action are the segregated bars. Although there are exceptions, in Saigon, Nha Trang, and Da Nang, and some of the other larger towns, Negroes do not go into white bars except at the risk of being ejected. I have seen more than one incident where a Negro newcomer has made a mistake and walked into the wrong bar. If insulting catcalls weren't enought to make him leave, he was thrown out bodily. There are cases where this sort of thing has led to near riots.

It is obvious that the Vietnamese resent us as well. We are making many of the same mistakes that the French did, and in some instances our mistakes are worse. Arrogance, disrespect, rudeness, prejudice, and our own special brand of ignorance, are not designed to win friends. This resentment runs all the way from stiff politeness to obvious hatred. It is so common that if a Vietnamese working with or for Americans is found to be sincerely cooperative, energetic, conscientious, and honest, it automatically makes him suspect as a Vietcong agent.

After my initial assignment in Saigon, which lasted two and one-half months, I volunteered for a new program called Project Delta. This was a classified project wherein specially selected men in special forces were to train and organize small teams to be infiltrated into Laos. The primary purpose of dropping these teams into Laos was to try and find the Ho Chi Minh trail and gather information on traffic, troops, weapons, etc. This was purely a reconnaissance intelligence mission, but the possibility of forming guerrilla bases later was considered. There was some talk of going into North Vietnam, but not by Project Delta. Another outfit, Special Operations Group (SOG) was already doing just that. SOG was a combined forces effort. The CIA, Air Force (U.S.) Navy, Army, and detached special forces personnel were all in on the act.

Project Delta was paid for by Uncle Sam from CIDG funds. We had to feed, billet, and clothe the Vietnamese. Free beer was supplied and lump sums of money were agreed on, money to be paid after completion of training and more to be paid when the teams returned.

Here we are in South Vietnam to help these people "preserve their freedom, etc.," willing to risk our lives to that end and here we are paying them to help themselves. These were men already being paid their regular pay in the Vietnamese Army and we actually had to pay a bonus each time they went to the field on training missions or made a parachute jump, all of which was supposed to be a normal part of their duties.

Originally, it was thought that the teams would be composed of four Vietnamese and two Americans. Although many of the people we were training had natural aptitudes for the area of operations, strong and effective leadership was lacking. It was emphasized constantly to the Pentagon and to the ambassador by those intimately involved in the training program, that if any degree of success was to be realized it was imperative that Americans must accompany the teams.

When at the last minute we received a firm "No Go" for the U.S. personnel, we asked, "Why?" The answer was that it was an election year and it would cause great embarrassment if Americans were captured in Laos. Anything of that nature would have to wait until after the election. The reaction to this decision on the part of the Americans was one of anger, disappointment and disgust.

The one thing that made it possible to accomplish the things we did was the relationship we had established with the Vietnamese. Each man took it upon himself to establish a friendly relationship with the men on the teams. We ate the same food, wore the same clothes, lived in the same tents, shared the same hardships. We worked more hours and carried the same loads. We made ourselves the guinea pigs in experiments. The pitch was, "We don't ask you to do anything we won't do ourselves." It worked. We had dedicated teams.

After the decision to eliminate Americans from the drops, the Vietnamese felt that they had been cheated. Petty complaints became rampant; e.g., if we do not get wool sweaters and better watches we will not go. They felt this was one more example of Americans standing back advising Vietnamese on how to get killed without risk to themselves. We started getting an increase in a.w.o.l.'s. The Americans had to watch their teams board the infiltration aircraft without them. Hands were shaken but with eyes averted. "Good lucks" were said but with bent heads. We felt guilty. We had strongly advised that the teams not be sent until the Americans could go, but to no avail.

Like everyone, I was disappointed. This was the one thing, if I had to single one out, that made me really start questioning our role in Vietnam. It suddenly occured to me that the denial of American participation was not based on whether it was right or wrong for us to be going to Laos. The primary concern was the possible embarrassment to President Johnson during an election campaign. Toward this end we sent people on a mission that had little or no chance of success. It became apparent that we were not interested in the welfare of the Vietnamese but, rather, in how we could best promote our own interests. We sent 40 men who had become our friends. These were exceptionally dedicated people, all volunteers, and their commanding officer showed up drunk at the plane to bid the troops farewell—just all boozed up. Six returned, the rest were killed or captured.

As it turned out, the mission found damned little. Most teams didn't last long enough to report what, if anything, they saw. The six survivors came completely through the areas and observed no troop movements, no concentrations of troops, and little vehicle traffic, day or night. In the final stages, two of the project helicopters flew two missions a day for 4 days, looking for the teams. They saw nothing and were not fired at. As for the highway from Tchepone to Muong Nong, one helicopter flew the highway, taking pictures with a hand-held 35-millimeter camera. It was low enough to take straight-on shots of people standing in doorways.

To many in Vietnam this mission confirmed that the Ho Chi Minh trail, so-called, and the traffic on it, was grossly exaggerated, and that the Vietcong were getting the bulk of their weapons from ARVN and by sea. It also was one more piece of evidence that the Vietcong were primarily South Vietnamese, not imported troops from the north. One more thing was added to my growing lists of doubts of the "official" stories about Vietnam.

When the project shifted to in-country operations Americans went on drops throughout the Vietcong-held areas of South Vietnam. One such trip was into war zone D north of Dong Xoi, near the Michelin plantation. There is no such thing as a typical mission. Each one is different. But this one revealed some startling things. Later I was to brief Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Westmoreland on the limited military value of the bombing, as witnessed on this mission.

As usual we went in at dusk—this time in a heavy rain squall. We moved only a nominal distance, perhaps 300 meters, through the thick, tangled growth and stopped. Without moonlight we were making too much noise. It rained all night so we had to wait until first light to move without crashing around. Moving very cautiously for about an hour, we discovered a deserted company headquarters position, complete with crude tables, stools, and sleeping racks. After reporting this by radio, we continued on our way. The area was crisscrossed with well-traveled trails under the canopy. A few hours later we reached the edge of a large

rubber plantation without incident. Keeping to the thick growth surrounding the plantation, we skirted the perimeter. We discovered that it was completely surrounded by deserted gun positions and foxholes, all with beautiful fields-of-fire down the even rows of rubber trees. None gave evidence of having been occupied for at least 3 or 4 days. We transmitted this information to the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) and then the team proceeded across the plantation, heading for the headquarters and housing area in the center.

When we arrived at a point 100 meters from our destination, the team leader and I went forward, leaving the team in a covering position. As we got closer, we could hear sounds from the houses, but assumed these were only workers. The briefing had neglected to tell us that the plantation was supposed to be deserted. Crawling, we stopped about 25 meters from the first line of houses. Lifting our heads, we received a rude shock. These weren't plantation workers. These were Vietcong soldiers, complete with blue uniforms, webbing, and many with the new Soviet bloc weapons. The atmosphere seemed to be one of relaxation. We could even hear a transistor radio playing music. After 30 or 40 minutes we drew back to the team position. We reported our find to the TOC and estimated the number of Vietcong to be at least one company. The whole team then retraced the two kilometers to the jungle and moved into it. Crawling into the thickest part, we settled down just as darkness and the rain closed in on us.

Underneath ponchos, to prevent light from our flashlights escaping, the Vietnamese team leader and I, after closely poring over our maps, drafted a detailed message for TOC. In the morning we sent the message, which gave map coordinates of a number of small landing zones (LZ's) around the area. We also gave them a plan for exploiting our find. It was fairly simple. Make simultaneous landings at all LZ's and have the troops move quickly to the deserted Vietcong gun positions and man them. At the sight of bombers approaching, the Vietcong would leave the housing area for the jungle. This would involve them having to travel across two kilometers of open plantation into prepared positions. We told TOC that we were going to try and get back to the housing area so we could tell them if the Vietcong were still there. If they didn't hear from us on the next scheduled contact, they were to assume that we had been hit and hadn't made it. If this occurred it would be verification of the Vietcong presence and they were to follow through with the plan. We would stay in the area and join the Rangers when they came in.

This time, we were more cautious in our trip across the plantation. On the way, we found a gasoline cache of 55-gallon drums. We took pictures and proceeded. Again the Vietnamese team leader and I crawled forward to within 25 meters of the houses. It was unbelievable. There they were and still with no perimeter security. Now, however, there was much activity and what seemed like more of them. We inched our way around the house area. This wasn't a company. There were at least 300 armed men in front of us. We had found a battalion, and all in one tight spot—unique in itself. We got back to the team, made our radio contact, and asked if the submitted plan would be implemented. We were told, yes, and that we were to move back to the edge of the jungle. There would be a small delay while coordination was made to get the troops and helicopters. At 1000 hours (10 a.m.) planes of all descriptions started crisscrossing this small area. I contacted one plane (there were so many I couldn't tell which one) on the Prick 10 (AN/PRS-10 transmitter-receiver for air-ground communications). I was told that they were reconning the area for an operation. What stupidity. No less than 40 overflights in 45 minutes. As usual, we were alerting the Vietcong of impending action by letting all the armchair commandos take a look-see. For about 30 minutes all was quiet, and then we started to notice movement. The Vietcong were moving out from the center of the plantation. Where were the troops? At 1400 hours Skyraiders showed up and started bombing the center of the plantation. Was it possible that the troops had moved in without our knowing it? TOC wouldn't tell us anything. The bombing continued throughout the afternoon with never more than a 15-minute letup. Now we had much company in the jungle with us. Everywhere we turned there were Vietcong. I had to agree that, in spite of the rain, it was a much better place to be than in the housing center. Why didn't we hear our troops firing?

Finally, the bombing ended with the daylight, and we crouched in the wet darkness within hearing distance of Vietcong elements. Darkness was our fortress. About 2030 (8:30 p.m.) we heard the drone of a heavy aircraft in the rainy sky. We paid little attention to it. Then, without warning, the whole world lit up, leaving us feeling exposed and naked. Two huge flares were swinging gently to earth on their parachutes, one on each side of us. At about the same time, our radio contact plane could be heard above the clouds. I grabbed the radio and demanded to know, "Who the hell is calling for those flares and why?"

"What flares?"

"Damn it, find out what flares and tell whoever is calling for them that they're putting us in bad trouble." I could hear the operator trying to call the TOC. I figured that friendly troops in the area had called for the flares to light their perimeter. Crack—crump. I was lifted from the ground, only to be slammed down again. I broke in on the radio. "Forget that transmission. I know why the flares are being dropped."

"Why?"

"They're being used as markers for jets dropping what sounds like 750-pounders. Tell TOC thanks for the warning. Also tell them two of the markers bracketed our position. I hope to hell they knew where we are." A long pause.

"TOC says they don't know anything about flares or jet bombers."

Another screwup. "Well how about somebody finding out something and when they find out, how about telling us unimportant folks? In the meantime, I hope that 'gooniebird' (C-47 plane) has its running lights on."

"Why?"

"Because any moment now the pilot is going to find he is dawdling around in a bomb run pattern. Come back early in the morning and give me the hot skinny."

"Roger—we're leaving—out."

I was mad, a pretty good sign that I was scared. The bombing continued through the night. Sometimes it was "crump" and sometimes it was "crack," depending on how close the bombs fell. When it finally stopped sometime before dawn, I realized that it was a dazzling exhibition of flying—worthless—but impressive. The flare ship had to fly so low because of the cloud cover that its flares were burning out on the ground instead of in the air. The orbiting jets would then dive down through the clouds, break through, spot the markers, make split-second corrections, and release their bombs. However, while it was going on, considering what a small error became at jet speeds, a small error would wipe us out. Should this happen, I could see a bad case of "C'est la guerre" next day at air operations. I couldn't help wondering also how "Charlie" was feeling about all this—specifically the ones only 25 or 30 meters away. It didn't seem possible, but I wondered if the shrapnel tearing through the trees tops was terrifying him as much as us.

First thing in the morning, my Vietnamese counterpart made contact on the big radio (HC-162D). After some talk into the mike, he turned to me with a helpless look:

"They say we must cross plantation to housing area again."

"What? It's impossible—tell them so."

More talk. "They say we must go. They want to talk to you."

When the hollow voice came through on the side band, I couldn't believe it—it was the same order. I told them it was impossible and that we were not going to go.

"You must go. That is an order from way up."

That figures. The Saigon wheels smelling glory have taken over our TOC. "My answer is, Will not comply; I say again, will not comply. Tell those people to stop trying to outguess the man on the ground. If they want someone to assess damage on the housing area send a plane with a camera. Better yet, have the Rangers look at it, there's more of them."

"There are no other friendly troops in the area. You are the only ones that can do it. You must go. There will be a plane in your area shortly. Out."

Up to this point we had assumed friendly troops were in the area and that if we got in trouble, maybe we could hold out until they could help us. No troops. Little wonder the Vietcong are roaming all over the place not caring who hears them.

Soon a plane arrived and I received: "We must know how many Vietcong are still in the housing area. You must go and look. It is imperative. The whole success of this mission depends on your report. Over."

"I say again, Will not comply, Over." (Hello court martial.) I looked at the Vietnamese team leader. He was tense and grim, but silently cheering me on. While waiting for the plane I asked him what he was going to do. He replied:

"We go, we die. Order say we must go, so we go. We will die."

Tell me Vietnamese have no guts. Another transmission from the plane:

"Why won't you comply? Over."

These type questions aren't normally answered. I knew, however, that the poor bastard up there had to take an answer back to the wheels. Well, he got one: "Because we can't. One step out of this jungle and it's all over. I'm not going to have this team wiped out for nothing. There are no Vietcong in the village; not since 1400 yesterday. The mission was screwed up when you started the bombing without sending in troops yesterday. As for the mission depending on us, you should have thought of that yesterday before you scrapped the plans and didn't bother to tell us. Over."

"Where are the Vietcong now? Over."

"Which ones? The ones 25 meters from us, or the ones 35 meters from us? They're in the jungle all around us. Over."

"Roger. Understand Vietcong have left houses—now in jungle—have information necessary—you do not have to go across plantation."

This was unbelievable. On TV it would be a comedy—a bad one.

Shortly after this uplifting exchange, the bombers returned, and we spent the remainder of the day moving from one Vietcong group to another. We would come upon them, pull back, and then an A1-E (bomber) would come whining down, machine-gunning or dropping bombs.

I discovered that the old prop fighter-bombers were more terrifying than the jets. The jets came in so fast that the man on the ground couldn't hear them until the bombs were dropped and they were climbing away. The props were something else. First the droning noise while in orbit. Then they would peel off and the drone would

change to a growl, increasing steadily in pitch until they were a screaming whine. Under the jungle canopy, this noise grabbed at the heart of every man. And every man knew that the plane was pointed directly at him. The crack of the bomb exploding was almost a relief. Many of these bombs landed 25 to 35 meters from where we were lying on the ground. The closest any of us came to being hurt was when a glowing piece of shrapnel lodged in the pack on my back. I couldn't help thinking, "These are our planes. They know where we are. What must it be like for a woman or child to hear that inhuman, impersonal whine directed at them in their open villages? How they must hate us!" I looked around at my team. Others were thinking. Each of us died a little that day in the jungle.

At 1730 (5:30 p.m.) the last bomb was dropped. A great day for humanity. Almost 28 hours of bombing in this small area with barely a break.

On the next afternoon we were told by radio to quickly find an LZ and prepare to leave the area. We knew of only one within reasonable distance and headed for it. A short distance from the LZ we could hear voices. Vietcong around the opening. We were now an equal distance between two groups of the Vietcong.

Finally they allowed the pickup ship to come in. Just as the plane touched down and we started toward it, two machinegun positions opened up—one from each side of the clearing. The bullets sounded like gravel hitting the aluminum skin of the chopper. My American assistant took one position under fire and I started firing at the other. Our backs were to the aircraft and our eyes on the jungle. The rest of the team started climbing aboard. The machineguns were still firing, but we had made them less accurate. I was still firing when two strong hands picked me up and plumped me on the floor of the plane. Maximum power and we still couldn't make the trees at the end of the clearing, but had to make a half circle over the machineguns. All of a sudden something slapped me in the buttock, lifting me from the floor. A bullet had come through the bottom of the plane, through the gas tank and the floor. When it ripped through the floor it turned sideways. The slug left an 8-inch bruise but did not penetrate. Through some miracle, we were on our way to base—all of us. We would all get drunk tonight. It was the only way we would sleep without reliving the past days. It would be at least 3 days before anybody would unwind. That much is typical.

I had seen the effect of the bombing at close range. These bombs would land and go for about 15 yards and tear off a lot of foliage from the trees, but that was it. Unless you drop these things in somebody's hip pocket they don't do any good. For 28 hours they bombed that area. And it was rather amusing because, when I came out, it was estimated that they had killed about 250 Vietcong in the first day. They asked me how many Vietcong did I think they had killed and I said maybe six, and I was giving them the benefit of the doubt at that. The bombing had no real military significance. It would only work if aimed at concentrated targets such as villages.

One of the first axioms one learns about unconventional warfare is that no insurgent or guerrilla movement can endure without the support of the people. While doing research in my job as an area specialist, I found that, in province after province, the Vietcong guerrillas had started as small teams. They were now in battalion and regimental strength. Before I left, the Vietcong could put troops in the field in division strength in almost any province. Such growth is not only impossible without popular support, it actually requires an overwhelming mandate.

We were still being told, both by our own Government and the Saigon Government, that the vast majority of the people of South Vietnam were opposed to the Vietcong. When I questioned this contradiction, I was always told that the people only helped the Vietcong through fear. Supposedly, the Vietcong held the people in the grip of terror by assassination and torture. This argument was also against doctrine. Special Forces are taught that reliable support can be gained only through friendship and trust. History denied the terror argument. The people feared and hated the French, and they rose up against them. It became quite obvious that a minority movement could not keep tabs on a hostile majority. South Vietnam is a relatively small country, dotted with thousands of small villages. In this very restricted area companies and battalions of Vietcong can maneuver and live under the very noses of Government troops; but the people don't betray these movements, even thought it is a relatively simple thing to pass the word. On the other hand, Government troop movements are always reported. In an action against the Vietcong, the only hope for surprise is for the Government to move the troops by helicopters. Even this is no guarantee. Gen. Nguyen Khan, while still head of the Saigon Government, acknowledged that Vietcong sympathizers and agents were everywhere—even in the inner councils—when he made the statement: "Any operation that lets more than 4 hours elapse between conception and implementation is doomed to failure." He made these remarks in the last days of his regime, right after a personally directed operation north of Saigon ended in disaster.

To back up the terror theory, the killing of village chiefs and their families were pointed out to me. Those that were quick to point at these murders ignored certain facts. Province, district, village, and hamlet chiefs are appointed, not elected. Too often petty officials are not even people from the area but outsiders being rewarded for political favors. Those that are from the area are thought of as quislings because they have gone against their own by cooperating with Saigon. Guerrillas or partisans who killed quislings in World War II were made heroes in American movies. Those who look on the Vietcong killings of these people with horror and use them as justification for our having to beat them, don't realize that our own military consider such actions good strategy when the tables are reversed. When teaching special forces how to set up guerrilla warfare in an enemy country, killing unpopular officials is pointed out as one method of gaining friends among the populace. It is recommended that special assassination teams be set up for this purpose.

I know a couple of cases where it was suggested by special forces officers that Vietcong prisoners be killed. In one case in which I was involved, we had picked up prisoners in the valley around An Khe. We didn't want prisoners but they walked into our hands. We were supposed to stay in the area 4 more days, and there were only eight of us and four of them, and we didn't know what the hell to do with them. You can't carry them. Food is limited, and the way the transmission went with the base camp you knew what they wanted you to do—get rid of them. I wouldn't do that, and when I got back to operation base a major told me, "You know we almost told you right over the phone to do them in." I said that I was glad he didn't, because it would have been embarrassing to refuse to do it. I knew goddam well I wasn't going to kill them. In a fight it's one thing, but with guys with their hands bound it's another. And I wouldn't have been able to shoot them because of the noise. It would have had to be a very personal thing, like sticking a knife into them. The major said, "Oh, you wouldn't have had to do it; all you had to do was give them over to the Vietnamese." Of course, this is supposed to absolve you of any responsibility. This is the general attitude. It's really a left-handed morality. Very few of the special forces guys had any qualms about this. Damn few.

Little by little, as all these facts made their impact on me, I had to accept the fact that, Communist or not, the vast majority of the people were pro-Vietcong and anti-Saigon. I had to accept also that the position, "We are in Vietnam because we are in sympathy with the aspirations and desires of the Vietnamese people," was a lie. If this is a lie, how many others are there?

I suppose that one of the things that bothered me from the very beginning in Vietnam was the condemnation of ARVN as a fighting force: "the Vietnamese are cowardly * * * the Vietnamese can't be disciplined * * * the Vietnamese just can't understand tactics and strategy * * * etc., etc." But the Vietcong are Vietnamese. U.S. military files in Saigon document time and again a Vietcong company surrounding two or even three ARVN companies and annihilating them. These same files document instances of a Vietcong company, surrounded by ARVN battalions, mounting a ferocious fight and breaking loose. I have seen evidence of the Vietcong attacking machine-gun positions across open terrain with terrible losses. This can't be done with undisciplined bandits. For many years now the tactics and strategy of the Vietcong have been so successful that massive fire power and air support on our side is the only thing that has prevented a Vietcong victory. These are all Vietnamese. What makes the difference? Major "Charging Charlie" Beckwith, the special forces commander at Plei Me, used the words "dedicated," "tough," "disciplined," "well-trained," and "brave' to describe the Vietcong—and, almost in the same breath, condemned the Vietnamese on our side.

It became obvious that motivation is the prime factor in this problem. The Vietcong soldier believes in his cause. He believes he is fighting for national independence. He has faith in his leaders, whose obvious dedication is probably greater than his own. His officers live in the same huts and eat the same food. His government counterpart knows that his leaders are in their positions because of family, money, reward for political favors. He knows his officers' primary concern is gaining wealth and favor. Their captains and majors eat in French restaurants and pay as much for one meal as they make in a week. They sleep in guarded villas with their mistresses. They find many excuses for not being with their men in battle. They see the officers lie about their roles in battle. The soldier knows that he will be cheated out of his pay if possible. He knows equipment he may need is being sold downtown. His only motivation is the knowledge that he is fighting only to perpetuate a system that has kept him uneducated and in poverty. He has had so many promises made to him, only to be broken, that now he believes nothing from his government.

I have seen the South Vietnamese soldier fight well, and at times ferociously, but usually only when in a position where there is no choice. At those times he is fighting for survival. On Project Delta there were many brave Vietnamese. When I knew them well enough to discuss such things, I asked them, "Why do you go on these missions time and again? You are volunteers. Why do you not quit and do less dangerous work?" The answer was always the same: "We are friends. We fight well together. If we quit, it will make the project bad." Never, "We are fighting for democracy—freedom—the

people"—or any cause. The enemy he was fighting had become an abstraction. He was fighting, and fighting well, to sustain the brotherhood of his friends. The project had created a mystique of individualism and eliteness. He felt important. Trust and faith was put in him and he returned it in kind. The Americans didn't condescend to him. The life of every American on the team was dependent on the Vietnamese, and we let them know we were aware of it. We found out early that appealing to them on the basis of patriotism was a waste of time. They felt that they were nothing more than tools of the scheming Saigon politicians.

ARVN troops and their commanders know that if they don't bother the Vietcong they will be safe from Vietcong attacks. I'll never forget what a shock it was to find out that various troop commanders and district chiefs were actually making personal deals with "the enemy." The files in Saigon record instances where government troops with American advisers were told by the Vietcong to lay down their weapons and walk away from the Americans. The troops did just that and the Vietcong promises of safety to the troops were honored.

In an effort to show waning popularity for the Vietcong, great emphasis was placed on figures of Vietcong defections. Even if the unlikely possibility of the correctness of these figures is accepted, they are worthless when compared to ARVN desertions. The admitted desertion rate and incidents of draft dodging, although deflated, was staggering. Usually, only those caught are reported. Reading OPSUMS (Operational Summaries) and newspapers while in Vietnam, I repeatedly saw references made to hundreds of ARVN listed as missing after the major battles. The reader is supposed to conclude that these hundreds, which by now total thousands, are prisoners of the Vietcong. They are definitely not listed as deserters. If this were true, half of the Vietcong would be tied down as guards in prisoner-of-war compounds—which, of course, is ridiculous.

This lack of enthusiasm and reluctance to join in battle wasn't difficult to figure. The majority of the people are either anti-Saigon or pro-Vietcong, or both, and ARVN is drafted from the people.

I was not unique among my contemporaries in knowing most of these things. However, whenever anybody questioned our being in Vietnam—in light of the facts—the old rationale was always presented: "We have to stop the spread of communism somewhere. If we don't fight the commies here, we'll have to fight them at home. If we pull out, the rest of Asia will go Red. These are uneducated people who have been duped; they don't understand the difference between democracy and communism."

Being extremely anti-Communist myself, these "arguments" satisfied me for a long time. In fact, I guess it was saying these very same things to myself over and over again that made it possible for me to participate in the things I did in Vietnam. But were we stopping communism? Even during the short period I had been in Vietnam, the Vietcong had obviously gained in strength; the Government controlled less and less of the country every day. The more troops and money we poured in, the more people hated us. Countries all over the world were losing sympathy with our stand in Vietnam. Countries which up to now had preserved a neutral position were becoming vehemently anti-American. A village near Tay Ninh in which I had slept in safety 6 months earlier was the center of a Vietcong operation that cost the lives of two American friends. A special forces team operating in the area was almost decimated over a period of 4 months. U.S. Operations Mission (USOM), civilian representatives, who had been able to travel by vehicle in relative safety throughout the countryside, were being kidnaped and killed. Like the military, they now had to travel by air.

The real question was whether communism is spreading in spite of our involvement or because of it.

The attitude that the uneducated peasant lacked the political maturity to decide between communism and democracy and "we are only doing this for your own good," although it had a familiar colonialistic ring, at first seemed to have merit. Then I remembered that most of the villages would be under Vietcong control for some of the time and under Government control at other times. How many Americans had such a close look at both sides of the cloth? The more often Government troops passed through an area, the more surely it would become sympathetic to the Vietcong. The Vietcong might sleep in the houses, but the Government troops ransacked them. More often than not, the Vietcong helped plant and harvest the crops; but invariably Government troops in an area razed them. Rape is severely punished among the Vietcong. It is so common among the ARVN that it is seldom reported for fear of even worse atrocities.

I saw the airborne brigade come into Nha Trang. Nha Trang is a government town and the Vietnamese airborne brigade are government troops. They were originally, in fact, trained by special forces, and they actually had the town in a grip of terror for 3 days. Merchants were collecting money to get them out of town; cafes and bars shut down.

The troops were accosting women on the streets. They would go into a place—a bar or cafe—and order varieties of food. When the checks came they wouldn't pay them. Instead they would simply wreck the place, dumping over the tables and smashing dishes. While these men were accosting women, the police would just stand by, powerless or unwilling to help. In fact, the situation is so difficult that American troops, if in town at the same time as the Vietnamese airborne brigade, are told to stay off the streets at night to avoid coming to harm.

The whole thing was a lie. We weren't preserving freedom in South Vietnam. There was no freedom to preserve. To voice opposition to the government meant jail or death. Neutralism was forbidden and punished. Newspapers that didn't say the right thing were closed down. People are not even free to leave and Vietnam is one of those rare countries that doesn't fill its American visa quota. It's all there to see once the Red film is removed from the eyes. We aren't the freedom fighters. We are the Russian tanks blasting the hopes of an Asian Hungary.

It's not democracy we brought to Vietnam—it's anticommunism. This is the only choice the people in the village have. This is why most of them have embraced the Vietcong and shunned the alternative. The people remember that when they were fighting the French for their national independence it was the Americans who helped the French. It's the American anticommunist bombs that kill their children. It's American anticommunism that has supported one dictator after another in Saigon. When anticommunist napalm burns their children it matters little that an anticommunist special forces medic comes later to apply bandages.

One day I asked one of our Vietnamese helicopter pilots what he thought of the last bomb raid. "I think maybe today we make many Vietcong." In July, when Mr. McNamara asked me how effective the bombing was in war zone D I told him. "It's an expensive defoliant. Unless dropped in a hip pocket it was only effective in housing areas." He didn't seem surprised. In fact, his only comment after my recital of my team's experiences in war zone D, was when he turned to General Westmoreland who was sitting on my right, "I guess we still have a small reaction problem." Ambassador Taylor said nothing.

While I was in Vietnam the American and/or Saigon Government was forever carping about North Vietnam breaking the Geneva accords. Yet my own outfit, special forces, had first come to Vietnam in civilian clothes traveling on civilian passports for the specific purpose of training and arming the ethnic groups for the CIA, a violation of the accords. The Saigon respect for the accords was best symbolized by a political cartoon in the Saigon Post. It showed a man urinating on a scroll labeled Geneva accords 1954. When the troops of Project Delta uncovered the arms cache at Vung Ro Bay, Gen. Nguyen Khan pointing at the weapons, happily presented them to the three ICC men as proof to the world that Hanoi was breaking the accords. Evidently they were too polite to point out that they had been found by men wearing American-supplied uniforms, carrying American weapons; men who had been trained by Americans and were being paid by Americans. Neither did they mention that the general flew to this spot in an American helicopter and that the weapons were being loaded onto an American-made ship manned by American-trained sailors.

It had taken a long time and a mountain of evidence but I had finally found some truths. The world is not just good guys and bad guys. Anticommunism is a lousy substitute for democracy. I know now that there are many types of communism but there are none that appeal to me. In the long run, I don't think Vietnam will be better off under Ho's brand of communism. But it's not for me or my Government to decide. That decision is for the Vietnamese. I also know that we have allowed the creation of a military monster that will lie to our elected officials; and that both of them will lie to the American people.

To those people who, while deploring the war and bombings, defend it on the basis that it is stopping communism, remember the words of the Vietnamese pilot, "I think maybe today we make many Vietcong." The Nazi bombing of London didn't make the Londoners quit. We have no monopoly on feelings for the underdog. People of other nations will continue to be increasingly sympathetic to this small agrarian country that is being pounded by the richest and most powerful Nation in the world.

When I returned from Vietnam I was asked, "Do you resent young people who have never been in Vietnam, or in any war, protesting it?" On the contrary, I am relieved. I think they should be commended. I had to wait until I was 35 years old, after spending 10 years in the Army and 18 months personally witnessing the stupidity of the war, before I could figure it out. That these young people were able to figure it out so quickly and so accurately is not only a credit to their intelligence but a great personal triumph over a lifetime of conditioning and indoctrination. I only hope that the picture I have tried to create will help other people come to the truth without wasting 10 years. Those people protesting the war in Vietnam are not against our boys in Vietnam. On the contrary. What they are against is our boys being in Vietnam. They are not unpatriotic. Again the opposite is true. They are opposed to people, our own and others, dying for a lie, thereby corrupting the very word "democracy."

There are those who will believe that I only started to feel these things after I returned from Vietnam. In my final weeks in that country I was putting out a very small information paper for special forces. The masthead of the paper was a flaming torch. I tried in my own way to bring a

little light to the men with whom I worked. On the last page of the first issues were the names of four men—all friends of mine—reported killed in action on the same day. Among them was Sergeant Horner, one of the men I procured for special forces when he was stationed at the Army Presidio in San Francisco.

To those friends I wrote this dedication: "We can best immortalize our fallen members by striving for an enlightened future where man has found another solution to his problems rather than resorting to the futility and stupidity of war."

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, when the Congress created the Community Relations Service by voting approval of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we had high hopes that the agency would prove able to help local communities with their civil rights difficulties by encouraging rationality, good will, and progress in place of conflict, fear, and resistance to change.

In the short period since its creation, I have been impressed by the actual accomplishments of this stripling agency. I am impressed by the fact that, in one southern community, both city fathers and militant civil rights leaders now acknowledge its usefulness; by the fact that, in a major northern city community, local leaders say that they had never established true communication and cooperation with their underprivileged until the Community Relations Service showed them how it could be done.

Such accomplishments are the result of professional skill.

It is my belief that future accomplishments of the Community Relations Service will depend principally on three factors:

First, the professional quality of its service, of which I spoke; second, the independence with which it is permitted to function; and third, the resources, in terms of budget and manpower, which determine the extent of its activities.

Less important than these factors is the department of Government in which it is housed.

There was a certain logic that guided us in placing it initially in the Department of Commerce. It was thought that its first great task would be winning compliance with title II of the Civil Rights Act—desegregation of public accommodations. Here, the Department of Commerce has a primary responsibility.

Although title II compliance problems persist, it is now clear that they do not require the overriding attention of the Service to the degree we anticipated. The need for keeping the Community Relations Service within the Department of Commerce has therefore faded.

On the other hand, the Attorney General has expressed his enthusiasm and respect for the work of an agency which can help communities solve their civil rights problems without Federal law enforcement activity. It was, in fact, his recommendation that the Service be transferred to the Justice Department, reporting directly to him, and not subordinate to any intermediary department of Government. His respect for the value of the Community Relations Service is clear. It is also clear from the proposed budget for 1967 that the administration intends the Community Relations Service to have, within the Department of Justice, the resources it needs.

The President's proposal that the Community Relations Service be transferred to the Department of Justice is one which we should look upon with favor. It will strengthen the word of that agency.

THE HIDDEN PERIL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, throughout the free world, thinking people are convinced that our involvement in Vietnam is the vital test of the will and determination of the United States to oppose aggression in the Pacific area no less than in the Atlantic. President Johnson has given the Communist Vietcong aggressors every indication of his desire for peaceful solutions in the present conflict, provided only that the iron hand of aggression is ruled out in the process.

In the Washington Post of January 23, 1966, the International Latex Corp. caused to be published a perceptive article in paid space, as a public service, written by French historian, M. Jacques Chastenet, member of the Academie Francaise. It is particularly telling, coming as it does from a Frenchman of such stature.

In the introduction to it, Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder and chairman of the company, presents briefly and well-reasoned the soundness of this Nation's firm stand against aggression in southeast Asia.

This patriotic effort on the part of a founder of a private company, this continuing and costly interest in international and national affairs which spans more than a quarter of a century is as encouraging as it is commendable, and I am confident it will not be lost either on informed Americans or on their allies.

I ask unanimous consent that this article which appeared in the Washington Post on January 23, 1966, to be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

THE HIDDEN PERIL

FOREWORD

In a recent article in these columns we had occasion to write: "In South Vietnam President Lyndon B. Johnson faced soul-searing and agonizing decisions. To a man of his strong political instincts, the temptations must have been to push for peace however illusory. Better than anyone else he understood that there was no political profit in assuming the risks of military action.

But courageously he brushed aside short-term expediency, and chose instead, commitments to the long-range interests of this Nation and of the free world. He recognized that failure to stop the current Communist aggressions—masquerading as wars of liberation—would guarantee more and more aggressions; that temporizing and surrender in southeast Asia now, far from securing peace, would invite larger and bolder Communist confrontations, each escalating the danger to world peace."

Today we received a clipping from France of a perceptive article written by the eminent historian, M. Jacques Chastenet (de l'Académie Francaise) which appeared in the widely read publication, Sud-Ouest.

We are pleased to present it at this time, in the public interest.

A. N. SPANEL,
Founder, Chairman, International Latex Corp.

The truce has not lasted long in Vietnam, and it is not certain that the truce proposed for the celebration of Vietnamese New Year will be much more durable. The American authorities seem to be preparing the public for a long continuation of hostilities.

Viewed from Europe and limited to the present field of operations, this war may seem to some to be absurd and even condemnable.

The United States has already sent over 200,000 men to Vietnam and within 6 months they plan on sending many thousands more. By intensive bombing, they have transformed wide woody areas to vast lunar deserts; the United States has suffered heavy losses and has inflicted the same, if not more, on the adversary; they have placed themselves in a delicate position at the U.N.; they have compromised their budgetary balance, thereby courting inflation. Why all this?

Could it be only to prevent North Vietnam from annexing South Vietnam? Such is the official explanation, but it is not the whole answer. The South Vietnamese (the mass of the people, not the Government) would probably prefer anything to the prolongation of the struggle.

In truth, the problem is quite different. The real question is whether or not southeast Asia and South Asia (perhaps also Australia) will become prey to the imperialism of the Chinese Communists. And possibly beyond that, the question is whether Communist China will be allowed to have at its disposal powerful nuclear armaments which it could use in an attempt to dominate the world.

The London government has just made it known that, for financial reasons, it was compelled to reduce the military forces it had kept until now in southeast Asia. The United States in large measure has carried on in its place. If it were brought to conclude a patched-up peace in Vietnam, that is to say to acknowledge defeat, there is no doubt that its prestige would be irreparably damaged, and that Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Malaysia, and Indonesia would successively fall in the orbit of Chinese communism in spite of local resistance.

India, so weak in spite of or because of its immensity, highly divided and endangered by desperate food shortages, would, in all probability, fall in its turn. Much more to the east, Australia, so insufficiently populated, would itself be threatened. And the repercussions in Latin America would be enormous.

One should not rely too much upon the Soviet Union to give all-out opposition to China. Whatever its interest may be, it would be hampered by the ideology of its leaders, an ideology which these men can hardly forgo. At most, it might, through indirect assistance to the threatened countries, delay the process.

Thus, through a war which may appear inglorious, it is in freedom's cause of the whole world that the United States is defending Vietnam. One may be tempted to blame the American people, but this is short-sighted and worse.

Some in the Pentagon consider this to be the time to nip in the bud the growing Chinese nuclear threat and for these reasons: Communist China has at present a considerable conventional army at its disposal, 115 divisions, among which 4 are mechanized, approximately 2,300 planes, embracing about 40 strategic bombers. This is more than needed to break any resistance in the Asiatic

countries we mentioned. However, its thermonuclear armaments are still in a state of infancy, and the installations where they are being constructed (mainly Manchuria) are extremely vulnerable. It is probable that within 10 years China will have atomic missiles enabling it, from its home bases, to reach Russia and, very likely, North America.

Indeed, it is because they want to fulfill their nuclear program in peace, that the leaders in Peiping are not declaring open hostilities in Vietnam. They know that the American reaction would be immediate and that classical-type bombings would be enough to destroy for a long period of time their hope of seeing their counrty become a nuclear power.

Are the Americans expected to take the initiative of this supreme escalation? Some, in the Pentagon, consider it; but one is obliged to agree that, world opinion being what it is at present—including French opinion and British opinion—it would be most difficult.

One must, however, look at things realistically, for apart from an unlikely change in the aspirations of its Government, Communist China will, around 1976, be able to inflict indescribable damage to Russia, to the west of the United States and, all the more, to Australia. Reprisals would be certain. But Mao Tse-tung has repeatedly said that the lives of 200 millions of his compatriots would be a price China is prepared to pay for the triumph of communism.

The "China peril" is no longer an empty phrase, at least in this phase. At present, the Americans alone seem to realize it clearly.

This does not mean that, susceptible to all the pressures exerted upon them, they will not end up in Vietnam, as they did before in Korea, with uncertain peace.

SPEECH BY VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY AT ROCKEFELLER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, our distinguished Vice President in a recent speech discussed the rewards and high obligations of a career in Government service.

His remarks were made on the occasion of the Rockefeller Public Service Awards. The Vice President pointed out the important role that the career public servant has in making our Government truly a government for the people and the vital assistance he gives the President in the development of new and constructive legislation and the smooth administration of the Government.

The Rockefeller Awards are one means by which we can recognize and honor the skills and devotion of exceptional public servants. I know that the Vice President's thoughtful commentary on these awards and on the meaning of public service will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, ROCKEFELLER PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS, WASHINGTON, D.C., DECEMBER 8, 1965

Every government in history has found ways to honor those who render outstanding service. But our own Government has never completely solved the problem of how to pay tribute to men and women whose performance in public service has been exceptional.

In many countries this problem is solved by medals, orders of knighthood, and titles of nobility. But our ability to do this sort of thing has been limited by the traditional and constitutional restrictions which are part of our democratic heritage.

Mr. Rockefeller and Princeton University are to be congratulated for the sensitive understanding which enabled them to see this lack of recognition for public service, and for the generous and imaginative way they have set out to fill it.

The effectiveness of their ideas is best proved by the fact that they stirred the Government itself to belated action.

Originally, the Rockefeller Awards gave a sabbatical year of travel to outstanding mid-career civil servants. But Congress recognized a good idea when it saw one and passed the Government Employees Training Act of 1958 which, in effect, adopted the idea and expanded the program. The Rockefeller Awards were then changed in nature, and converted into tributes to officials at the highest ranks of Government service.

This imitation should in itself be a source of pride to the sponsors of this award.

For I know that, in the world of the foundation, nothing gives more pleasure than to see one's own seedling nursed by others. (And on this basis, may I say, Mr. Rockefeller and his family have had a very high batting average. For instance, one might well say that the great medical research facilities endowed by the Rockefeller family were the forerunners of the National Institutes of Health, which will go down in history as among the finest contributions our Government has made to our world.)

But to get back to these public service awards: I think it is worth remembering that this idea was conceived at a time when Federal employees were going through a dark period of trial and tribulation.

The time was 1950 and 1951, and we were hearing a great deal about corruption in Government. Calumny and scandal were being heaped upon hardworking Federal employees. And the public was being led to believe that the Federal civil service was a nest of spies and traitors.

It was at this moment of our history that John D. Rockefeller III, approached President Dodds of Princeton University and said something like this: "Our career officers in the Federal Government are far better than the public is being led to believe. Let's do something to tell the public the other side of the story—to remind the Nation that it has a dedicated, honest, and able career service in its Government."

These awards are the result of that conversation.

Today, happily, the Government employee enjoys high public respect. But I think it is worth remembering that our benefactor came to us, not in the van of a cheering multitude, but as a lone voice.

As a nation we are fortunate indeed in the kind of people who have devoted their lives to careers in Government. The morale and spirit which pervades their ranks, and their dedication to public service, are precious national assets.

Indeed, it is remarkable that the executive branch of our Nation, which has accumulated both power and responsibility over the years, has maintained a tradition of humility and service—and has erected stringent standards of honesty which have reduced corruption to levels far below those, I must say, which exist in many nonpublic activities.

To what do we owe this record? It is worth asking this question for a variety of reasons.

In the first place—if you will permit me to be coldly realistic—we must cite the fact that our Government employees are well paid in dollars.

In some countries we hear people say, "The poor fellows are underpaid, you can't blame them for a little graft on the side."

Happily, this kind of false governmental economy is not practiced here. On the whole, our Federal staff is well paid. They are not so well paid, of course, that many of them couldn't work elsewhere at a higher rate. But they are well enough paid so that their families can maintain decent standards of living and their children can be well educated.

So income tax is at least not today so much a negative factor in Government service.

But, more importantly, the Government employee is doing what he wants to do. Deep down, every alert and intelligent mind longs to play a creative role in building a better world.

Indeed, many men work hard to accumulate a fortune just so they can perform public service later on.

Who in private life can share the satisfaction of knowing that, in the last 24 hours, he has been able to cut red tape that will help make it possible for man to reach the moon * * * or that he has devised a program that will enable 5,000 high school dropouts in a Western city to find a niche in schools or in industry—or has averted a minor war—or has added a few hundred dollars a year to the income of families who desperately need that income.

And, finally, there is the factor of power: power for change and constructive initiative.

Time and again I have seen the bright ideas of Federal executives, often well below the top echelon, become major national programs.

Medicare, for example, is a concept which came to life on the desk of a junior executive some 25 years ago. It became a major issue for a few courageous liberals in the prewar and immediate postwar years. It finally was approved by President Truman, espoused by President Kennedy, and led to enactment by President Johnson. That Federal official is in the Federal Government today. Several universities and insurance companies would give him three times his salary. But can you tell me that any compensation could outweigh the satisfaction that came to him in seeing a boyhood idea transformed into a reality?

This, in short, is what the Federal Government can offer you: The opportunity to serve others, the opportunity to think far ahead, to think big, and to help a better world come into existence. If this is what you want in life, then Federal service is your great opportunity. If this doesn't interest you, you're wasting your time in the Federal service.

The Federal service, as I have described it, is a dynamic service, an imaginative service, a service whose top executives should be intimately and courageously identified with the program and platform of their President.

The Constitution of the United States says very little about the vast executive branch, which has grown so numerous. The Founding Fathers put it all in one sentence: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America."

That is all. The rest is merely a matter of appointment and delegation.

The President, in turn, embodies a program, a platform, and a popular will. It is the job of the Government employee to support and effectuate that program. The civil service is not an end in itself. It is not permanent government which goes on serenely unperturbed behind a meaningless facade of electoral contests. It is an instrument available to the President to help him accomplish the tasks to which he is committed. It is responsible, through him, to the American people.

Inevitably, Federal officials at many levels will play a role in helping the President to understand and define those tasks, but they must never confuse institutional inertia with Government policy. The decisions which the people make at elections are real

issues, and their decisions must be respected and effectuated.

And they must be carried out with efficiency and good management.

This is why President Johnson insists today that all departments and agencies subject their policies and programs to constant review and evaluation. And this is why the President himself, and his Bureau of the Budget, comb through each department and agency budget—cutting away duplication, waste, and programs which have outlived their usefulness and may continue solely by inertia.

Woodrow Wilson, the great political scientist and President after whom your graduate school is named, Mr. Goheen, envisaged a dynamic role for the Government administration. He saw the development of pressure groups representing special interests—a development which has progressed by geometric proportions in the years since his death—and he said, quite rightly, that the business of government is to mobilize the general interest against the special interest.

This, of course, is more easily said than done, because the government office becomes the honey pot which draws the special interest flies, and with the best of intentions, a government administrator may hear only one side of the story unless he makes a heroic effort to learn what is in the best interest of the vast unorganized public.

The regulatory agency which becomes, in time, the meek handmaiden of the regulated, is an old story. It is seldom—at least in our Government—a result of the corruption of bribes. It is more often a result of laziness, or lack of interest, which is a more serious danger to good government than venality.

But, as I inferred earlier, the even greater danger to good government is the danger of inwardness, of rivalry within and between Government agencies.

It is all too easy for the government official to become a bureaucrat. It is all too easy to forget that ours is a government for the people and that those in government are in public service, not self-service.

In undertaking any action—in considering any policy—there should be one measure: Will this benefit the people?

The constituency of the Presidency is the Nation at large, and it is this constituency which the executive branch must bear in mind. And the needs of the Nation will not always be reflected in the Washington lobbies, in pressure mail, or in newspaper editorials. Sometimes, it will require great tenacity and curiosity to discover these needs. But this is the job of the men and women who help the President bear the executive burdens.

For the President is the people's lobbyist.

And, as he has recently made clear: He expects our departments and agencies to produce programs and proposals which they believe to be, to the maximum degree, in the interests of our citizens. He will determine what may be politically possible or difficult.

And that is as it should be.

Before he reached the White House, President Wilson once remarked: "Men of ordinary physique and discretion cannot be Presidents and live, if the strain be not somehow relieved. We shall be obliged always to be picking our chief magistrates from among wise and prudent athletes—a small class."

Our guests of honor tonight clearly fall within that class. I congratulate them on having survived the rigors of office. I thank their wives and families, who have missed their presence at many suppers and on many weekends—I am sorry, Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Goheen, that you do not have "his" and "her" medals, because I know that behind every hardworking official is a wife who works even harder. And I congratulate the American people on their good fortune in having these award winners as their servants.

MANY BENFITS FROM FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the importance of flood control projects, so dramatically illustrated by floods last year in my State and the Midwest, is also emphasized by the adequate flow in the main channel of the Missouri River during the relative dry spell earlier this winter. The water held back and stored in upstream reservoirs during spring and summer rains later was used to good purpose in relieving the subsequent drought.

But much remains to be done. As the Congress studies the President's budget requests for 1967, it is important that we consider all benefits of our water control and utilization program. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, "Winter Water," by Jim Monroe, of radio station WCMO, Kansas City, Mo., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WINTER WATER

Plenty of water in the midst of a winter drought. Dry weather isn't so critical in winter as it can be in the growing season, yet a shortage of winter water causes its own troubles.

Our winter water lies ready for use in the huge reservoirs upstream on the Missouri River. It will not be used to relieve dryness of the land, but gates will be opened on a calculated basis to generate new record amounts of electric power and to maintain the Missouri at a good level to assure downstream users of plenty of intake capacity without the common winter ice jams.

In years past, ice floes were regular problems as they served to cut the flow of water like dams. Dynamite and bombs were used on occasion to break loose the big packs. City water intakes were bogged with mud in the low water. Now, the six upstream reservoirs are at record high levels to provide plenty of winter water downstream. By spring, they will be lowered sufficiently to take care of floodwaters and prevent damage along with maintaining a good navigation level.

The Missouri River is now tamed as far down as Omaha. Plans are developing slowly to control the river farther downstream in Kansas and Missouri. With public support, flood control and its fringe benefits could become one of the outstanding achievements of the century.

OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, last week I informed my colleagues that the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will hold a series of public hearings on the possibility of creating the office of ombudsman here in the United States. The ombudsman is a Swedish institution created in 1809; it is a form of guardian of the people's rights against abuses and malfunctions by government, its programs, and its officials.

Mr. Alfred Bexelius, the present ombudsman of Sweden, will be in this country next month. He has graciously consented to appear before the subcommittee on March 7, 1966, to explain the history and function of his office. I urge my colleagues to attend this hearing if their schedules permit.

There have been a few proposals in Congress in recent years to create such an institution as an arm of the Congress of the United States. Most active in this area has been Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, from Milwaukee, Wis., who is the author of a bill to create an administrative counsel of the Congress—or Federal ombudsman. Congressman REUSS has recently written a very interesting article which appeared in the February 1966 issue of the Progressive magazine entitled "A Troubleshooter for Congress." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A TROUBLESHOOTER FOR CONGRESS

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

The same 89th Congress which passed such progressive measures as medicare, aid to elementary and secondary education, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 also passed, after only the briefest consideration, an inflammatory declaration of the right to unilateral intervention in Latin America. In another regressive action it so distorted the proposed highway beautification program that the measure finally enacted, to the dismay of most Members, proves to be a step backward for the 20 States which will be deprived of their right to continue to remove billboards under their police powers. The Congress also adhered to its unhappy precedent of spending $16 billion yearly for research and development—90 percent in defense, space, and atomic energy, 10 percent in health, education, and all other areas—without ever examining the entire program and relating the allocation of funds to the priorities among our national needs.

Clearly, the infusion of some 40 "additional" progressive Congressman and the limited rules changes made in the House last January have not solved all the problems involved in developing a more effective Congress.

The biggest single barrier to an independent, positive role by Congress is the inability of its members to devote enough time to thought, study, and debate on the great questions of national and international policy. Instead, they find that much of their time, and the time of their staffs, is devoted to what they call their "casework"—the job of helping citizens with their problems with the Federal bureaucracy.

Citizens' problems with the bureaucracy are an inevitable concomitant of the modern state. For example, social security and welfare programs spawn individual injustices when there is administrative error, abuse of discretion, delay, or dicourtesy. Or the hapless citizen may be baffled by seemingly endless redtape or the kind of jargon that often slips into agency forms and Government statements. He may be unaware of any legal recourse he may have. Litigation, moreover, is slow and costly. So, in reality, the aggrieved citizen is without any remedy to fit the grievance in most cases—except to write his Congressman.

And this is exactly what millions of Americans do every year. "Cases" are estimated to comprise anywhere from a third to two-thirds of all the mail that pours into congressional officers. Every year, the average Representative must deal with several thousand "cases." They range from simple ones that can be cleared up with a telephone call—such as a delayed social security check—to complex matters which require many hours of work by the Congressman and his staff.

How complex these cases can be may be judged from the following example.

In 1958, male employees of the Hilltop post office in Milwaukee were outraged by an invasion of their privacy. Toilets in the post office men's room were without doors. When the door to the men's room was open, the toilet facilities were in full view of the occupants of the adjoining lunchroom. The employees got nowhere with their complaints and turned to me for help. I wrote scores of letters to the Milwaukee postmaster, regional postal officials, Washington postal officials, and finally the Postmaster General. I inspected the station. I even offered to buy a partition to allow some privacy. I argued against a series of "reasons" why nothing could be done—such as the need for inspectors to be able to watch for thefts from the mails, and the cost of doors. Not until last year, after I threatened a House committee investigation, was an elementary right to privacy respected. In an historic decision, the Post Office Department put up partitions.

Take another case. In the summer of 1960, John J. DeFrancisco of Milwaukee, penniless and unable to hire an attorney, came to me after the Army had obtained a $5,253 judgment against him.

DeFrancisco, a copper miner, had been drafted into the Army on August 7, 1942. After 3 months of basic training he was sent with other "soldiers" to Houghton, Mich., with instructions to report to the copper mine. He was issued a card by the Army stating that he was "on furlough from the U.S. Army." He was ordered to keep his uniforms in shape and be ready to move out on 24 hours' notice. Thinking they were still in the Army, DeFrancisco and his companions worked in the mines from November 4, 1942, until June 11, 1945, when DeFrancisco was sent with an Army unit to the west coast. He was discharged at Camp Beal, Calif., on April 19, 1946. While working in the mines, DeFrancisco was paid $4.60 a day by a mining firm, almost all of which was spent on room and board. He received no pay from the Army. His wife, a son, and his wife's two minor sisters lived on an $80-a-month Army allotment check.

In 1958 the Army filed suit to recover the allotments plus interest. DeFrancisco, who had only a grade school education, ignored the notice of the suit and the Army obtained the judgment.

After listening to DeFrancisco's story, I dug out his Army records. They confirmed his story in every respect except that they listed him in the "ready reserve" instead of "on active duty" during the period he worked in the mines. Following exhaustive legal research which showed that the Army had no legal basis for recovery of the allotment, I went into Milwaukee Federal court on several occasions to plead DeFrancisco's case. By this time the case had attracted national publicity. Finally the Army decided to drop its unjust claim.

As a result of the newspaper stories, other men who had been drafted and sent to the mines were able to have similar judgments against them dismissed. Several men who were disabled in mine accidents, and had been denied veterans' disability payments, instituted court proceedings to collect compensation as a result of the DeFrancisco case.

This congressional casework role is important in humanizing Government bureaucracy and making it responsible. It is constructive to have the actions of remote, permanent civil servants reviewed continually by Congressmen and Senators who must answer to the people every 2 or 6 years. The effect is to prod bureaucrats into the best possible administration of the laws.

But the great difficulty is: How can Members of Congress continue to give citizens the help they need in problems with the Federal bureaucracy and still find time to be effective, thoughtful, original legislators?

A solution I have advanced is the ombudsman—the outlandish Swedish word for "representative." The ombudsman originated in Sweden in 1809 as an agent of Parliament to assure proper administration of the laws—which is still his role today. He stands ready to receive any Swedish citizen's complaint concerning Government administration. He has discretion to investigate a complaint or not, and he may undertake investigations on his own initiative. He may compel testimony and the production of evidence.

He may make unannounced inspection trips. When he has completed his investigation, he may make recommendations for the correction of any abuse or error he finds. He may suggest changes in procedure to avoid future difficulties. He may publicize his findings and make recommendations to the Parliament. Although he has no power to change an administrative decision, the prestige of the office has given the ombudsman's recommendations for remedial action great weight. The possibility of adverse publicity, marshaling public opinion against an agency, or of legislative action, adds to the tendency of administrators to heed the ombudsman's recommendations.

Other nations, looking for a means of redressing individual grievances against the bureaucracy, have been attracted to the ombudsman concept. Finland established an ombudsman in 1919, Denmark in 1955, New Zealand in 1962, and Norway in 1963. In October, 1965, the British Government issued a white paper announcing its intention to establish an ombudsman during this session of Parliament.

Widespread interest in the institution has resulted in a second printing of a new book edited by Prof. D. C. Rowat, "The Ombudsman: Citizen's Defender" (University of Toronto Press).

In July 1963, and again in February 1965, I introduced legislation to establish an American ombudsman to help Congressmen help their constitutents. Senator CLAIBORNE PELL of Rhode Island introduced a companion bill in the Senate. Ombudsman bills have also been introduced in five State legislatures, with a California bill winning passage in the lower house.

The Federal ombudsman—or administrative counsel of the Congress, to give the office its formal name—would centralize much of the casework now being handled by 535 Congressmen, Senators, and their individual staffs. He would be appointed by the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate solely on the basis of fitness and without regard to party. An eminent jurist or administrative expert, he would be paid the same salary as Members of Congress. Assisted by a staff of experts in the major types of casework, he would investigate cases referred to him by Members of Congress. He would have power to obtain any necessary papers and files and to consult with Federal officials without the permission of their supervisors.

When he completed his investigation, he would report to the Congressman who referred the case to him and also make known to the agency concerned any recommendations for remedial action.

In a case where an agency was unwilling to correct what the ombudsman considered a serious administrative error or abuse, the ombudsman could make a special report to Congress which would be printed as a public document and be available to the press. He would also make an annual report to Congress, containing more general recommendations and reports. Thus, like his overseas prototypes, he would have the power to investigate, recommend, and publicize.

Establishment of an American ombudsman would have four major advantages:

First. It would free time for Members of Congress and their staffs to work on the important national and international issues that confront Congress.

Second. It would more effectively protect citizens' rights against administrative abuse. Under the present system, congressional casework is handled by men-of-all-work in the offices of Representatives and Senators, almost none of whose staff budgets can afford true experts in even the major categories of casework. The result is that in complex cases the citizens' advocate a congressional office is frequently at the mercy of the administrative branch's experts. Through centralization under the Federal ombudsman, Congress could have its own experts looking into citizens' grievances.

Third. It would allow more effective diagnosis and the elimination of root causes of recurring difficulties between citizens and the bureaucracy. With complaints so scattered under present arrangements, it may not be recognized that a vast number of problems arise from a single source. The ombudsman, seeing the entire pattern of citizens' complaints, would be better able to identify trouble spots and recommend remedial action.

Fourth. It would be more efficient than continuing increases in individual Congressmen's staffs. The casework burden is bound to increase in the years ahead. The population of House districts is growing rapidly and in 1980 will average 564,000 inhabitants per district, compared with 410,481 in 1960. Most Senators also will serve larger populations. In addition, new programs, such as Medicare and rent supplements, will generate added cases. To respond by merely adding to existing office staffs would provide only an unwieldly, costly, inefficient means of handling the growing volume of casework.

The American ombudsman is based not only on the Scandinavian institution but also on our own experience with the Legislative Counsel and the Legislative Reference Service. Through them, Congress has given itself the benefits of expert, centralized assistance in the drafting of legislation and in legislative research. The ombudsman or Administrative Counsel would extend this service into the area of casework.

The ombudsman proposal is currently under consideration by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which will make its recommendations for congressional reform this year. Ombudsman bills are before the Committee on House Administration and the Senate Rules Committee.

Recently, the Gallup poll asked some questions about the ombudsman idea. Forty-two percent thought it was a "good idea" to "set up an independent agency in Washington to handle the complaints of citizens who think they have not been treated properly by Government officials." Twenty-nine percent thought this was a "poor idea," and an equal number had no opinion.

Then Gallup posed the issue in the following terms: "As you may know, Congressmen spend about half their time doing errands and favors for people in their districts. To give Congressmen more time to consider new legislation it has been suggested that all letters and requests—except those dealing with policy matters—be turned over to a central bureau for handling."

Forty-six percent thought this was a "good idea." Forty-one percent regarded it as a "poor idea," and 13 percent had no opinion.

A 46-to-41 plurality is not to be disregarded for a proposal such as this. Yet I suspect that opposition was exaggerated by implications in the question that the ombudsman would be asked to do "errands and favors" and that Congressmen would wash their hands of any concern about the fate of citizens' grievances and nonpolicy requests.

In fact, under the language of the ombudsman bill, cases could be referred to the ombudsman only when a citizen "alleges that he believes that he has been subjected to

any improper penalty, or that he has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States, or that the determination of award of any such right or benefit has been, is being, or will be unreasonably delayed." The law would rule out any possibility that the ombudsman would become a favor-seeker or errand boy.

Moreover, Congressmen would continue their interest in their constituents' problems. Cases could come to the ombudsman only through Members of Congress. Congressmen could refer cases or continue to handle them themselves as at present. If dissatisfied with the ombudsman's investigation or report, they could pursue cases further.

Funneling cases through Members of Congress allows the Congressman to remain directly concerned with his constituents' problems, but relieves him of much of the time-consuming work involved. It would build on the firmly established tradition of "write your Congressman."

The British ombudsman proposal, which is strikingly like the American scheme in many ways, also would channel complaints through members of the legislature. Like the United States, Britain is a country with a tradition that its national legislators help constituents with their problems with the Government.

"In Britain," says the October British Government white paper, "Parliament is the place for ventilating the grievances of the citizen—by history, tradition, and past and present practice. It is one of the functions of the elected Member of Parliament to try to secure that his constituents do not suffer injustice at the hand of the Government. We do not want to create any new institution which would erode the functions of Members of Parliament in this respect, nor to replace the remedies which the British Constitution already provides. Our proposal is to develop those remedies still further. We shall give Members of Parliament a better instrument which they can use to protect the citizen, namely, the services of a Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration."

The United States has created many of its institutes of government by borrowing and adapting. We took the name of our Senate from Rome, our Speaker from the English House of Commons, and our doctrine of separation of powers from the French philosophers. We could do worse than to borrow the concept of the Swedish ombudsman.

Perhaps the proposal will have a better chance if we can resolve one problem. Hardly anyone can pronounce "ombudsman," and trying to pronounce it tends to provoke titters among the uninitiated. On the other hand, Administrative Counsel of the Congress sounds awfully bland. A better name, anyone?

THE JOB CORPS CENTERS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the February 8 issue of the Wall Street Journal, James C. Tanner reports that our Job Corps centers are making a promising beginning in training idle youth. Mr. Tanner's article grew out of his visits to the centers and his talks with the corpsmen themselves. He gives an insight into a typical corpsman's day and comments on the functional and realistic approach to learning being used by the Job Corps. Young men and women, bored by orthodox teaching methods, are now learning valuable skills. The real success of the Job Corps will be the useful employment of these young men and women and their emergence as productive and responsible citizens. Industries are recruiting Job Corpsmen who, 10 months ago, would never have been considered for employment. This is the proof of the wisdom and promise of this program. I have personally visited two of these Job Corps centers and I was much impressed by them.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tanner's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

SALVAGING DROPOUTS—U.S. JOB CORPS MAKES PROMISING BEGINNING TRAINING IDLE YOUTHS—FIRST "GRADUATES" FIND WORK EASILY; A HIGH QUIT RATE AT CAMPS IS BIG PROBLEM—A LOOK AT L.B.J.'S PET CENTER

(By James C. Tanner)

SAN MARCOS, TEX.—Robert Coffey and Curtis Lemarr are 19-year-old high school dropouts. Still, they share what is temporarily one of the Nation's rarest educational distinctions. They are among the first "graduates" of the U.S. Job Corps—and their stories exemplify what this antipoverty agency is trying to achieve.

A year ago they seemingly had no future. Robert, a Negro, had quit school to help support his mother after his sister died in an auto crash, but he could find work only as a $1.15 an hour delivery boy for a Little Rock, Ark., department store. Curtis, shy son of a disabled Tennessee coal miner, left school after an argument with his principal, and could find no regular job at all.

Last fall, after passing a machine-shop course at the Job Corps' Gary camp here in the Texas hill country, both found jobs at the Longview, Tex., oil field equipment plant of U.S. Industries, Inc., for $1.78 an hour. Already Curtis has been raised to $1.95 and Robert, who now runs a turret lathe, to $2.10. Moreover, the company gives both a good chance to work up to machinist—a job paying over $3 an hour. "They're more eager than most," says George R. Jenkins, personnel manager of U.S. Industries' petroleum equipment division.

BLUE BLAZERS

Will comparable prospects await the 4,500 youths a month who will come out of Job Corps camps by mid-1966? No firm answer is yet at hand. The Corps is barely a year old, and though 17,900 young men and women now wear its blue blazers, its graduates on February 1 numbered only 819.

But the question is one of the most vital in the whole war on poverty. During the fiscal year beginning July 1 the Corps is scheduled to grow from its present 90 camps to 124, accommodating 45,000 youths, and the Government plans to spend $350 million on it—more than a fifth of all planned antipoverty spending in fiscal 1967. So perhaps a close look at the Corps, and at the Gary camp as one of its leading centers, is in order.

The Corps is intended to make productive citizens out of some of the estimated 500,000 American youths, aged 16 to 21, who are out of school and lack marketable skills. Men and women, in separate camps, are taught both academic and vocational courses, but the stress is on job training.

The camps for men combine the atmospheres of an Army post, a boarding school and a college campus. Most numerous are the rural or conservation centers, which were set up mostly to teach farming or forestry work, but now are broadening their courses to include such things as "culinary arts." Bigger urban centers, such as Gary, offer courses in retail sales, welding, auto repair and the like. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), parent antipovery agency, contracts running of the camps to companies, universities or nonprofit groups. Operators include units of Litton Industries, Inc., International Business Machines Corp. and Ford Motor Co.

MANY CRITICS

The program has drawn harsh criticism. Some worriers fear the Corps is training youth for the wrong jobs in tomorrow's economy—though business firms help plan the courses, and some, including U.S. industries, are looking to the Corps to supply skilled workers now in short supply.

"At first I expected a bureaucratic boondoggle, but these boys are taking courses attuned to industry," says Ronald Keener, assistant vice president of Texas Instruments, Inc. He also is vice president of Opportunities, Inc., a group of 79 companies that have volunteered to oversee training at Gary and help place its graduates.

Other critics have called the camps "country clubs for juvenile delinquents." There have been charges that some girls in the Charleston, W. Va., camp have practiced prostitution, and in November 11 trainees from the Custer Camp were jailed in Kalamazoo, Mich., after a window-smashing melee. Poverty fighters concede there are some troublemakers in the camps, but contend there are proportionately many fewer than among young dropouts outside the Corps.

TOO SMALL?

Some, in contrast, think the corps is too small. "The idea is a superb one, but to have any real social meaning it must be expanded a hundredfold," says Herbert Hill, director of labor programs for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

In fact, the corps, like other antipoverty agencies, has had its growth slowed since Vietnam spending began to soar. The targets it now is scheduled to hit in fiscal 1967 originally were to be reached this fiscal year.

Still, the corps has generated much enthusiasm among poor youths. Some 300,000 have applied. Most haven't been screened, since the corps tries to keep its pool of accepted youths waiting for camp assignment to a couple thousand.

The corps studies environmental, educational, and behavior records of youths, and gives them medical, IQ, reading, and arithmetic tests. "Functional" illiterates may get in, but complete illiterates don't. Neither do youths with histories of repeated criminal behavior.

Youths who are taken are assigned to camps on the basis both of choice and of test scores. Those doing well on math tests usually are urged to go to urban centers. Rural camps take the less intellectually agile.

At Gary, which took its first trainees last March 3, enrollment is rising by 150 a week, and will reach a peak of 3,000 soon, making the camp the biggest in the corps. It offers the most courses, too—39, including training for such jobs as male nurse, bulldozer operator, and underwater welder.

In other ways, also, Gary is a Corps showplace. President Johnson announced and dedicated it personally, and its training schedules have been expanded continually at his urging. It's self-sustaining, with its own housekeeping crews, fire department, security force, and hospital. Though financed and supervised by OEO, it is, unlike most camps, run by a nonprofit group—Texas Educational Foundation, Inc., whose three members are appointed by Gov. John Connally.

Gary's training methods and problems, however, mirror those in other camps—and so do its accomplishments.

"There was no precedent in Texas for such a facility," says San Marcos Banker J. R. Thornton, president of Texas Educational Foundation. "We're really running a boarding school. We've had to live through a

period of public acceptance. You're on trial with a program like this until you can prove it's worthy."

Like many camps, Gary occupies an abandoned military base, and takes trainees from all over the country. They're required to work around the base, sweeping the barracks, helping in the kitchens and maintaining the grounds. For this they draw salaries of $30 a month, and an additional $50 a month is set aside as a terminal leave bonus. A youth can have half his terminal leave bonus, or $25 a month, sent home to a dependent. If he does, the Government matches his contribution, so that the dependent gets $50 a month.

DAILY LIFE

A corpsmen's weekday begins at 6. After breakfast, he cleans his room, then reports to class at 8. He's required to spend 3 hours a day in academic courses, 3 hours in vocational training, and 1 hour in physical education. A citizenship class is mandatory.

One innovation at Gary is integration of vocational and academic courses. Cooks and bakers in math classes are taught fractions so that they can measure ingredients; machine operators learn to translate fractions into decimals. Apprentice auto mechanics spend a part of their time in English class learning to spell "carburetor" and other vehicle parts. In science classes they pick up the theory of what makes an engine run. The average youth takes a year to finish his training, though some graduate in less time and some will take up to 2 years.

On the theory that a busy boy is a happy one, trainees are encouraged to use Gary's two swimming pools, movie theater, tennis courts, gymnasium, and television lounges, and to participate in the vigorous intramural sports. Cooperative corpsmen are given passes for off-base visits, and any trainee can quit the program if he chooses.

MANY DROPOUTS

Despite the careful preliminary screening, many do quit. Homesickness takes the biggest toll, but some youths come down just for an airplane ride. At Gary, 32 of every 100 enrolled in the initial months failed to complete prescribed training.

Jobs Corps staffers expect the dropout rate to decline, and insist that even brief exposure to a camp can change the life of a youth conditioned to poverty. "If they stay here a month, they have gained," says John C. Henry, a Gary community relations coordinator. "They're eating regularly, and they've got clothes. They will not be content to go back to the old way of life."

Gary has traced many who quit and finds that some are readmitted to other Job Corps camps. Others often find jobs, go back to school or enter the military. One corpsman left before graduating, for example, but credits the training he did get for helping him through Marine boot camp; he spent his first leave back at Gary. The Job Corps considers it has succeeded when a trainee is placed in a job, returns to school or is accepted by the armed services.

The director of Gary, Oscar J. Baker, a noted Texas educator, makes no pretense that his charges aren't a challenge. "Students here have one common factor," he says. "They come to us with a sense of failure and various degrees of skepticism that they will ever be much more." First objectives of Gary, he says, are to rekindle their hope and restore their confidence.

While costs of training a Job Corpsman haven't been pinned down yet, they likely will turn out to be more than it would take to keep him in Harvard. "Public schools," says Mr. Baker, "operate 7 hours a day while we operate like a city. In training corpsmen, you are concerned with them 24 hours a day." He also contends, "statistically, if less than 5 percent of the Job Corps trainees hold responsible employment for the remainder of their working years, they will have paid back the investment the Government has made in the program."

The original OEO contract for operation of Gary estimated costs for the first 18 months at $8,100,000. However, Mr. Baker recently had to get a fatter budget approved by the OEO, partly because the center is training at least 1,000 more than had been initially expected. Payroll costs alone are running nearly $500,000 a month.

To attract top quality teachers, Gary pays them more than they generally would make in comparable public school posts. All told, Gary has 1,116 staffers for 3,000 trainees, but many of these are guidance counselors and housekeeping and medical employees. Some 90 percent of incoming trainees need immediate dental treatment. "In most you also see the ravages of malnutrition and lack of immunizations," a doctor here adds.

A SECOND CHANCE

Trainees generally credit the Job Corps with giving them "a second chance." Denver Sexton, 17-year-old son of a Kentucky coal miner, says he had to quit school in the eighth grade because of financial problems. He came here March 3 with the first trainees. "You should have seen him then," says a Job Corps staffer. "He had long hair, looked like a beatnik, and wouldn't talk to anybody." Recently, Denver, neatly attired and clean-cut, got up before a banquet here to make a brief and articulate speech of thanks after he was named November Corpsman of the month.

Kenneth (Mike) Wyatt, 20, finished the 11th grade at Waco, Tex., but an auto accident put him in a coma for 5 months and erased his plans for completing high school. After a stint at Gary, however, he passed entrance exams at Southwest Texas State College the other day. He intends to study there soon; meanwhile he is selling shoes in a Waco store.

Alex Maynard, also 20, from McAlester Okla., was a freshman in a Negro college until financial strain forced him to quit. He worked a while as a stock boy in an Oklahoma department store, but his wages never topped $60 a week. He enrolled here in retail sales, graduating the other day. He is now employed as a men's clothing salesman at Foley's, a Houston department store, earning $351 a month plus 12 percent commission on his sales.

PLACEMENT RECORD

Gary has graduated 188 so far. All have quickly found jobs, gone back to high school or college or enlisted in the armed services. And prospective employers are seeking other Gary grads.

At this point, indeed, "we can't meet demand," says Harold Massey, Gary placement director. Texas highway builders are clamoring for all the bulldozer operators Gary can turn out. Other employers, like Mr. Jenkins of U.S. Industries, are coming here to recruit. Even the New York Mets baseball team sent scouts here, though Job Corps staffers are inclined to brush that off as a publicity stunt.

Job Corps officials are confident the bulk of graduates from Gary and other camps will be placed in coming months, too, if the Nation's economy continues to grow as predicted. "We won't guarantee placing 100 percent, but that's our objective," says Lewis D. Eigen, an associate director of the Job Corps in Washington. Mr. Eigen has set up a placement system and is enlisting the aid of businessmen to promote and hold jobs open for Job Corps graduates. A plastics bottle manufacturer already has assured him it will need at least 15 to 20 Job Corps grads when it opens a new plant several months from now.

HERBERT C. BONNER, LATE A REPRESENTATIVE FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to pay a word of tribute to the late Congressman Herbert Covington Bonner, whose death has deprived us of a good and kind neighbor.

Herbert Bonner was born in the year 1891 in Washington, N.C., the son of Herbert Macon and Hannah Hare Bonner. His father was the captain of the steamboat *Hatteras* which carried passengers and cargo from the port of "little Washington" to points along the intercoastal waters. Herbert sometimes accompanied "Captain Mac" on these excursions and his early love of the water and boating never left him.

After attending Graham's Academy in Warrenton, N.C., he joined the George B. Helms Tobacco Co. as a traveling tobacco and snuff salesman. By horse and buggy he covered the roads and byways of a five-county area selling his wares. He loved these trips and looked forward to the warm hobnobbing at the country stores.

He opened his own tobacco company in 1911 with his brother-in-law and continued as a salesman for the company until World War I when he left to serve as a sergeant in the 81st Army Division. In 1925 he accompanied his boyhood friend, Lindsay C. Warren, to Washington as his secretary, and brought his lovely bride of 6 months with him. When Warren was appointed Comptroller General in 1940, Herbert Bonner was his uncontested successor. He encountered opposition only 3 of the 13 times he ran for reelection during the 25 years he served in Congress.

I know of no Congressman in the past or present who was more fervently dedicated to the well-being of those he represented than was Herbert Bonner. He felt a genuine empathy with the people back home he so loved, and his efforts for them were tireless. With his instinctive avoidance of ostentation, he went about the attainment of his aims with a noted absence of display.

Among his legislative achievements was passage of the measure which led to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, the first of the seashore areas in the Nation to be set aside as a public playground. He was responsible for construction of the bridge which bears his name and links the once isolated Outer Banks of North Carolina, and was one of the first to recognize the need for a revised acreage allotment tobacco program. He continually worked for improvements in the postal facilities and service for the people of his district, and his competence in obtaining his objectives was remarkable.

Herbert Bonner's accomplishments, however, were not confined to the State level, and he left an impressive legacy as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. His good friend, Speaker Sam Rayburn, said of him in this capacity:

His committee has been chairmaned by some of the greatest Members of Congress, but none greater than Herbert Bonner.

Herbert's interest in marine affairs was profoundly earnest and the work of the committee during the 10 years of his chairmanship bore the mark of his imagination and courage. Through his own tenacious efforts, he offered and steered to enactment legislation authorizing construction of the first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the SS *Savannah*. It was his idea that the ship should be a cargo-passenger vessel which could be practically employed in its demonstration of the peacetime possibilities of nuclear power rather than simply a showboat for display purposes. After the sinking of the *Andrea Doria* in 1956, he chaired a subcommittee investigation of the incident which resulted in the 1960 Convention for Safety of Life at Sea. He was one of the first to recognize the unique adaptability of atomic power to icebreaking vessels, and in 1958 his proposed legislation for a nuclear-powered icebreaker successfully passed both the House and Senate but was defeated by Presidential veto. In all likelihood the future will be the beneficiary of his vision. He initiated a congressional study of the efficiency of the Panama Canal as a modern interoceanic waterway, and led efforts that resulted in the revision of obsolete passenger shipping laws and thus insured the survival of American passenger shipping. He also concerned himself and his committee with labor-management relations in the maritime industry which he considered to be the basis of many of the maritime problems. In the last speech he was to deliver in the House of Representatives on October 20, 1965, less than a month before the death which he knew to be inevitable, he argued for the establishment of an independent Federal Maritime Administration. He stated:

> I intend as soon as possible in the next session to hold hearings on this legislation with the hope that by giving everyone a full opportunity to express themselves, we will be able to get our merchant marine policy back on course.

His courage and optimism never failed, and unlike Tennyson's Ulysses who feared to "rust unburnish'd," Herbert Bonner's life up to its end "shined in use."

I never knew him to hold bitterness or enmity in his heart against his fellows, and his generous nature was quick to forgive anger and malevolence in others. He possessed an extraordinary facility of getting along with men of heterogeneous political faiths, and his native temperance together with his political acumen and sincere liking of people enabled him to accomplish ends which would have eluded others.

He was a man of relentless honesty and when he gave his word it was his honor. With all his astuteness as a political leader, he was on occasion deceived by very reason of this honesty since he assumed the same allegiance to it in others. He never lost his eager interest in everything and his wonderful teasing and dry humor was a source of much pleasure to those who knew him.

Congressman Herbert C. Bonner was known and addressed as simply "Herbert" by the people back home, young and old alike. He was one of them and they knew it. It is a moving tribute to the man that his name has been given to many of the children of those who loved him. One of his most devoted friends and longtime employee named her only son Herbert, and if it could be determined, we might well find that there are as many Herberts scattered throughout the First District of North Carolina as there were Georges in the Colonies during the days of the American Revolution.

Herbert Bonner was always interested in the opinions of his friends and associates, and he listened to others with respect and attention. He once remarked that during his early days in Washington he observed a sign in Speaker Sam Rayburn's office which read:

> When you're talkin you ain't larnin.

He received this homely instruction well, and many years later when he had distinguished himself as a Congressman, Speaker Rayburn was moved to say of him:

> Herbert Bonner doesn't talk too much. So when he does talk, he challenges the attention of the House because he knows what he's talking about.

And indeed he did.

He felt a special warmheartedness for children and expressed this fondness in many kindnesses for them. He once read an item in his hometown newspaper which casually alluded to a little boy with ragged pants who was seen rolling a warped wooden hoop down the street. The boy was described as looking rather forlorn. Herbert Bonner called the newspaper editor from his Washington office and said:

> You go buy that boy a pair of pants and also a real hoop and let me know how much they cost.

In the final weeks of Herbert Bonner's life when death was close at hand, he made every effort his failing body would allow to attend the sessions of the House of Representatives. On several occasions he had an aid rush him back from his visits to Walter Reed Hospital in order that he might cast his vote.

Herbert Bonner was survived by his devoted wife, Eva Hassell Hackney Bonner, who had been his constant inspiration in all his public services.

Since his passing, those of us who called him friend remember with a new awareness the poignant truth expressed by the Persian poet ages ago:

> For some we loved, the loveliest and the best
> That from his vintage rolling time hath prest,
> Have drunk their cup a round or two before,
> And one by one crept silently to rest.

THE VALUE OF COAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, those of us from coal-producing States have long realized the economic value of our greatest natural resource. Its total value has been estimated at more than $2 billion annually to the people in 25 States.

The importance of the coal industry has been justly dramatized in a special edition published by the Welch, W. Va., Daily News on January 29, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that one article in that special edition, dealing with the revenue-producing aspects of coal, be printed in the RECORD for study by Members of the Senate.

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

COAL MEANS $2 BILLION ANNUALLY TO 25 STATES

The mining and transportation of bituminous coal and lignite directly add $2,290 million in wages, purchases and taxes to the economy of hundreds of American cities and towns in 25 States each year, according to a report from Operations and Policy Research, Inc., of Washington, D.C.

The report is based on the first company by company survey ever undertaken of coal producers, coal carrying railroads and mining machinery and equipment manufacturers. The survey was limited to wages, State and local taxes paid and expenditures for services and supplies. The objective of the survey was to measure the impact of coal-generated wealth on the trade and livelihood of the communities in which it is produced or transported.

The report shows that $1,323 million in wages are paid annually to coal miners, railroad workers engaged in transporting coal and employees of manufacturing companies who work solely on coal mining machines and supplies.

Coal companies, railroads and manufacturers each year pay $866,666,996 for supplies and supplies and services for the parts of their operations directly related to coal.

State and local taxes paid by these industries total $106,995,912.

Coal means $541,608,506 annually to West Virginia. A total of $271,547,420 is paid in wages.

Coal wages go back into the economy in these ways: $76,304,825 is spent for food each year by coal workers in West Virginia; $73,860,898 is spent on wearing apparel; medical expenses total $15,749,750; transportation takes $31,771,058; $6,245,591 is spent on personal care (beauty and barber shops, cosmetics, etc.); $14,935,108 goes for recreation; and $30,684,858 is spent on other goods and services not listed.

BOB HOPE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, Bob Hope has performed an invaluable service to all Americans by entertaining U.S. service personnel throughout the world. Since 1941 this great citizen has unselfishly devoted his time and talents to the task of bringing joy and humor to our men and women who are far from home.

Many of Mr. Hope's performances have been conducted during the holiday seasons when most persons prefer to remain at home with their families and friends.

Bob's recent trip to Thailand, Vietnam, and Guam is a fine example of his many visits to military installations. Television viewers and radio listeners are familiar with this tour because of the film clips and tape recordings which have been broadcast widely in the United States, permitting the general public to appreciate the fine quality of these performances.

At my request, the Department of Defense has compiled and forwarded to me a list of the widespread posts and areas in which Bob Hope and his troupe have entertained. It also has prepared lists of associates who traveled with Mr. Hope during the 1964 and 1965 trips.

As a small tribute of the deep appriciation for these services and the esteem of the American public for these fine people, I ask unanimous consent that this information be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF BOB HOPE'S ASSOCIATION WITH THE MILITARY

March 1941 to June 1948: All of Hope's weekly broadcasts originated at military installations.

December 1948: Performed for Berlin airlift personnel in Germany and England.

December 1949: Alaska.

December 1950: Japan and Korea.

December 1954: First oversea TV filming accomplished at Thule, Greenland. One performance at Goose Air Base, Labrador. Sponsored by Secretary of the Air Force.

December 1955: Hope and small troupe entertained in Iceland at the request of MATS commander.

December 1956: Entertained at one Army post, three Air Force bases in Alaska. Sponsored by commander, Alaskan Command.

December 1957: First tour under Department of Defense sponsorship through Armed Forces Professional Entertainment Branch (AFPEB) and USO. Toured Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Guam, Hawaii, plus planeside show during refueling at Kwajelein Island.

December 1958: Second AFPEB tour, Morocco, Spain, Italy, Germany, and Iceland.

December 1959: Third AFPEB tour, Alaskan Command.

December 1960: Fourth AFPEB tour, Caribbean.

December 1961: Fifth AFPEB tour, northeast area (Greenland, Labrador, Newfoundland, etc.).

December 1962: Sixth AFPEB tour, Far East (Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, Philippines, Guam).

December 1963: Seventh AFPEB tour, Near East (Turkey, Greece, Libya, Italy).

December 1964: Eighth AFPEB tour, Pacific (Vietnam, Thailand, Philippines, Guam, Korea).

July 1965: Ninth AFPEB tour, Dominican Republic (July 12–15).

December 1965: Tenth AFPEB tour, Pacific (Thailand, Vietnam, Guam) (December 18–29).

THE 1964 BOB HOPE CHRISTMAS SHOW

Bob Hope, Jerry Colonna, Anita Bryant, Janis Paige, Jill St. John, Ann Sidney (Miss World-British Subject), Anna Maria Alberghetti, John Bubbles, Peter Leeds, Les Brown and his band.

JULY 1965 BOB HOPE SHOW TO DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Bob Hope, Jerry Colonna, Tony Romano, Joey Heatherton, Lola Dee, Tuesday Weld.

THE 1965 BOB HOPE CHRISTMAS SHOW

Bob Hope, Jerry Colonna, Les Brown and his band, Anita Bryant, Jack Jones, Peter Leeds, Kaye Stevens, Carroll Baker, Joey Heatherton, Dianna Lynn Batts, Fayard Antonio Nicholas, Harold Lloyd Nicholas.

SENATOR MAGNUSON—FISHERY LEADER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the January 1966 anniversary issue of the Fishermen's News, published and edited in Seattle by John H. Wedin, contains 42 important articles relating to the U.S. fishery. Among the authors are Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and many of our colleagues in the Senate and the House, together with fishery experts from all parts of the country.

"The golden age begins" is the phrase Editor Wedin used to title the anniversary issue. The front page is almost covered by a photograph of a man who ever since coming to Congress over a quarter of a century ago has led in the long, hard fight to preserve and to expand the American fishery. He is my colleague, my chairman, and my friend, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, of Washington State. Of him Editor Wedin wrote:

Of all those associated with the present golden age of Pacific fisheries, none has been more dedicated toward developing the fleets than Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the powerful Senate Commerce Committee. His 25-year record of adopted fishery legislation was the subject of a feature in the 1965 annual, and is unequaled in national fishery legislative history. One of the prime problems in the present world fishery explosion is that of resource conservation.

Mr. President, I concur in this flattering and factual statement. And I take pleasure now in asking unanimous consent to have the article written by the Senator from Washington for this anniversary issue printed in the RECORD.

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

HIGH SEAS FISHERY CONSERVATION—1965

(By Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee)

For this Fishermen's News anniversary edition, it has been suggested that we look forward 20 years and speak of what can be seen for the fisheries. This is a constructive and helpful thing to do at the beginning of the year. Attention could be focused on any one of many aspects of the fisheries for the future. I would like to concentrate on what I personally consider to be the most perplexing international fishery problem—the conservation of high seas fishery resources.

I am firmly convinced that during the next 20 years the international law of fisheries will be drastically changed. For the past 300 years the taking of fish has been considered one of the "freedoms" on the high seas. The resource has been common property. This system of international law, or "no law," has permitted, and, even encouraged, the excessive exploitation of certain fishery resources. With everyone having an equal right to the resource on a first-come-first-serve basis, conservation doesn't pay. No nation unilaterally will postpone exploiting the resource to permit replenishment unless there is some assurance that the nation will later have a special right to benefit from the sacrifice made. There can be no such assurance under the present scheme of international fishery law.

In recent years enormous modern and efficient foreign fishing fleets have operated in the coastal waters of the United States and other coastal nations. Foreign fleets have concentrated in coastal waters over and adjacent to the Continental Shelf generally 10 to 50 miles off the coast. Under the present international law the coastal state cannot be certain what fishery stocks or what quantity of fish are being taken or, therefore, what effect the foreign catch is having on coastal fishery resources. If the United States as a coastal nation wants information on the foreign catch off our coast or possibly a reduction in the foreign fishing effort, we must, under present international law, persuade the sovereign foreign nation to surrender the information voluntarily or voluntarily to comply with restrictions on their fishing effort. A brief "no" is considered too blunt by the foreign nation. Talks can commence and then be continued and continued, particularly if other nations can be brought into the discussions. In the meantime, back in the water, the resource can be plundered with the highest profit going to the most militant exploiter. We from the Pacific Northwest remember the days when the halibut and fur seal resources were devastated and know the price that must be paid and cooperation that is necessary to revive a renewable resource after excessive exploitation.

But I have stated that the present international regime will be replaced before 1985. What will come to take its place? I will suggest that a new international order for the fisheries will be found in which either (1) the coastal state will have exclusive jurisdiction over its coastal fishery resources, or in the alternative (2) the 1958 Geneva Fishery Convention will be fully implemented. In either case, there will be a means whereby the fishery resources beyond territorial waters can be effectively conserved. How would this look in more detail?

If the present trend continues, a world fishery catch of over 150 million tons can be expected by 1985 compared with the present catch of about 50 million tons, and I for one am convinced that the increase in world population and the need for animal protein will only accelerate the present rate of expansion of fishery catch. With this increased pressure on fishery resources, more and more nations will be pressed to claim exclusive fishery jurisdiction out to the Continental Shelf and beyond.

If no other solution to the fishery conservation problem is found effective within the next few years, I believe coastal fishery nations will obtain absolute jurisdiction over their coastal fishery resources either by a Geneva-type international convention or by mass unilateral action by individual nations. If an international conference is called at some time within the next 5 years similar to the Geneva Conferences on the Law of the Sea of 1958 and 1960, to consider jurisdiction over fishery resources, I believe the developing nations would predominate in any vote to assume absolute and exclusive jurisdiction over coastal fishery resources. Generally, at such international conferences a two-thirds vote is required for formal action, but it is my opinion that the necessary votes might be marshaled for extending jurisdiction with strong U.S. support. But even if this would fail, I believe the same result might eventually prevail through independent unilateral national action and through bilateral and similar agreements among nations.

This has been the historical development of the 12-mile fishery zone. It, or something that strongly resembled it, lost in Geneva in 1960. Nevertheless, during the past 5 years every coastal nation except the United States and a handful of others has adopted a 12-mile coastal fishery zone anyway. No one seriously doubt that a 12-mile fishery zone is acceptable international law today, although not included in any convention adopted at the Law of the Sea Conference.

It can be reasonably argued that exclusive jurisdiction over other more valuable resources such as oil, natural gas, and mineral resources of the Continental Shelf, which were also previously considered high seas resources, have been in recent years allocated among nations on the basis of geographical location under the 1958 Convention on the Continental Shelf. The fact that fishery resources are more mobile than minerals is no acceptable distinction. King crab, which is a living resource that qualifies under the Continental Shelf Convention, is probably more mobile than certain species of bottom fish that live on or above the shelf. Moreover, with multiple State regulatory jurisdiction in the United States, we have found

that fishery resources can be reasonably conserved so long as some jurisdiction has the immediate responsibility even if that responsibility shifts according to the location of the fish in different State waters. I repeat, if no other solution to the conservation of high seas fishery resources is found, coastal nations will assume exclusive jurisdiction.

The alternative development lies with the implementation of the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas. My personal preference, at least initially, is to work for the implementation of this Convention which for the first time under international law gives a responsibility to all nations to conserve fishery resources and gives to each coastal state a special interest and the primary responsibility for initiating coastal fishery conservation regulations on the high seas. Under the Convention, fishery resources are no longer considered simply property common to all nations, since the coastal state has the dominant and effective interest in the conservation of the resource. This dominant interest in the conservation of the resource does not give to the coastal state any exclusive right to harvest the resource, but it does give the coastal state a means to make certain that these coastal resources will not be extinguished but will survive as a renewable resource and source of food for future generations. Any dispute between the coastal state and any foreign nation fishing in the waters of the coastal state can be settled finally by arbitration.

In my opinion, the 1958 Fishery Convention can provide the international legal framework necessary to assure the conservation of world fishery resources on the high seas. Twenty of the necessary 22 nations have signed the Convention, and it is reliably reported that several other nations are seriously considering ratification in the near future. It certainly appears the Convention will become effective and in force this year. The problem then lies in getting all nations to conform to the Convention and for the terms of the Convention to be uniformly interpreted by all nations. Immediately after the 22d nation ratifies the Convention, there will remain the question of how to interpret this new law and whether the Convention restrictions and duties apply to nations that have not ratified. This question is important because several of the most important fishing nations have not taken this action, including Russia and Japan. If the Convention does not apply to these two countries, it will be of very limited value.

In my opinion the most effective means to obtain additional ratifications of the 1958 Convention and to obtain uniform application and interpretation is to call an international conference to discuss the implementation of the Convention. This will have the effect of increasing interest in the ratification of the Convention and will provide an opportunity to obtain a consensus on its implementation. The U.S. Senate has already passed a resolution calling for such an international conference and I believe this conference will make possible the full implementation of the 1958 Fishery Convention.

By 1985, I believe therefore that the coastal high seas fishery resources of the world will be under some form of conservation scheme other than by the present one in which no nation has a dominant interest and all nations must agree or the conservation program fails.

THE POLL TAX IN TEXAS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the February 9 decision of a Federal three-judge court regarding the use of a poll tax in the State of Texas. The ruling of this court provides us with the first poll tax decision under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The court unanimously struck down the use of the tax as a prerequisite to the constitutional right to vote in the State of Texas, on the ground that the imposition of such a tax "constitutes an invalid charge on the right to vote. It is in effect a penalty."

Many of us in the Senate who were deeply concerned about the right of all citizens to vote can recall that the original bill submitted to the Congress last year paid homage to this voting barrier. The original bill provided that wherever a poll tax existed it would be collected by the very Federal officials sent into certain political areas or subdivisions to remove impediments to the voting process. Many of us considered this an unacceptable treatment of what we thought to be the one remaining weapon that could be used by those who would seek to limit the voting rights of citizens. Thanks to the original efforts of some 39 Senators we were able to bring this section of the bill into question and we attempted to remove the poll tax entirely from our voting system through congressional action. While unsuccessful in our attempt, the treatment of the poll tax in the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was completely reversed. Rather than allowing the collection of a poll tax in any area, the Attorney General was directed to bring suit wherever he found the poll tax in use.

It was because of this that the Texas Federal court had a case before it—and it was because of this action in the Senate that many in the State of Texas, now deprived of the right to vote by the payment of a tax, have the hope that this voting impediment has fallen with the rest.

It is my hope that a final and favorable determination of this constitutional question will soon be forthcoming from the U.S. Supreme Court. At that time the full intent of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 will have been realized.

EXPANSION OF THE NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH EFFORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in 1964, Congress passed the Water Resources Research Act to significantly expand the national water research effort. The problem of providing enough water for all of our needs has come to be recognized as national in scope. The water research program reaches every State.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has submitted the first annual report of the Office of Water Resources Research which was created by the 1964 act. The report covers the operations of the Office of Water Resources Research for fiscal year 1965. The document illustrates the continuing concern of the Interior Department with problems related to water resources. In cooperation with other Federal agencies, and agencies at the State and local level, the Department has led the way in the inauguration of water resources and research training programs in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico. At present, some 400 new projects are underway across the country, and I feel certain that a giant stride has been taken toward more adequately meeting the Nation's future water needs. Research alone, of course, does not produce more water; but it helps tell us how to do that.

The rapid and widespread response to the program is most heartening. The problems and oversights that characterize any new program are now in the process of being corrected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's letter of transmittal, the report, and the summary of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is my first annual report to the Congress of activities authorized by the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329), as required by section 104 of the act.

The program of supporting non-Federal research and training in the field of water resources is authorized as a means of strengthening the Nation's capability in water resources conservation and management for assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population. Even the first year's operation of the program provides abundant grounds for optimism that it will be successful in furthering the objectives of the authorization.

Promptly responsive to passage of the act, there has been widespread high-quality participation by scientists and engineers representing many of the disciplines of the natural, life, and social sciences. Academic and nonacademic scientists and engineers throughout the Nation are evidencing their readiness to help develop the knowledge and understanding that are essential for effective solution of the critical problems of these States, regions, and the Nation.

The program of research and training has broadly based support—in the Congress, among the executive agencies, by the scientific community, by State and local public officials, and citizen organizations of all kinds. This widespread involvement lends confidence in the continuing vigor of the program, its balance of the many scientific and practical components of water resources problems, and its focus on problems of urgent public concern.

During the first year, pursuant to the statutory authorization, a water resources research center in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico formulated an approved program of research and received an initial allotment of Federal grant funds. Already these 51 research institutes have started working on several hundred new projects. In addition to strengthening research itself, the impetus of the new program has strengthened and enlarged university faculties and curriculums in water resources-related subjects. Part-time employment as research project assistants and technicians is enabling several hundred students to continue their training for professional work in the water resources field.

Progress also has been most encouraging on another one of the objectives of the Water Resources Research Act: improvement

of coordination of research. An extensive network of formal and informal communication among the 51 research centers, the Office of Water Resources Research, and Federal, State, and nongovernmental research organizations, is facilitating and expediting mutual awareness of current work among all who are engaged in water resources research.

With the cooperation of other Federal agencies and in collaboration with the Science Information Exchange of the Smithsonian Institution, the Office of Water Resources Research published the first volume of the Water Resources Research Catalog, which presents information on some 2,000 current research projects dealing with water problems. Ready access to information about who is doing what has already demonstrated its value in minimizing unproductive duplication of research.

Recognition of effectiveness of scientific communication in increasing the productivity of research manpower and funds encourages the Department of the Interior to proceed now with a strengthened and expanded water resources scientific information center that will serve the 51 State research centers, the agencies of the Department of the Interior, and other Federal or non-Federal organizations as they may request. Operation of this water science information center, employing labor-saving procedures and equipment, should significantly reduce the unproductive drain on manpower and funds that is consequent to decentralized, frequently duplicative and inefficient literature search by individual investigators, and laboratories.

Attached hereto is the report and recommendations of the panel of scientists, engineers, and other persons experienced in public affairs related to water resources. It is a highly knowledgeable examination of the first year's activity in the new program. It identifies accomplishments and also points to gaps on which attention must be focused promptly. Especially noteworthy in the Panel's report is that, while warmly commending the Office of Water Resources Research for its first year progress, the Panel finds that the Office of Water Resources Research should give more attention to the breadth and balance of the total program and its relevance to the most important local, State, and regional water problems needing research. Immediate steps are being taken to meet these suggestions.

The Panel report also points out that "the water research effort and the training of water scientists are being gravely restricted by the failure of the Water Resources Research Act to enlist, on a par with the land-grant colleges and universities, the contributions and talents of other well-qualified institutions, individuals, and agencies." The Panel correctly states: "The enormous dimensions and complexity of the Nation's oncoming water supply problems, and the urgency of solving them in time, demand that we use the best-trained scientists and facilities available, wherever they are."

I am fully in accord with the Panel's emphasis on the pressing need to amend title II of the Water Resources Reseach Act at the earliest possible hour and thereby to implement fully the program that President Johnson has termed "vital."

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

JANUARY 5, 1966.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL CONVENED TO REVIEW OPERATIONS OF THE OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Nation's appetite for water is voracious. On all sides, the mounting demands are insistent and relentless. Municipalities, industry, recreation, agriculture, and other users are asking for more and more. Daily consumption is expected to double, approximately, within the next 15 years—if the water is available. Already it is rated in excess of 300 billion gallons a day. By 1980, it is likely to reach 600 billion gallons or more.

In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, Congress passed the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. The specific purpose of the act is to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water.

In oversimplified terms, the Nation must learn how to be more efficient in the use, reuse, management, and control of its water resources in order to meet its immediate and long-range requirements. This calls for an accelerated and sustained research effort across the entire frontier of water knowledge. It calls for the training of a corps of water scientists throughout the country to maintain the effort and intensify it as the needs of the population dictate.

In the Department of the Interior, the twin assignments of water research and the training of water scientists under the act have been centered in the Office of Water Resources Research (OWRR). Clearly, the OWRR has recognized both the urgency and the magnitude of its responsibilities from the outset. In its first year of operation, it has pressed forward with vigor and has, in fact, been the instrument through which a nationwide water research and training program has been initiated.

The accomplishments to date are impressive and merit commendation. Under the stimulus of title I of the Water Resources Research Act, and the leadership of OWRR, 51 water resources research institutes are now in being—one in each State and in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In each the first stages of a water research program have been developed. A wide range of study has been started. A significant beginning has been made in the training program. The machinery has been established to carry forward, refine, and evaluate the total research and training effort in collaboration with the institutes. There is a widespread, important, and growing enthusiasm for the research and training effort in the associated land-grant colleges and universities.

The prompt development of water research programs by each of the 51 institutes, with participation by several hundred highly qualified scientists and engineers, is evidence of the readiness of the academic community to undertake research on water resource problems of significance to their States, their regions, and the entire country.

Three additional gains must be noted. There is evidence that operation of the Water Resources Research Act is prompting a wider recognition and understanding of the urgency of the Nation's water problems. It shows early indications of retaining able, young scientists at the smaller universities, where they are needed and can serve local and State water needs. And, a long-needed Water Resources Research Catalog has been compiled, identifying more than 2,000 current research projects. This catalog will not only contribute to orderly program development, but help avoid wasteful duplication.

The panel recognizes the time-consuming administrative details and procedures involved in launching a new program. Now that the effort is well started, it is evident that OWRR and associated water scientists across the country must, very quickly, begin to focus more attention on identification of critical gaps in water knowledge and move to foster research that will fill the gaps.

The Nation's water research and training program must be responsive, at all times, to the Nation's water needs. This will require in OWRR the exercise of an imaginative and creative leadership, not only in the identification of problems and in the development of specific research projects to deal with them, but in coordination of the total research and training effort under the act to give it purposeful balance and perspective.

In the exercise of this essential leadership function, the panel believes the OWRR must foster general and specific lines of research as well as respond to the proposals originating in the water research institutes and other places.

The panel believes the OWRR should now develop, as a matter of high priority, the additional criteria it will use in identifying the kinds of research it will and should foster. It should further develop procedures for eliciting the judgments of the institutes on the most important local, State, and regional water problems needing research. And, it should provide guidance to the institutes in selecting the most needed projects.

The panel could not and did not undertake to evaluate the quality of the research projects initiated during the past year. At this early stage we are content to rely on what appears to be an eminently thoroughgoing process in OWRR for reviewing and evaluating project proposals. The panel did note, however, an imminent need for OWRR to give more attention to the breadth and balance of the total program. In this connection, the following points merit emphasis:

1. The first round of approved projects appears to concentrate heavily on problems of hydrology and the water cycle.

2. Few projects, to date, focus on the economic, political, social, legal, and organizational problems associated with the Nation's water future—although these are obviously among the more critical ahead. There is meager research underway, for example, into the water problems associated with the sharply urbanizing trends of the Nation.

3. An increase in the tempo of river basin planning throughout the country is on the horizon, under provisions of the Water Resources Planning Act. Inevitably, this planning function will uncover a host of unanswered questions, demanding answers. The OWRR should begin to gear itself to this oncoming challenge. For the solution of basin-wide problems, as in other fields, there will be need for a multidisciplinary approach, probably on an unprecedented scale.

In the fulfillment of its mission, the OWRR should also find ways of exercising an intellectual leadership in water research. We believe there must be emphasis on the development of challenging ideas and innovations in the water field—ideas and innovations to which the water research institutes and the scientific community across the country will feel impelled to respond.

Providing such leadership in research is a sensitive and frequently difficult task, because much creativity results from researchers pursuing their own intellectual interests rather than responding to central direction. Certainly it is not in the province of OWRR to dictate what research the institutes should undertake, but it is incumbent on OWRR to foster the type of intellectual exploration and interchange which will focus attention on areas of critical importance in the water field.

With this function in mind, we recommend that the OWRR consider, among other possible actions, the following:

1. Sponsorship of a series of perspective studies. This could be accomplished by employing or contracting with individuals of outstanding competence to prepare papers, from time to time, directing attention to broad areas of subject matter, or geographical regions needing water research attention. Periodically it would be useful, for

example, to sponsor a broad study of the water resources situation, to evaluate the overall water research and training program in relation to demonstrated national needs, to identify gaps or weaknesses in the program, and to recommend specific remedial actions. Such studies would have an additional benefit as the basis for national and regional conferences on research needs, where the findings could be examined and debated.

2. Establishment of a system for continuing liaison with the many organizations and agencies having a significant interest in water resources. This would permit the OWRR to be informed, on a current basis, about the water research views and needs of people and organizations operating in a wide range of environments. As part of the liaison system, there is need to augment water research communications to serve the needs of the nationwide program. The communications system should be designed not only to report on developments and to inform water research institutes about significant problems and progress, but to stimulate multidisciplinary communication and thought about water problems at institutes and universities associated in the research and training effort.

3. Development of arrangements, by contract or otherwise, with a number of highly qualified persons charged with keeping themselves currently informed about the origins, objectives, urgency, progress, and other pertinent details of water research in a wide range of specific fields. This would provide OWRR and the Nation's water research effort with a corps of experts throughout the country, knowledgeable in their specialized fields, and competent to assess the direction and adequacy of work in these fields

Finally, it is the unanimous judgment of the panel that the water research effort and the training of water scientists are being gravely restricted by the failure of the Water Resources Research Act to enlist, on a par with the land-grant colleges and universities, the contributions and talents of other well-qualified institutions, individuals, and agencies.

The enormous dimensions and complexity of the Nation's oncoming water supply problems, and the urgency of solving them in time, demand that we use the best-trained scientists and facilities available, wherever they are. The plain and indisputable fact is that they are not always associated with the land-grant colleges and universities. Indeed, we block out large areas of unique competence from the Nation's water research service when we arbitrarily limit ourselves to the land-grant institutions.

Accordingly, the panel wishes to emphasize the very pressing need to amend title II of the Water Resources Research Act at the earliest possible hour. The present situation with respect to title II effectively deprives the Nation of the water research resources available at such academic institutions as the Universities of Michigan, Texas, Chicago, Duke, Syracuse, and Princeton; and also such nonacademic organizations as Franklin Institute, North Star Research Institute, the Research Institute of the Illinois Institute of Technology and numerous private firms and State agencies. The title should be revised to remedy this situation, to secure the additional research competence, and to provide adequate financial support for their participation in the program.

The OWRR has received scores of unsolicited applications for authorization of research projects under title II. The authorizations and collateral financing could not be granted because of the prevailing restrictions, even though the proposed research could not, in all probability, be carried forward elsewhere with comparable skill and competence, if at all.

Until title II of the act is amended, to remove the existing limitations, the OWRR and the Nation's water research program must be pushed along under a severe handicap, at half power.

MEMBERS OF SPECIAL PANEL

Dr. Irving Fox, vice president, Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Mr. Milo W. Hoisveen, secretary and state engineer, North Dakota Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak.

Dr. Omer J. Kelley, manager, Agricultural Research Center, Stanford Research Institute, South Pasadena, Calif.

Dr. Arthur Maass, professor of government and chairman of the Department of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, the Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, director, League of Women Voters of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Harold G. Wilm, chairman, Conference on Interstate Water Problems, Council of State Governments, State of New York Conservation Department, Albany, N.Y.

Mr. Gordon K. Zimmerman, executive secretary, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Washington, D.C.

SUMMARY

The Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329), approved by President Johnson July 17, 1964, states: "In order to assist in assuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population, it is the purpose of the Congress, by this Act, to stimulate, sponsor, provide for, and supplement present programs for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, and the training of scientists in the fields of water and of resources which affect water."

That purpose is now implemented by cooperative Federal and State support of water resources research in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico. The projects supported under the act are directed primarily to strengthening the involvement of non-Federal scientists and engineers in finding improved means for dealing with critical water resources problems throughout the Nation. Title I of the act, in large part, adapts the successful experience of State agricultural experiment stations established at land-grant universities.

The program authorized by the Water Resources Research Act is widespread: It is strengthening local professional competence to deal with the water resources problems of each of the States and regions, and it is developing competence to deal with complex water problems of national concern.

Consistent with the statutory provisions, activities supported under this program do not duplicate established programs of other Federal and non-Federal agencies; the new program focuses especially on important areas that require additional research emphasis. The background and legislative history of the act emphasize multidisciplinary research projects that bring together the physical, life, and social sciences and engineering in solving public problems.

The readiness of academic institutions and their facilities to engage in the attack on water resources problems resulted in vigorous progress of the program even in its initial year. Federal agencies have been highly cooperative in assisting the universities in formulating research programs and in assisting the Department of the Interior in its administrative responsibilities. State agencies, citizen organizations, private enterprises, and nonacademic research entities also have contributed to the breadth and strength of the program. State water research centers are supported by statewide involvement of public officials and private interests who, through various types of advisory boards and coordinating committees, assist in directing the research toward important public problems of water resources conservation and management.

During the first year after enactment of the Water Resources Research Act, a center in each of the 50 States and Puerto Rico formulated an approved research program, and utilized its initial allotment of Federal funds to meet startup costs, particularly the purchase of technical equipment. The 51 research programs generated some 400 new water resources research projects under the leadership of more than 300 senior faculty research scientists and engineers. Training of new hydroscientists was strengthened by addition of more than 100 new faculty members and over 170 new water-related courses of instruction. More than 550 students received financial support through the program as part-time paid research assistants on approved projects.

Research and training associated with the program extends through the scope defined in the act: "Such research, investigations, experiments, and training may include, without being limited to, aspects of the hydrologic cycle; supply and demand for water; conservation and best use of available supplies of water; methods of increasing such supplies; and economic, legal, social, engineering, recreational, biological, geographic, ecological, and other aspects of water problems."

The Office of Water Resources Research, established by the Secretary of the Interior to administer the program, consists of a small professional and administrative staff. It collaborated with the 51 State water research centers in the prompt and effective utilization of the $3,450,000 appropriated for the initial year's support of title I activities.

Formulation of the approved research programs afforded opportunity for progress in coordinating research and avoiding duplication. This objective is furthered by development of improved channels for information about water-related research throughout the country. To this end, OWRR carries on extensive consultation with research center scientists, and further facilitates coordination and avoidance of duplication by means of catalogs of current work, specialized bibliographies, and advisory reports by special consultants.

Substantial progress has been made in the first year because of the readiness of highly-qualified academic scientists to engage in research on water problems, and because of the willingness of public and private interests to aid in strengthening the program. However, difficult tasks remain. Among the most important of these is to develop improved methods for identifying the highest priority problems; to sharpen the focus of research on these urgent problems; and, through improved knowledge and understanding of the problems, to provide the scientific and engineering basis for their effective and practicable solution. Particularly significant will be strengthening the emphasis of research in multidisciplinary approaches to the economic aspects of water conservation and management, to problems of public administration and water law, and to water resources planning.

Ground water conservation and water quality management are other problem areas in which multidisciplinary research is needed. Broadly stated, research should provide improved understanding of the complex relationships of water resources to the total environment: physical, biological, and human.

To meet the many complex problems of water conservation and management, the work of the 51 water research centers sup-

ported under the act should be complemented by involvement of the academic and nonacademic research scientists whose institutions are not affiliated with the research centers. This can be especially significant in certain specialized fields such as those associated with water resources planning, water quality management, and industrial water problems.

SENATOR LISTER HILL AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HEALTH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, participants at the White House Conference on Aging in November gave an affectionate, heartfelt ovation to one of their principal speakers, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. It was a memorable occasion. As the Senator said, the conference met on a note of triumph during a dramatic year of a dramatic decade. What he did not tell the audience—but what the audience knew—was that the Senator had created much of the dramatic achievement that culminated in the mood of triumph at the conference. The Senator who had fought so many battles for the betterment of health in this Nation could—for a few moments—take deep satisfaction at a record of almost total victory.

But, satisfying as the record is, Chairman HILL was concerned about the future. He described shortages of men and facilities; he said we have not yet learned how to use our knowledge fully or effectively; he reminded us that there are millions more who continue to be denied health services provided within recent years for millions of others. And he said:

> It is to the credit of the public and the health professions alike that one of the reasons we have never attained that goal (delivering services to everyone who needs them) is that we have constantly broadened our definition of what is adequate. Our reach continues to exceed our grasp.

Mr. President, our reach is much longer than it would have been if the Senator from Alabama had not helped us to turn in new directions, and our reach will continue to grow with him to create and guide new tools for the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have a summary of his address printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LISTER HILL AT WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HEALTH, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 4, 1965

It gives me particular pleasure to be here and to address this Conference on Health. That it has been called by the President of the United States, that you—its active participants—are among America's most distinguished citizens, are to me of the highest and of the most gratifying significance.

This, indeed, underscores the value which the people of this Nation place on health problems. It demonstrates how clearly we recognize that personal problems of health can also be national problems. It signals our understanding that assuring a high standard of health is a national concern—demanding the time, the energy, the knowledge, and the skill of us all as individuals and as a Nation.

The eminent British statesman Benjamin Disraeli declared almost a century ago:

"The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend."

We meet today on a note of triumph. For this is a dramatic year of a dramatic decade. It is fitting that this Conference should be called in the year which has seen the enactment by the Congress of the United States of a series of laws which will help open the doors to better health for all our people.

As chairman of the legislative and appropriations committees that have jurisdiction over health legislation, I am naturally gratified over this record—a record which is the latest addition to a historic series of Federal legislative actions, each addressed to a different facet of the very complex health problem we face today. Taken together, they form a solid base upon which we can, if we will, build the healthier future we envision for ourselves and our children, and for their children after them.

There are the programs of Federal support for medical research, symbolized by the National Institutes of Health, and reaching through and beyond them into every corner of the land. There are the sister programs in applied research and demonstration, also centered in the Public Health Service, but working in close cooperation with State and local health departments, schools and hospitals, clinics, and private practitioners throughout the land. There are the Hill-Burton Hospital and Medical Facilities Act, the Health Research Facilities Act, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, the Mental Health and Mental Retardation Act, the Medical Libraries Act, and the Acts in the field of Environmental Health. There is the regional medical programs legislation stemming directly from the bold and imaginative work of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

I have said that we meet on a note of triumph. We meet also on a note of challenge. Let no one present—be he legislator or physician, educator or scientist—consider that the strife is over, that the battle is won.

The ever-present need for more knowledge of diseases—their cause, their prevention, their cure—the shortages and maldistribution of physicians and dentists and other key health personnel—the lack of adequate research and treatment facilities—the economic and geographic obstacles to care—all these have been recognized, and, what is far more important, acted upon with programs of substantial and sustained financial support.

We have become a world leader in medical research. We are building not only more hospitals, but hospitals better designed and better equipped. We are steadily enlarging our professional school capacity, and we are even now launching a historic national effort to solve the problem of costs.

We have done much. And yet anyone who looks at our medical status today must add, however reluctantly, we have not done enough. The very vigor, the vitality which has made it possible for us to act so constructively in finding solutions, has created still further problems, and these now cry out to be solved. Our Nation continues to grow, and so, despite all our endeavors, we are still short of men and facilities. We amass knowledge at a rate undreamed of even a generation ago, yet we have not learned how to use our knowledge fully or effectively. We provide fuller access to health services for millions of people who would perforce have gone without a few years ago, yet there are millions more who continue to be denied these same services, for reasons beyond their control, but within our capability. There is the further sobering fact: that many of those who get care do not get enough, and the care they get is not always the best. We have not, indeed, solved the most basic problem of all—the hard and practical problem of delivering services to everyone who needs them.

It is to the credit of the public and the health professions alike that one of the reasons we have never attained that goal is that we have constantly broadened our definition of what is adequate. Our reach continues to exceed our grasp. We no longer are content to measure the adequacy of our supply of health services simply in terms of average needs—serving the majority who can and do seek and find health services without prodding or prompting.

For we are too much aware of those who do not know that they should seek services or where to find them. We are too much aware of those who cannot seek it—not only the poor—but the other ill and unfortunate people who cannot be served within the traditional patterns of care, for they must be helped also. The spastic child in need of dental services—where does he turn? The mentally ill, for whom there are too few services and facilities available—how are they to be helped? The sufferer from chronic illness, who requires long-term and costly rehabilitative services, both physical and psychological services which neither the health professions nor the community planners have geared themselves to provide—who will reach out to him?

These questions are all the more difficult to answer because they are being asked at a time when the Nation is so hard pressed to maintain our existing standards of health services. And yet they are being asked, and with increasing urgency, by the health professions, by public servants, by the general public alike. It goes without saying that answers will be found.

Finding answers means intensifying the Nation's effort to assure sufficient supplies of professional manpower and facilities. It means the acquiring of still further knowledge through research. But more than that, and perhaps even more difficult than that, finding answers means finding ways to put every professional skill that exists and every piece of knowledge we have attained to the fullest and most effective use and with the greatest possible speed. Manpower and facilities are not in themselves enough. Knowledge alone is not enough. But when we have succeeded in making it possible for men to use knowledge in a productive environment for the personal benefit of the patient—then we will have our answers.

Five centuries before the coming of Christ, the ancient philosopher cried out, "The essence of knowledge is, having it, to apply it."

More than 2,000 years later, from the quickening intellectual world of Elizabethan England, Francis Bacon declared, "Knowledge is not * * * a tower of state for a proud mind to raise itself upon; or a sort of commanding ground for strife and contention; or a shop for profit and sale; but a rich storehouse for the glory of God and the relief of man's estate."

The purposeful use of knowledge is the age-old goal of mankind. It is the definition of progress in medicine. It has never been easy to achieve. My own father was a physician. He devoted a lifetime to the pursuit and use of that knowledge which meant health and life to those who turned to him for care. He learned much, but he was ever aware of the pressing need to know more and still more and to use his knowledge more skillfully.

For today's doctors, the need and the difficulties are even greater. To harness the flood of knowledge pouring endlessly from our laboratories and classrooms will be a monumental undertaking, not only for the health professions, but for us all—technicians and technologists, engineers and educators, legislators and architects, planning commissions and public health agencies,

and, yes, the individual himself. For in the end, each of us bears a major responsibility in the protection of our own health.

We must not lag in our pursuit of scientific knowledge. For the great thrust of research has brought us to the threshold of still greater wonders. But at the same time we must give as much emphasis to activities devoted to the discovery of the proper application of knowledge as our basic research gives to acquiring it. The beginnings we have made in understanding the peculiar needs of groups like the aging and the chronically ill must be diligently pursued. How these needs can be met—what is needed in terms of home care programs, what role can be filled by especially designed and centrally located out-patient clinics, what can only be provided in facilities for long-term care and how these should be designed, what can be done to reduce the terrible financial burden long-term care places upon hapless families, what skills and techniques can restore strength to the disabled through medical rehabilitation and how can communities marshal their resources to provide them?

Still further, we cannot stop with understanding of these problems. We must not only hammer knowledge into methods and techniques, but also we must teach our practitioners to use them. And that demands the development of postgraduate and continuing education courses realistically designed so that they can be fitted into the heavy schedule of a busy doctor without exhausting him or depriving his patients.

Undergraduate professional education itself must be constantly assessed and strengthened, so that the doctors we educate will be better doctors when they graduate and better equipped by the education to meet changing needs.

And the schools we are now in the process of building must be better built. Designed to accommodate the curriculum we now know, they must nonetheless be so adaptable that they may further, rather than hinder, the dramatic new educational concepts which our changing times will inevitably make possible and necessary.

The planning of all our health facilities must be equally knowledgeable and far-sighted. The imaginative proposals for regional programs for research and treatment of heart disease, cancer, and stroke are a good example of what can be done in this regard. But even this must serve, not as a fixed pattern for future action, but as an incentive to further exploration and innovation.

Let these—exploration and innovation—be our bywords as we dedicate our efforts to a healthier people. Let no one be content with a pattern because it is traditional, with a procedure because it is hallowed by usage. We are met today, in this great White House Conference on Health, not for self-acclaim, but for self-appraisal and self-renewal.

I look to this Conference, and the American people look to this Conference, with high expectations. Out of your knowledge and experience can come the designs that will shape the better future we envision. I have no doubt but that you will fulfill these hopes, that you will be outspoken in your criticisms, unswerving in your determination to achieve the highest possible levels of health care, and uncompromising in demanding the best that all of us can give to this great and worthy cause.

In his eloquent and compassionate state of the Union message to the Congress on January 3, 1934, one of the greatest Presidents of all time—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—proclaimed that:

"Human welfare has not increased and does not increase through mere materialism and luxury, but * * * it does progress through integrity, unselfishness, responsibility, and justice."

Let these words inspire and challenge all of us here today and in the days to come.

THE WELFARE OF NEEDY CHILDREN OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for some years now, I have been concerned with the welfare of the needy children of our Capital City. I am, of course, concerned with the welfare of needy children in any city.

But it has always seemed wrong to me that the Congress has granted certain opportunities to the families of children elsewhere while denying them to children in Washington—a city which should serve as a model to the Nation and the world for humane government.

This issue has come to revolve around the question of whether the children of the District's needy unemployed parents should be entitled to public assistance—as they are entitled to assistance when they are deprived of support through death, or severe disability, or desertion. The program insuring such support is the unemployed parent segment of Aid to Families with Dependent Children—AFDC–UP. Such programs are optional with the States, and States must put up money to match Federal funds. The Congress, wearing its national legislative hat, has approved AFDC–UP for States across the country, but wearing its local legislative hat, has denied it to the needy children of the District.

President Johnson, in the budget he has proposed for the District of Columbia, has showed his continued concern for the needs of the Capital's children. He has proposed that the current program—adopted last year instead of AFDC–UP—be expanded and improved. Time and money ceilings would be taken off the TAFUP program giving help to families awaiting training in the poverty program's title V Work and Training Opportunity Center—WTOC. The hope here is that the program would then qualify for Federal matching funds under national legislative provisions.

I feel that the President's proposals constitute a step in the right direction. They show considerable promise. What I am concerned with is the welfare of our children, not technical quibbling as to how this welfare can be secured. Our children's suppers must not become political footballs.

I am pleased to tell you today that I am assured by officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that if the proposed budget program meets the asserted requirements—through removal of time and money ceilings—it would qualify for Federal matching funds. I will support it, at least for this coming fiscal year, while the Capital's improved public welfare program gets off to a belated start.

At my request, I have been receiving monthly reports from the District Department of Public Welfare on the public assistance picture here. The latest, giving figures on the winter month of December, is now on my desk. These reports have been most helpful to me, and I greatly appreciate the efforts local officials have made to keep me, my colleagues, and the public in touch with the situation as it progresses.

I feel I must point out some factors in the current Capital public welfare picture—factors highlighted in these reports—which are of interest to citizens here, and throughout the Nation. For the needs of the District's children have gained national attention through Senate debate epitomizing different points of view toward the whole program of public welfare. These needs will be reexamined carefully in the next Congress. At that time, the monumental Public Welfare Amendments of 1962—which I first presented to the Congress as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—are scheduled for reconsideration. Under the law, these amendments—including AFDC–UP—will expire on June 30, 1967. As a member of the Senate Finance Committee which has jurisdiction over this legislation, I intend to examine the program carefully in relation to the needs of the Nation and its poor and to the District of Columbia especially. AFDC–UP, for instance, has been adopted by 19 of our States—including many large urbanized ones. Two others will begin in the near future. But there are still 29 States and four jurisdictions that have not adopted it. Where do unemployed families in these States turn for help?

One of the chief principles behind the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 was prevention—the seemingly apparent fact that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Knowing it would cost less in public funds and human suffering in the long run, we strove to keep families together. The AFDC–UP program sought to enable a father to get public assistance while he was out of a job. Then he would not have to desert them so they could qualify for public support. Here in the Capital City, the Public Welfare Director's latest response to my queries shows that we are reaching our most needy families too late:

Three hundred forty-three household heads are in training in WTOC—the Work Training and Opportunity Center, funded temporarily under title V of the poverty program. Sixty-seven of these heads of households are men. The women are now heads of households; the men have left. The women are carrying the family burden. For the most part, then, we are picking up the pieces in broken families. We are giving some mothers work training, so they can achieve gainful employment. And we are hoping that their children are adequately cared for while she works, under approved child care plans.

To recapitulate, only one out of every five of the household heads in training is a man. Under the circumstances, we must aim to make the women self-supporting, and do it in the best way we can without damage to the children. If this means more attention to day care and other child care programs—such as the Head Start and Summer Adventures for Youth programs of last summer—then we must provide it. We must provide it not only when the mother is in training—but when she is on the job. For she is absent from the home in any

case and she is the supporting parent. And we must face the fact that this may, at least in part, be due to restrictive welfare practices which made leaving his family the only door open to the father of her children.

Now, in asking for the AFDC–UP program last year, District public welfare officials gave us a figure of 1,105 families for an estimated 12-month caseload and 490 families for a 6-month case load. In other words, based on local resources, on unemployment figures, and on the experiences of similar cities, we have assumed that children of about 490 household heads would benefit from AFDC–UP over a 6-month period and that this figure would build up to over 1,100 in 12 months. Welfare Director Brewer's last report to me shows that as of the last day of 1965, 485 household heads were either in training or receiving help while they waited for training—on TAFUP. If the program builds up as it should, and the caseload figure reaches the 1,100 mark, then the program will be moving toward our goals of achieving skills and independence for those denied them before.

But I am still concerned with the fate of those children whose parents applied for training but did not make the grade in the selection process. There were 107 household heads, for instance, disapproved in December. There is still much unmet need in the District of Columbia. Statistics should not be used to mask human suffering. The very success of the crisis assistance and temporary shelter programs here—long overdue and now much used—shows that many children in our Capital are in terrible need. Since these programs started, according to Mr. Brewer's reports to me, 353 families with 1,197 children have been helping during rockbottom crises. And the family emergency service program has provided special child welfare services to 119 families with 478 children. The cold month of December—the last covered by the reports—accounts for the bulk of this caseload. The statistics for January, which saw the blizzard of 1966, will give us more concrete evidence, I think. The heavy snow was a nasty inconvenience for most of us. For the poor, deprived of their marginal construction jobs, or their day's work, flocked to the city's welfare agencies. When my staff, and some of yours too, I assume, got an SOS to bring cans of food for an emergency collection at Friendship House nearby, I asked myself: Is this the Capital of the world's richest Nation? Can we turn our backs on children starving beneath our legislative noses while statistics are interpreted and programs discussed?

Look, for instance, at the persistent drag in handling applications for the basic aid to families with dependent children program—applications for families: 282 new applications were received in the month of December; 609 additional applications were in process at the beginning of the month—a total of 891 applications. But only 283 of the 891 applications were processed and handled during December. In most States, such applications are handled between twice and three times as fast. A child can slowly starve in this long waiting period.

Look, too, at the fact that in the Capital no active cases can be referred from the regular AFDC program to the Work Training Opportunity Center. Nationally, about 63 to 65 percent of the trainees in the title V work training programs come directly from the AFDC programs—they come right off the relief rolls and into training. This means that if they are women—and most AFDC family heads are—they have been considered employable and have worked out satisfactory child care plans. What most people do not realize is that here in the Capital, the work training programs have absolutely no effect on reducing the current relief rolls of our AFDC programs. As Mr. Brewer puts it in his report to me:

> Families receiving AFDC assistance are not employable and are automatically ineligible for the WTOC program. Therefore, no active AFDC cases are referred to the WTOC program.

I have pointed out that one of the chief principles underlying the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 was prevention—to prevent a family from going on relief in the first place. Another was rehabilitation—to give a family opportunity to get off relief—to achieve independence, to make a fresh start. I will never forget the remark of the 23-year-old mother who did get off relief through a rehabilitation project:

> Believe me working is much better—

She said—

> You are independent. As long as I can get a job I will not go back on public assistance. If I got laid off in a slack time at the laundry, I would look for something in another field until things picked up again.

But you cannot take people off relief rolls for rehabilitation when they have already been screened off because they are not eligible for one technical reason or another. When local restrictions so hamper a relief program—even a program with good intentions—it cannot achieve its humane and constructive purposes of prevention and rehabilitation. Where potential employability of an unemployed parent, for instance, rules out the family for financial help to children, there is obviously no current relief roll reduction to be gained from work training opportunities.

Most communities respond to hunger and need and no job by providing assistance in such cases. But our Capital's needy children have slim chance for food, if they happen to be born to a mother who could work at something if that something were available.

Let me reaffirm my position. I am willing to experiment with different methods to bring help to the Capital's needy children—as to all needy children. I consider the program proposed in the President's budget promising and will support it. In the next Congress, we will be taking a good hard look at the public welfare picture and the needs of the poor in the entire Nation. What we must try to do is develop public assistance programs that will meet people's immediate needs and then develop opportunities for them which will channel them toward independence.

Meanwhile, in our Capital, we should continually test proven methods and try new approaches. Here are some of the programs—used elsewhere with success—which I would like to see emphasized in the District during this experimental period:

First. Why not launch an aggressive attempt to locate families with an unemployed father while he remains with his family—and to locate the marginal unemployed father with a big family. These are high-risk groups. With counseling, guidance, employment help, and crisis financial help, we could really prevent dependency. This will not be easy because the unemployed man with a family has shied away from community assistance—after all, he knew it was not there for him. But the District has a huge staff of welfare investigators—many more than New York City or Los Angeles, I believe—and this is a job they could do.

Second. As long as we are dealing primarily with families headed by women, let us make an all-out effort to prepare these women for jobs which are sorely needed and hold some sort of promise for the future. The Work Training and Occupation Center should place heavy emphasis on the current—and future—demand in the health services. In other cities, food handlers, orderlies, nurses' aids, practical nurses, and even a few registered nurses are being trained from public assistance caseloads. Such trainees can be found among applicants who are rejected for our District programs because they have potential employability. We are on a treadmill when we train marginal people for marginal jobs which have no future.

Third. How about some kind of community organization—perhaps connected with the work training center—which can systematically handle inquiries and placements for odd jobs and fix-it types of work. Many men wandered about suburban streets looking for a few dollars worth of snow shoveling jobs during the blizzard. It seems to me that this beleaguered city could have used a central service where they could have applied for jobs. Such a service would benefit the community and the temporarily unemployed—among whom we would probably find many unemployed and deserting household heads. And it would be a center of contact—aggressively to interest and enroll marginal workers into training classes which would eventually lead to more stable and promising employment.

Fourth. Our gracious First Lady has pioneered with her beautification plan for the Capital City. Let us get behind her—help make the Capital more beautiful—and help men achieve independence at the same time. The projects she and her Society for a More Beautiful National Capital have outlined for Washington will need maintenance as well as building. I understand Neighborhood Youth Corps boys helped in such prevocational work last summer.

But such prevocational experience should not be limited to young adults of high school age. Our priority problem is to get male household heads into a training stream which will upgrade their potential work skills. Why not offer paid employment tied into the beautification plans? This is not busy work or made work. It is real work, with a constructive and useful purpose. I am certain that most men would prefer it to relief—it would get them started along work training and employment avenues which can be tested out in an imaginative program in gardening, lawn care, construction work, landscaping work, or carpentry, electrical work, masonry, and roofing. Such a program would combine doing productive work for pay with counseling and direction toward job skill training.

Fifth. Disability—especially when it is suffered by a man who heads a household—often causes family breakdown. Chronic diseases usually associated with old age begin to hit the marginal worker in his forties. Studies show that by the time the man becomes disabled enough for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, he has suffered his chief impairment for about 13.3 years. Under the Federal law there is considerable leeway for the regular AFDC program to pick up these incapacitated parents at a stage where physical rehabilitation and retraining is possible. Let us be sure the Capital is helping this group of fathers in the early stages of disability—when they would be considered employable for off-and-on, part-time work.

In our Nation as a whole we now have about 35 million poor. A quarter of these—the poorest of the poor—are on relief. Now we have about 8.1 million people on public assistance—7.5 million in federally aided programs. But we must remember that our population is increasing—we have more children and people are living longer.

The great bulk of these people on relief are very old, or very young, or blind, or seriously disabled. Almost no one questions the terrible authenticity of their plight.

But the program giving help to children of needy families—aid to families of dependent children—captures the public attention. This program gives badly needed help to children during crises times. The turnover is high—where humanely administered, the program and services help people off relief and into independence.

We will consider this broad problem thoroughly in the next Congress. Meanwhile, let us continue to work together as best we can to achieve a humane and constructive welfare program in the richest nation of the world, and in its Capital.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM: A DENIAL OF FREEDOM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act empowers the States to ban compulsory unionism. Nineteen of them have done so by right-to-work laws which vest in every man the freedom to stand erect on his own two feet and decide for himself with his own God-given faculties whether he will join or refrain from joining a labor union.

Acting upon the demand of certain union labor leaders, the administration is urging Congress to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, and thus nullify these State right-to-work laws. The administration justifies its request for repeal by the single unconvincing argument that such action would make the laws of all 50 States uniform. I respectfully submit that if it shares the administration's view that uniformity of law is desirable in this field, Congress can best secure such uniformity and at the same time manifest its character as the legislature of a free country by enacting a national right-to-work law, which will restore to Americans in the other 31 States the right to carry their own sovereignty under their own hats.

The demand for the repeal of section 14(b) brings to mind the ancient saying in Ecclesiastes: There is no new thing under the sun.

The doctrine prevailed in France at the time French kings possessed virtually absolute power over the lives of their subjects that "the right of working is a royal right which the Prince can sell and the subjects must buy." The demand for repeal of section 14(b) is a call for compulsory unionism, and compulsory unionism is based upon this adaptation of the doctrine prevalent in France in despotic days: The right to work is a labor union right, which the labor union can sell and the individual worker must buy if he is to be allowed to earn a livelihood for himself and his loved ones with his own hands and talents.

During a previous generation, labor unions rightly condemned so-called yellow dog contracts whereby employees were required to agree either to join a union selected by their employer or to abstain from joining any union whatever. To free employees from such coercion and secure for them the freedom of choice now embodied in the right-to-work laws of the 19 States, these yellow dog contracts were wisely outlawed by Federal and State statutes.

The demand of certain union labor leaders for the repeal of section 14(b) is really a demand that another kind of yellow dog contract, that is, the union shop agreement, be given legal sanction throughout the United States.

The union shop agreement is an anomaly in law. Such an agreement is made by an employer operating a shop or industry and a particular union without the participation of the employees whose compensation or terms of employment are concluded by it. By the term "a particular union," I mean the union which is recognized in any way by the National Labor Relations Board as the bargaining agent for such employees.

Under a union shop agreement, every employee, old or new, is forced to become and remain a member, pay dues, and submit to the discipline of the particular union, or else lose his job. It is wholly immaterial whether the particular union is good or bad, or whether the individual employee has sound reasons for not wishing to be affiliated with it.

It is appropriate to note in passing that since the Supreme Court has adjudged the act of Congress barring Communists from union offices to be an unconstitutional bill of attainder, a union shop agreement may compel loyal Americans to become involuntary members of a Communist-controlled union, which is disloyal to them and their country.

An unbiased analysis readily demonstrates that the union shop agreement is repugnant to the freedom of those who labor.

The union shop agreement is a coercive instrument designed to draft into unions as dues-paying members employees who will not voluntarily join them. It operates by economic intimidation. Few men are so situated that they can afford to lose their jobs. This is particularly true of those who have acquired wives and children and thus given hostages to fortune.

Union shop agreements are often detrimental to employees because of the way in which they are negotiated. The employer wishes to obtain an employment contract favorable to him rather than his employees, and the labor union wishes to secure a compulsory unionism agreement which will enable it to avoid the task rightly resting upon it as a voluntary association, that is, the task of procuring its members by voluntary persuasion. They succumb to the temptations stimulated by these wishes and enter into a sweetheart contract in which the union grants to the employer terms of employment advantageous to him and detrimental to the employees in exchange for a compulsory unionism agreement whereby the employer forces all his employees to join the union contrary to the desires of many of them.

By outlawing union shop agreements, right-to-work laws remove the motive of the union to subordinate the interests of the employees to its wish, and thus leave it free to conduct negotiations for the sole purpose of obtaining an employment contract advantageous to the employees.

Note has been taken of the fact that compulsory unionism robs workers of freedom of choice and compels them to join particular unions regardless of whether such unions be good or bad unions.

Those who demand compulsory unionism apparently assume that all unions are good unions. To be sure, most unions merit this description. Unfortunately, however, any assumption that all unions are good is certainly ill-founded.

I had the rather melancholy experience of serving on the Senate select committee headed by an able and courageous Senator, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, which spent more than 2 years investigating activities in the labor-management field. The committee investigated some 20 unions which had acquired the power in one way or another to represent several million supposedly free Americans. The facts showing how this power had been exercised by these unions proved conclusively the truth of Lord Acton's aphorism: Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Despite thousands of fifth amendment pleas by scores of officers and agents of the unions investigated, the McClellan committee took 20,432 pages of testimony, which made it manifest that the unions investigated were unworthy to receive either the voluntary or the coerced support of freemen.

I can summarize with accuracy what the investigation revealed by quoting a statement made by me at the conclusion of the McClellan committee's work. I quote:

The testimony taken by the committee has shocked the conscience of the Nation.

This is true because the testimony has made it crystal clear that some or all of the following things have occurred upon frequent occasions in some of the unions investigated:

First. Union moneys in enormous amounts have been converted to their own use, or that of their cronies, by union officers whose duty it was to safeguard them.

Second. Union officers committing such raids upon union treasuries have destroyed union records to conceal their financial misdeeds from union members, income tax authorities, law enforcement officers, and investigating committees.

Third. Union members have been deprived of any real voice in the election of union officers or the management of union affairs by dictatorial activities of union officers, undemocratic regulations, wanton abuse of the trustee process, and even, on occasion, sheer terrorism.

Fourth. Persons convicted and sentenced to prison for armed robbery, burglary, extortion, and other infamous crimes have been placed in positions of authority over honest and law-abiding union members shortly after their release from prison and before they had brought "forth fruits meet for repentance."

Fifth. Union charters have been granted to known racketeers and their associates who have used them as devices to prey upon the public and helpless workers compelled to earn their bread in the sweat of their brows.

Sixth. Union officers and agents of employers have entered into conspiracies resulting in sweetheart contracts or other arrangements which constitute betrayal of the union members such officers were supposed to represent.

On an occasion 2 years earlier, Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, made some illuminating comments upon the facts revealed by evidence presented to the McClellan committee during the first months of its investigation. Mr. Meany's comments corroborate in substantial part the accuracy of my statement. I quote his comments as set out in an article headlined "Meany Is Shocked by Rackets' Scope," which appeared in the New York Times for November 2, 1957:

When the AFL and the CIO merged nearly 2 years ago, he said, the concern of labor leaders about corruption was written into the constitution. "We thought we knew a few things about trade union corruption," he said, "but we didn't know the half of it, one-tenth of it, or the one-hundredth part of it. We did not know, for instance, that we had unions where a criminal record was almost a prerequisite to holding office under the national union. We didn't know that we had top trade union leaders who made it a practice to secretly borrow the funds of their union. We didn't know that there were top trade union leaders who used the funds for phony real estate deals in which the victims of the fraud were their own members. And we didn't know that there were trade union leaders who charged to the union treasury such items as speed boats, perfume, silk stockings, brassieres, color TV, refrigerators, and everything else under the sun." Mr. Meany asserted that "some of these things are still going on." "Of course," he remarked, "you can't get much cooperation from a national union the officers of which are practicing the same sort of larceny on a national scale as is being practiced by their so-called local representatives on a local scale."

This ends the quotation from the article in the New York Times, whose writer stated that Mr. Meany was commenting on the conduct of leaders of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Some of those who demand compulsory unionism assert, however, that the McClellan committee ended its work in March 1960, and that in consequence the American people ought to presume that the evils revealed by its investigation no longer exist anywhere in the labor movement.

It is not likely that the American people will be so naive as to indulge such a presumption as long as irresponsible labor unions call jurisdictional strikes at Cape Kennedy in contempt of the national security, or James R. Hoffa remains the president of the country's most numerous and powerful union, or the officials of a supposedly respectable union miscount 25,509 of the 133,000 ballots cast in an election for a national president in order to thwart the will of the members and make it appear that the incumbent was reelected by a majority of 2,193, when he was actually defeated by a majority of 23,316.

The vast preponderance of corruption, denial of member rights, and maladministration discovered by the McClellan committee in unions was in unions which depended upon the coercive provisions of union shop agreements to obtain and retain their members. It is not surprising that this was so.

The tragic truth is that union shop agreements are calculated to make union members unable to secure their rights against dictatorial union leaders or to prevent corruption or maladministration by corrupt leaders.

This is so because union shop agreements permit dictatorial control of workers by union leaders. The workers are compelled to become and remain dues-paying union members under penalty of losing their means of livelihood.

As Wallace Turner, who acquired expert knowledge of the subject while working as a reporter for the Portland Oregonian, testified before the McClellan committee, members of unions are reluctant "to get out of line" for fear "that their union cards will be taken up and they will be out of employment."

Sylvester Petro, professor of labor law in the New York University School of Law, and author of the wise commentary on the McClellan investigation entitled "Power Unlimited—The Corruption of Union Leadership," declares that "the 40-odd volumes of the McClellan Record may accurately be summed up as an overwhelming documentation of Mr. Turner's Point." He adds, in substance, that "union officers would not be so highly tempted to abuse members and thugs and racketeers would not find unions so attractive" if members "were free at any time simply to quit paying dues"—page 139.

I share in full measure Professor Petro's views. No amount of sophistry can erase the truth that those who work for their daily bread must have the right to belong or refrain from belonging to a union if they are to be really free.

The recognition of this fundamental freedom does not impair any privilege rightly belonging to labor unions. Each union is left free to number among its dues-paying members all those it can induce by voluntary persuasion to join it. Surely, it is no injustice to require labor unions to obtain their members in the same way in which churches and all other voluntary associations secure theirs.

When all is said, yellow-dog contracts are simply not acceptable in a free country, regardless of whether they are imposed upon workers at the employer's behest or the union's demand. In either case, they rob the workers of a basic freedom—the right to make their own choice in a matter of crucial import to them.

The proposal to repeal section 14(b) raises once again an ever recurring and age-old issue—the issue of tyranny versus freedom.

I make a promise to you and all other Americans who loath tyranny and love liberty. I shall urge Senators to read and ponder a great poem—Rudyard Kipling's "The Old Issue"—before the Senate votes upon the question of repeal.

In "The Old Issue," Kipling tells in eloquent and truthful words how freedom was bought for us by our fathers at great cost long ago, and how it will be lost by us unless we resist the unceasing attempts of government, which he calls the King, to take it from us bit by bit. I quote a few lines from this great poem:

All we have of freedom, all we use or know,
This our fathers bought for us long and long ago.
Ancient Right unnoticed as the breath we draw,
Leave to live by no man's leave, underneath the Law.
Lance and torch and tumult, steel and grey-goose wing,
Wrenched it, inch and ell and all, slowly from the King.
So they bought us freedom, not at little cost,
Wherefore must we watch the King, lest our gain be lost.

I close with this observation: Right-to-work laws enforce, and union shop agreements nullify, the ancient right which Kipling calls "leave to live by no man's leave." One does not have leave to live by no man's leave if he is compelled to pay a labor union for leave to earn his livelihood.

SURPLUS NO LONGER THE KEY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that in the new food-for-freedom legislation, the administration proposed to depart from the surplus concept in food aid.

In my judgment, the time has passed when we can afford to operate this fine program on the basis of a surplus disposal. It is true that we had heavy agricultural surpluses on hand when the original food-for-peace legislation was passed nearly 12 years ago, but they are now greatly reduced. World conditions have changed. What is needed now is not a surplus disposal program for the United States, but a positive food program for our friends around the world that makes sense in terms of meeting human needs and stimulating economic development. The President's food-for-freedom program meets that requirement.

The surplus disposal concept has made the program difficult to administer. In some instances it has led to unbalanced food programs, with heavy emphasis on grain and too little emphasis on other useful products. It has brought accusations from others that we dump our surpluses. It has not sufficiently prompted recipient countries to build their own economies.

The time is ripe for this basic change. President Johnson and all who participated in formulating these new proposals are to be commended. I am confident that the Congress will endorse this change of emphasis.

NEW AIRCRAFT FOR U.S. AIRLINES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in this Monday's New York Times, there was an article describing the new aircraft that the U.S. airlines plan to put in service in 1966. The article is based upon an Air Transport Association report which indicates that these aircraft are valued at $1.4 billion.

The deliveries in 1966, of course, are just a part of an overall airline reequipment program that totals $3.8 billion. The program began in 1965 and will continue through 1969. As of the end of 1965, the airlines had 574 new aircraft on order for deliveries between now and 1969.

Airline orders of this magnitude have enormous significance for the aircraft manufacturing industry, as well as the entire economy of the Nation. I know that the economy of the State of Washington will benefit enormously from the 350 Boeing jet transports that will be delivered to the airlines in the next several years.

Airline orders mean jobs and I was very pleased to note a recent statement from the Boeing Co. which pointed out that the orders for commercial jets have created 15,000 new jobs for that one manufacturing company alone.

The airlines are to be commended for their vase reequipment program. It has a great meaning for the economy of the Nation as well as the millions of passengers and shippers who will be taking advantage of this new shipment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to reprint the full text of the Air Transport Association of America's statement which describes the new equipment on order; also several news articles on the same subject.

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

U.S. AIRLINES TO ADD 282 NEW JET AIRCRAFT DURING 1966

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The U.S. scheduled airlines expect to place 282 new turbine-powered aircraft in service during 1966, the Air Transport Association of America said today. The new aircraft are valued at $1.4 billion.

The 282 airplanes to be delivered in 1966 are the largest number ever added to the airline fleets in any one year. The $1.4 billion cost of the aircraft also represents a new high.

"The additional capacity will be needed to provide for and properly anticipate the Nation's growing demand for air transportation," Stuart G. Tipton, president of ATA said. "For the domestic trunks, this means an estimated 14 to 17 percent increase in available seat miles in 1966, depending on the rate of retirement of older equipment and assuming no material changes in seating configurations.

"It's interesting to note that during 1965, the airlines disposed of well over 100 obsolete piston aircraft. Some 80 percent of all airline revenue passenger miles are now accounted for by pure jet aircraft and that figure will continue to increase during 1966 as airlines dispose of still more piston aircraft and replace them with new jets," Tipton said.

This year's deliveries are part of a 5-year program—1965–69—designed to reequip the Nation's airlines with new pure jet and turboprop aircraft. The total airline commitment for the purchase of the aircraft in this period is now $3.8 billion. One hundred sixty-one airplanes valued at an estimated $880 million were delivered in 1965.

An ATA survey of airline equipment in service and on order as of December 31, 1965, showed that the airlines now have a total of 574 new jets and turboprops on order for delivery in 1966 through 1969. The cost of the new aircraft will be $2.9 billion.

Tipton noted that 396 of the new jets on order are designed for short and medium hauls. "Service to the many smaller cities in the United States is in the process of being improved with the new jets and the response from passengers so far indicates that they are providing a significant stimulus to air travel," he said.

As of yearend 1965, the survey showed, the airline fleet totaled 1,925 aircraft of all types. The fleet was broken down into 704 pure jets, 299 turboprops, 898 piston aircraft, 14 turbine-powered helicopters and 10 piston helicopters.

(Attached is the ATA survey of flight equipment in service and on order as of December 31, 1965, and a delivery schedule for the new aircraft.)

Aircraft in service and on order by U.S. scheduled airline industry (Dec. 31, 1965)

Type and manufacturer	Model	In service	On order
Fixed wing:			
Jet:			
Boeing	B-707	187	103
	B-720	115	8
	B-727	163	[1] 173
	B-737		60
British Aircraft Corp	BAC-111	21	32
Convair	CV-880	47	
	CV-990	18	
Douglas	DC-8	129	31
	DC-9	4	131
Sud Aviation	Caravelle	20	
Total		704	538
Turboprop:			
Canadair	CL-44	23	
Convair	600	8	(2)
	580	20	(2)
Fairchild	F-27	62	3
Hiller	FH-227		24
Lockheed	Electra	117	
	L-382B		2
Nord Aviation	262	6	6
Pilatus	P-6A	4	
Vickers	Viscount 700	48	
	Viscount 800	11	
Total		299	35
Piston:			
Convair	240	53	
	340	50	
	440	95	
Fixed Wing—Continued			
Piston—Continued			
Douglas	DC-3	141	
	DC-4	2	
	DC-6	185	
	DC-7	84	
Lockheed	Constellation	35	
	Super Constellation.	68	
Martin	202	8	
	404	76	
Others		101	
Total		898	
Total fixed wing		1,901	573
Helicopters:			
Turbine:			
Boeing Vertol	107	10	
Sikorsky	S-61	4	1
Total		14	1
Piston:			
Bell	47-G	3	
Sikorsky	S-51	1	
	S-55	2	
	S-58C	4	
Total		10	
Total helicopter		24	1
Total scheduled industry		1,925	574

[1] Includes 51 leased aircraft.
[2] 44 conversions of piston aircraft to turboprop.
[3] 22 conversions of piston aircraft to turboprop.

Delivery schedule—New aircraft on order by U.S. scheduled airline industry (Dec. 31, 1965)

Manufacturer	Model	Total aircraft on order	Aircraft on order for expected delivery in—			
			1966	1967	1968	1969
Boeing	B-707	103	49	47	4	3
	B-720	8	8			
	B-727	173	88	60	16	9
	B-737	60		3	49	8
British Aircraft Corp	BAC-111	32	32			
Douglas	DC-8	31	14	12	5	
	DC-9	131	55	71	5	
Fairchild-Hiller	F-27	3	3			
	FH-227	24	24			
Lockheed	L-382B	2	2			
Nord Aviation	262	6	6			
Sikorsky	S-61	1	1			
Total, all aircraft		574	282	193	79	20

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1966]

TRANSPORT NEWS AND NOTES: 282 TURBINE-POWERED PLANES TO BE ADDED—PACIFIC CARGO RATE CUT SCHEDULED

Scheduled airlines in this country expect to place 282 new turbine-powered aircraft in service this year, the Air Transport Association of America reported yesterday. The new planes are valued at $1.4 billion.

A survey of airline equipment showed that 96 of the new jets on order are designed for short and medium hauls.

Stuart G. Tipton, president of the association, said: "Service to many small cities in the United States is in the process so far indicates that they are of being improved with jets, and the response from passengers so far indicates that they are providing a significant stimulus to air travel."

The survey showed the airline fleet totaled 1,925 aircraft of all types at the end of 1965. There were 704 pure jets, 299 turboprops, 898 piston aircraft, 14 turbine-powered helicopters, and 10 piston helicopters.

PACIFIC RATE REDUCTION

Lower trans-Pacific cargo rates on a wide variety of commodities have been agreed on by member airlines of the International Air Transport Association for introduction on March 1.

The lower rates are subject to the approval of the interested governments and follow reductions in cargo rates on the North Atlantic that were put into effect in September and on January 1.

Like the transatlantic rates, the new Pacific tariffs are intended mainly to encourage quantity shipments and eliminate directional load imbalances.

Under the new rates, for example, electronic data-processing equipment in shipments of more than 11,000 pounds would be shipped between San Francisco and Tokyo at 65 cents a pound. This is for westbound shipment only, and compares with the general rate of $1 a pound.

Radios, television, household electrical appliances, optical goods and photographic projection equipment from Tokyo to San Francisco would be shipped at 68 cents a pound, compared with the current cost of 75 cents a pound for minimum shipments of 440 pounds. On shipments of a minimum of 1,100 pounds the proposed rate would be 62 cents a pound.

Similar rate cuts would apply in other traffic sectors.

ZIM REPLACING VESSELS

Zim Lines has assigned two 18-knot freighters to its cargo service between New York and Mediterranean ports, according to A. Manor, executive vice president of American-Israeli Shipping Co., Inc., representing the line.

The motorships *Yafo* and *Hadar*, built in 1964 and 1965, respectively, will replace the combination passenger-cargo liners *Israel* and *Zion*, which are being withdrawn from transatlantic service. The *Yafo* is scheduled to sail from Haifa on February 11 and from New York on March 4. The *Israel* will make her last sailing from New York March 25.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 31, 1966]

MORE JETS FOR AIRLINES

The Nation's airlines are expected to put a record 282 pure jets and turboprops in service this year, according to the Air Transport Association of America. The cost will also be a record $1.4 billion. The expanded fleet will increase the industry's available seat miles by 14 to 17 percent depending on the rate of retirement of old equipment, the ATA said. Last year the airlines retired more than 100 piston aircraft. About 80 percent of all airline revenue passenger miles are now realized from pure jets. The airlines have a total of 574 new jets and turboprops on order for delivery in 1966 through 1969 at a cost of $2.9 billion.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Feb. 1, 1966]

PLANES

The U.S. scheduled airlines expect to place 282 new turbine-powered aircraft in service during 1966, the Air Transport Association of America said. The new aircraft are valued at $1.4 billion.

The 282 airplanes to be delivered in 1966 is the largest number ever added to the airline fleets in any 1 year. The $1.4 billion cost of the aircraft also represents a new high.

The additional capacity will be needed to provide for and properly anticipate the Nation's growing demand for air transportation, Stuart G. Tipton, president of ATA said. "For the domestic trunks this means an estimated 14- to 17-percent increase in available seat miles in 1966, depending on the rate of retirement of older equipment and assuming no material changes in seating configurations," he said.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE JOPLIN (MO.) ROTARY CLUB

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, 50 years ago this week a small group of men held the first meeting of the Joplin, Mo., Rotary Club. I am pleased to report to the Senate that after five decades of outstanding community service, the Joplin Rotary Club is today stronger and more active than ever.

This week in Joplin is Rotary Week and tonight around 600 people—including community leaders from Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas—will be on hand for the historic golden anniversary banquet.

As a past director of Rotary International, and I know I speak for the many Senators who are also members of Rotary, I am deeply proud to congratulate the Rotarians of Joplin for a half century of contributing to the dynamic growth of southwest Missouri.

Rotary in Joplin has spelled progress in every area of civic, economic, and social development. The history of the Joplin Rotary Club is a fine record of dedication and community service.

In 1917 the newly-organized Joplin Rotarians raised enough money to finance a new YMCA building. During World War I and World War II members of the club were hard at work in a variety of homefront tasks so vital to the success of the war effort.

The club has done a great job with crippled and underprivileged children. Through the club's work these youngsters have been provided the spark of hope that every American boy and girl deserves.

Mr. President, one of Missouri's leading newspapers, the Joplin Globe, carried a moving account of the first 50 years of the Joplin Rotary Club. I ask unanimous consent that this fine article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FIFTY-YEAR HISTORY: JOPLIN ROTARY CLUB EXPANDS GOALS AND WORK WITH GROWTH

The Joplin Rotary Club, celebrating its 50th anniversary this week, had its origin in 1915, 10 years after the first Rotary Club had been organized in Chicago.

A basis for the Joplin organization was provided by a group of local business and professional men meeting as the Noonday Luncheon Club. On October 15, 1915, 10 Joplin men met with a Kansas City Rotarian, Frank Kelly, to begin steps toward forming a local Rotary organization.

The group was comprised of a newspaper manager, candy manufacturer, milling company manager, music store owner, operators of an engineering firm, a baking company, a wholesale grocery company, a cigar manufacturing company and an adding machine company and an auditor.

The club was chartered in 1916 and held its first meeting as a Rotary Club February 12, with 12 members attending. Since it was necessary for the group's bylaws to be revised before approval, the club became a unit of Rotary International September 4, 1916.

Since then, the club has grown until its current membership includes 157 persons, comprised of business, professional and civic leaders of the community.

Twenty wives of Rotary members united in 1919 to form Women of Rotary, an organization which has thrived and taken on numerous goals of its own.

The Joplin club is now one of 12,238 Rotary units with 583,750 members in 131 countries and geographical regions. Records of Rotary International indicate that 132 new clubs have been formed since July 1965.

The Joplin club is a unit of district 611, which consists of 69 clubs in Arkansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Kansas. Joplin was host to its first district conference in 1920, when some 2,000 Rotarians convened in the then newly constructed Interstate Grocers Alliance Building, with President William Landreth presiding. Since then, Joplin has been the site of district conventions in 1932, 1938, 1949, 1953, 1957, and 1961.

As reorganizations took place, Joplin Rotary Club has been included in district 11 (1915–19), district 17 (1918–22), district 15 (1922–37), district 136 (1937–49), district 198 (1949–57), and district 611 (1957 to present).

As the Rotary Club grew in membership and complexities of the 20th century increased, the organization experienced a broadening of purposes and functions.

The first primary objective of the club, adopted December 4, 1916, was financing of a new YMCA building. The club launched a 7-day campaign, and on March 31, 1917, committees reported that the goal of $250,000 had been oversubscribed by $5,000. The present YMCA building was erected at 5th Street and Wall Avenue.

The custom of having a "ladies' party," with a gift exchange and a dinner dance, has been held regularly since December 14, 1916. Also in 1916, the club undertook another charitable activity by donating $100 worth of shoes to needy persons.

In 1917, the club set objectives of encouraging patriotism and encouraging sports on the community level. On April 12 of that year, the club gave escutcheons of the flag to each public school and has continued to donate patriotic emblems and flags to the city. The club demonstrated its support of athletic activities by staging a parade before the first Western League baseball game here April 20, 1917.

The Rotary Club was instrumental in efforts to obtain a concrete-paved highway into the Kansas and Oklahoma mining fields. Led by a committee headed by J. M. Evans, the club raised $100,000 in the Joplin district, which was matched by State and Federal funds. With that beginning and additional contributions, West 7th Street road and its extension to Baxter Springs were constructed.

When the United States entered World War I, the club determined to aid the Government's pleas for internal support. On May 24, 1917, the club pledged to support the first liberty loan drive and voted to suspend dues and hold classifications open for all members in military service.

Other events of 1917 included establishment of the Carthage Rotary Club, which was instituted by the Joplin Rotary Club, and opening of the first "Rotary Inn." The Rotary Inn was located at Sagmount 2 months as summer quarters.

Wartime activities of the club included donation of phonograph and records to Company G, Missouri National Guard; support of the second liberty loan drive; leading the campaign for war funds by the YMCA, YWCA, and Red Cross; sponsoring a football game between Camp Doniphan, Mo.; serving in the thrift stamp campaign; erecting a flagpole as a community patriotism shrine; staging a patriotic parade on the first anniversary of the Nation's entry into the war; subscribing $99,300 on Rotary Day during the third liberty loan drive; holding an "old tier day" for benefit of the Red Cross, and leading in united war work fund efforts for which $148,000 was obtained in the fall of 1918.

On February 24, 1918, the Joplin club attended in a body worship services at the First Presbyterian Church, originating Rowdy Sunday. In order to promote cordial intercity relations, a flying squadron was organized that year.

The Joplin club was instrumental in formation of the chamber of commerce on June 20, 1918.

A group of members donated a room to Freeman Hospital in memory of Rotarian Robert M. McGuire, who died after an operation intended to fit him for military service.

As a hospitable gesture, the local group invited Carthage and Miami Rotarians to attend an intercity meeting September 13, 1918, which was followed by a series of meetings. Other practices for which the club has gained recognition include holding meetings at industrial plants and conducting model luncheons. The first such luncheon was held by Joplin, at a district conference in Oklahoma City in 1919.

Other projects of 1919, included appropriation of $3,000 for public health services in the county, in a drive launched by the public service committee; presenting a charter to the Springfield club; arranging picnics for inmates at the Joplin Children's Home; entertaining soldiers of the 35th Division returning from the war; participating in publicizing of zinc ore mined in the district; and opposing subversive elements in labor unions.

The Joplin Rotary Club helped lay the groundwork for the Ozarks Playgrounds Association, arranging a good-will trip into Arkansas in 1919.

On Armistice Day in 1919, Rotarians planted memorial trees in Schifferdecker Park, one for each Joplin veteran who had lost his life.

Among its many activities in early days, the Joplin club contributed to formation of an American Legion band, raised $6,500 for local road construction, assisted in a recount of the Federal Census in 1920, sponsored park improvements, and joined the movement which led to far-reaching improvements in the school system.

Throughout their history, Joplin Rotarians have given support to community improvements through support of bond elections. On April 20, 1922, a public celebration was staged "welcoming the return of prosperity" to arouse optimism among citizens of the community.

In the early 1920's the club helped in financing the Schifferdecker Municipal Golf Course and in raising a $125,000 fund for Freeman Hospital.

In 1939–40 President John W. Garrett inaugurated the sons' and daughters' Christmas party for children of Rotarians and the Jasper County Rotary meeting for Joplin, Webb City, and Carthage Clubs. Both of the events have been observed annually since that time.

With the advent of World War II, the Joplin Rotary Club again gave its full support to the war effort. Sixteen active members served with the Armed Forces, and all members joined the war enterprises at home. Members took leading parts in war bond drives, war chest campaigns, and USO and Red Cross activities. They donated to blood banks and served as hosts to soldiers at Camp Crowder and Camp Clark.

In the postwar years, the organization resumed its civic projects full scale and continued to take on new ventures. One practice which was begun in the late 1940's was the plan of bringing Rotary International Institute speakers here each year. Speakers are sent out by the international organization, but at the expense of the local clubs.

Funds of the club to finance district conferences and activities were doubled when, in 1950–51, the district conference assessment was increased from $1 to $2 per member.

The Harry Pate Memorial Award was established in the late 1940's and early 1950's under Presidents William R. Thurston and Frederick G. Hughes. The awards are gold-lettered footballs presented annually to lettermen of the Joplin High School and Missouri Southern College (at that time Joplin Junior College) football teams.

The Joplin Rotary Club has expanded its goals by providing community service through direct donations in many instances. The club has been principal organizer or has participated to a large extent in numerous charitable and youth projects.

In 1924, the club endorsed expansion of trade school activities at the high school, and several members took an active part.

Individual members had been helping crippled children for some time when, in 1929, the club formed a crippled children's committee. Later that year the Jasper County Crippled Children's Committee was created, with members of the Rotary Club in charge and taking care of most of the expenses.

The club still maintains a custom of furnishing lunches to the crippled children's class at North Junior High School, a project which was begun in the 1951–52 year.

A dental clinic was installed by the Joplin Rotary Club in 1929, free to all needy schoolchildren. The following year, other clubs began contributing to the clinic's upkeep, and that fall the city administration assumed full responsibility. The establishment of the clinic is credited largely to the efforts of the late Dr. John A. Cotton.

After the dental clinic, the Rotary also participated in establishing a sight clinic and has assisted in supplying eyeglasses to needy schoolchildren.

At other times, the club has assisted needy schoolchildren by purchasing books, clothing, and other essentials.

In 1946–47, when S. Warren Coglizer was president, the club inaugurated an annual camp for "less chance" boys. The first year, 62 boys attended the camp at the Boy Scout camp. Each was sponsored and financed by an individual club member.

During the 1956–57 year President Philip Emrich started the junior achievement program, which has been continued. The club also helped in organizing Joplin Boys' Club.

The club also has contributed to aid for retarded children, the Boy Scout camp at Childress Farm and the American Field Service program.

The Joplin Rotary Club has been one of many civic organizations to participate in the American Legion's Boys' State program sending qualified sons of Rotarians to the 3-day conference on practical government.

Rotary funds are available as loans for college and nursing school students. The Rotary International Foundation Fund annually finances a foreign exchange program at the graduate level for some 240 promising students.

The Joplin club, formed early in the century, has played an active role in the ever-expanding Rotary movement. Clubs Joplin has assisted in organizing include those at Springfield, Lamar, Webb City, Butler, Rolla, Lebanon, and Neosho in Missouri and Pittsburg, Kans., and Eureka Springs, Ark.

UTAH AS THE 1972 OLYMPICS SITE

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I have asked Senator Moss to add my name as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, which would express congressional approval of the U.S. Olympic Committee's decision to recommend Utah as the site of the 1972 Winter Olympic Games.

I am glad to join as a cosponsor of this resolution. As a New Yorker I was disappointed that Lake Placid was not

chosen, not just because Lake Placid is in New York, but because the people from Lake Placid made an excellent presentation to the USOC. I hope Lake Placid will make another effort in 1976. Now, however, we must all unite to work on Utah's behalf for 1972. I hope, therefore, that the resolution gains wide cosponsorship and quick passage, because that kind of support may help Utah's case when the International Olympic Committee makes its final decision in April of this year. Utah has excellent winter sports facilities, both natural and man-made, and has transportation and hotel-motel facilities which are both ample and conveniently available.

I know that we will be proud as a nation if Utah is selected as the 1972 winter site, and I know that we will be even prouder after a winter Olympics held in Utah proves to have been a great success. That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71.

NEW HAMPSHIRE'S GOVERNOR SPEAKS OUT ON FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, last Monday, I sponsored a conference between municipal officials and Federal officials to discuss the various Federal programs providing financial and other assistance to local governments.

Some 165 New Hampshire mayors, selectmen, town and city managers, and other local officials met in Concord, N.H., to discuss such programs as the water and sewer grants programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce and Agriculture, urban renewal programs, community action programs, and many others.

One of the highlights of the day's activities was a speech by New Hampshire's outstanding Governor, John W. King.

Governor King's address is an enlightened commentary on Federal assistance to States and local communities. I believe that it should be read by every Member of Congress who is interested in the subject of Federal grants-in-aid.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the speech by Gov. John W. King, of New Hampshire, delivered at a Conference on Federal Cooperation with Local Government, printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH BY GOV. JOHN W. KING, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, AT CONFERENCE ON FEDERAL COOPERATION WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FEBRUARY 7, 1966

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I should like to welcome all of you today, and thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to attend the conference. It is very gratifying that so many of you have come to learn more about how these programs can help the people of your communities.

There used to be a prevailing opinion in New Hampshire that we wanted no part of Federal grants-in-aid. We were proud of Yankee independence and felt secure in the conviction that we would take care of ourselves. This opinion still exists in some quarters. I have been criticized at times for advocating the greater use of Federal programs. A few of our communities have recently taken a strange pride in refusing Federal aid to education.

But there is increasing evidence that this is strictly a minority view in New Hampshire now. This is partly a result of the problems of growth which have affected New Hampshire as much as the larger centers of population in this country. Increasing urbanization has affected small towns as well as large cities. You have all wrestled with the problems created by the increasing need for public facilities. Much of the attention of any local official is consumed by the struggle between the tax rate and the pressure for more schools, better police and fire protection, new sewage treatment facilities, improved housing, and the other demands created by growth and change.

It has become obvious to most of us that we simply do not have the resources to solve all these problems by ourselves. As a result, Federal programs involving grants, loans, and technical assistance have been established by the Congress from time to time. There is no question that the Federal Government will play an increasingly important role in local affairs.

While it is fashionable in some quarters to view this development as an evil trend, I cannot bring myself to look upon the Federal Government as a fire-breathing monster pounding at our gates. If Uncle Sam is deeply involved in State and local government, it is because State and local government have been unable to solve their problems acting by themselves.

This is not to say that the Federal Government is perfect, or that it has a monopoly on good ideas. I have been as ready as anyone to criticize a Federal program when I believed it was poorly conceived or poorly administered. We should not blindly accept a grant-in-aid simply because they are available.

As government officials, it is our obligation, and an obligation which we are fulfilling today, to study each Federal program carefully. We must ask ourselves if it fulfills a genuine need which we cannot meet ourselves. We must find out if it will create an obligation for support on the part of our State or community which would place an undue burden on the taxpayers in comparison to the benefits they would receive.

While we have this obligation to be critical and to examine carefully the consequences of our actions, it should not be carried out in a negative frame of mind.

In the last analysis, the reason for the increasing Federal role in State and local affairs is a simple fact of life. Only the Federal Government has the means and the machinery to collect the revenue necessary to meet the needs of the people of this country.

The revenues of the Federal Government are increasing at the rate of $6 billion a year. State and local revenues are growing at a much slower rate. Yet the demand for the services provided by State and local governments is rising most rapidly at this time. The result is obvious.

To quote from a recent issue of the Kiplinger letter which discussed this trend, "Much of the Federal spending will be via State and local governments, to help them with social programs that they can't handle themselves, with money and advice.

"By 1970, State and local governments will get about $20 billion a year from the Federal kitty, double last year's total. This year, it was $12 billion.

"Many people see a threat in all this. The danger of the Federal Government taking over too much, getting its hands too far into States and cities. They want the lower governments to resist, refuse to take any Federal money less they lose their self-reliance. But bear in mind three things: (1) The money is going to be spent. If not spent in one place, it will go to another. Refusing it won't reduce the overall outlays; (2) States and cities must put up some of their own money, too, if they want Federal funds. This gives them a stake in watching the use; (3) Federal Government wants local decisionmaking on money handling."

I think that this is a very clear statement of the case. It is a generally accepted fact that the larger units of government can collect revenue more easily, but the smaller units of government can spend it more wisely. The Federal Government, in its tax collecting power, derives benefit from the economy of size. However, local governments, because they are closer to the people, know more about what the needs are and can meet them more effectively.

Personally, I favor some form of the so-called Heller plan whereby a certain portion of the Federal Government's revenue would be turned over to the States as a part of their general revenue. I am convinced that the situation which I have just described will lead to the enactment of such a plan in the future. By making available more funds without strings or conditions attached, it would allow the States to meet the demand for those services which are rising at the most rapid rate in each individual case.

Regardless of the exact form it takes, we can be sure that cooperation between Federal, State, and local governments will increase. Conferences like this one will help make that cooperation more effective. I should like to compliment Senator TOM McINTYRE for sponsoring this conference, to thank the Federal officials who have come here to speak to us today, and to express my appreciation to all of you who have come to learn more about these programs. The knowledge you gain here can be a most effective tool in meeting the problems which face you back home.

TRIBUTE TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the boards of commissioners of Drainage Districts Nos. 16 and 17 of Mississippi County, Ark., have adopted a resolution expressing appreciation for service rendered by the officers and employees of the Corps of Engineers district office in Memphis, Tenn. I share the appreciation and gratitude expressed in this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

For more than 40 years, the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, has cooperated with Drainage Districts Nos. 16 and 17, of Mississippi County, Ark., in protecting the fertile lands in this great delta region from the threats of inundating floodwaters of the Mississippi, St. Francis, and Little Rivers. Prior to construction of new levees, the corps worked with the two districts and advised with their engineers and employees. Almost 30 years have now passed since the corps assisted the two districts in constructing a modern and formidable levee system on either side of Little River and Big Lake in Mississippi County. Since that time, the corps has assisted, cooperated and advised with the two districts in related drainage and flood control problems. During all of these years, the association with district engineers in Memphis office; with other military personnel and

with civilian personnel, has been most pleasant, and has been most beneficial to the welfare of all land owners in Mississippi County, Ark.

These two districts are looking forward to many more years of continued pleasant and mutually agreeable and beneficial association between the districts on the one hand and the Corps of Engineers on the other hand. These districts feel that no other Government agency is qualified to do as good a job and accomplish the same results at the same cost as can be done under the guidance, control and direction of the corps. Past history supports these views.

In particular, the Memphis district has been most fortunate in having as district directors the most outstanding officers in the U.S. Army. All of these officers have been qualified, courteous, cooperative, ready and willing to advise and assist at all times and most competent: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of Drainage Districts Nos. 16 and 17 of Mississippi County, Ark., That the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, and particularly the Memphis office, be and it is hereby commended for the many contributions that its personnel, military and civilian, have made to the welfare of Mississippi County, Ark.

The secretaries of these two districts shall deliver in person or shall mail copies of this resolution to the district engineer, Memphis office, to the engineer in charge, Vicksburg office, and to the commanding general, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.

Adopted January 31, 1966.

CHAS. ROSE,
President, Board of Commissioners, Drainage District No. 17.

EARL H. WILDY,
Chairman, Board of Commissioners Drainage District No. 16.

GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY—PARTNERS IN OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Rear Adm. O. D. Waters, Jr., oceanographer of the Navy, on January 27, addressed the Ocean Science and Technology Advisory Committee and the Oceanography Subcommittee of the Antisubmarine Warfare Committee of the National Security Industrial Association

The two NSIA oceangraphy groups, as many of us know, held an important 2-day joint conference here in Washington, attended by executives and marine experts of scores of industries throughout the country.

Admiral Waters' informative address at the closing luncheon of the joint conference, emphasized the role of industry in the full exploitation of our ocean resources, and in the application of our broadening scientific knowledge of the marine environment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Waters' address at the ASWAC-OSTAC luncheon be printed in the RECORD.

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

GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY—PARTNERS IN OCEANOGRAPHY

As you can imagine, I attend quite a few meetings, on a wide variety of subjects, with lots of different people. There are none that I find more enjoyable and profitable than those of the NSIA and its committees. This current one is no exception.

The reason for this is that industry representatives always bring fresh viewpoints and new approaches. This is to be expected, since you represent different companies, many of which are engaged in healthy competition. Any firm that ever slows down in its production of new and salable ideas would soon be out of business. Associating with industry helps to remind Navy men that we must also be competitive, whether we are dealing with new weapon system concepts, or the oceanography needed to support them.

We are most happy to have you as a member of the Navy team, helping to solve our problems in antisubmarine warfare and oceanography. As you know, industrial concerns have always been a key part of our Navy effort in oceanography. As one example, industry can take credit for much of the development work in our marine instrumentation program. Over half of the work sponsored by our instrument center has been done under contract by private firms.

A recent large project of which we are rather proud was the integrated shipboard survey system, installed on board our new ship, the U.S.N.S. *Silas Bent*. The *Bent* and the survey system are at present shaking down concurrently, since they are designed to operate as a unit. Thanks to the good work of industry in building both the ship and the instrumentation, we are confident that *Bent* will mark a real turning point in ocean surveying.

As another example of our confidence in our business community, last summer we let two multi-million-dollar survey contracts to private industry. These surveys are designed to explore vast tracts of the world oceans. They are gathering a wide variety of oceanographic and geophysical data, which will give us answers to many of our operational problems. Here too we have confidence that industry, with a minimum of supervision, can function effectively as a team member.

We in Navy oceanography are quite proud of this team. It was by no means accidental, but carefully designed. In addition to industry, it includes the support of good science at our private institutions and universities. Over the years, the Office of Naval Research has led the Nation in backing this type of endeavor. As a result, the foundations for long-range progress in the ocean sciences are laid.

A key concept, however, of basic research is that it must be untrammeled and even free to make mistakes and go up blind alleys from time to time, for only in this way can we determine which of our theories are valid and which are not. The Navy therefore decided to conduct much of its study on specific military problems, where the end product desired is accurately known, through the second member of the team—our in-house laboratories. Over the years the material bureaus, Ships, Weapons, and Yards and Docks, have built up a formidable capability. Their specialized laboratories are second to none in the world. In collaboration with the survey and research capability of the Oceanographic Office, they provide the means for sharply focused developmental work on specific military problems.

This team of industry, institutions, and in-house laboratories, using the unique talents of each contributor, has made the Navy a key member in the national oceanographic program. It has made us a leader not only in the dollar size of the program, but in the value and utility of what we do.

Since taking over this job as oceanographer of the Navy, I have, of course, studied up on the history of Navy oceanography. It seems to me that there is a definite pattern which events are following, not only in the Navy but in oceanography in general.

In the late forties and early fifties, most of our Navy effort in oceanography was going into fundamental research. We really knew relatively little about the ocean. This research was designed to solve a few general problems, using data which was on hand or which could be readily obtained.

In the fifties, we began the second phase, the massive collection of data. Comprehensive information on the oceans was needed not only as the groundwork for further broad-scale basic studies, but for future applications and exploitation.

At about the same time, there began a shift in emphasis, trending away from pure research and toward developmental work and applied research. In the Navy, this was a period of growth for our in-house laboratories which specialized in this type of work.

Now we are just entering a new phase, that of full exploitation and application. Our surveys continue to increase, since the conversion of science to useful ends will require vast amounts of detailed information.

It is significant that last year, for the first time, the national oceanographic program included a section on engineering. This year it will increase, as we move toward an unlimited variety of applications in every field. The National Academy of Engineering, shortly after its establishment last year, set up a Committee on Ocean Engineering.

The real opportunities for industry in the oceans are just beginning, and the companies who have gained experience through their association with the NSIA will certainly be in an advantageous position in the future.

But no matter how good the teamwork, no matter how well planned the cycle of evolution, nothing will come of it unless you have something worthwhile to sell. We in Navy oceanography feel that we have a good and useful product.

When you consider the Polaris submarine, it is obvious that you need to know quite a lot about the ocean in which these boats will be submerged for months on end.

Many of you here today remember the amphibious landings of World War II, and the troubles we had then. It's easy to sell an oceanographic program which tells you about the beaches, currents and waves, which control amphibious operations.

Destroyer skippers, faced with sonars which don't always detect and weapons systems which don't hit the target regularly, want to hear from the oceanographers who can offer valid explanation and solutions.

We have found it particularly important in Navy oceanography to talk to the customers. It's no use giving a destroyer skipper (or a tuna-boat skipper, for that matter) a complex scientific paper. He isn't interested in reports on research projects. We must have a problem-solving science, speaking in Navy language, and addressing Navy operational problems.

That is why you gentlemen from industry are here today—to find out from the Navy and our coworkers in the Government, what we're doing and what our problems are.

Some of you will be looking at very specialized problems, those of ASW. But in many respects, the fundamental questions being asked about ASW oceanography are applicable in principle to the utilization of any oceanographic data.

What factors do you need to know?

What accuracy do you need?

What distribution of data in time and space?

What capability for forecasting into the future?

How do you present this information in meaningful and useful forms?

I won't even attempt to answer these questions, since we have here at these meetings probably the best assortment of talent in the country to work on them. I would just like to reemphasize that if we can answer them successfully, Navy oceanography, and all other sorts of applications, will succeed. And let us never forget that turning the sea to our useful purposes is rapidly becoming

more than an attractive goal—it will soon be essential to our survival.

I wish all of you, industry, Navy, and scientists, the very best of success in your meetings and deliberations. If you can arrive only at approaches to good solutions for the problems that face us, your efforts will have been worthwhile.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, we have just received from the President a reorganization plan which proposes to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department. The Community Relations Service, in its short lifetime, has proved extremely valuable in finding solutions to very difficult problems in the field of civil rights. I believe that the President's plan will greatly strengthen the work of this agency, and that we should support this proposal.

The President proposes to move Community Relations Service to the Justice Department as a fully integrated agency, independent of other arms of the Department, with its Director, bearing the rank of an Assistant Attorney General, reporting directly to the Attorney General.

He has also requested that in the fiscal year 1967 the budget—and manpower—of the Community Relations Service be increased 50 percent—in spite of the Spartan nature of the entire budget due to Vietnam.

The President, as recently as February 4, told the American people via press, radio and television, his reasons for enlarging the mission of the Community Relations Service.

The Attorney General has also expressed his enthusiastic support for this proposed enlargement of Community Relations Service activities—and his pleasure at having available for close consultation in his role as coordinator of Federal civil rights efforts this agency which, perhaps more than any other, maintains true and compassionate communication with those who are struggling for the full realization of civil rights.

The idea of a Community Relations Service was first proposed in the Congress by President Johnson when he was in the Senate 7 years ago. Few know better than he how useful it has been thus far in aiding the objectives of this Government for peaceful and full achievement of civil rights for all Americans. He has requested that the Congress endorse a change which he believes will enhance its usefulness.

I urge that the Congress give this endorsement.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in 1918, after 2½ centuries of foreign exploitation and domination, the people of the Ukraine charted their own course to freedom by declaring their independence. Two years later, their hard-won independence was lost and the Ukraine was absorbed behind an iron curtain.

As short lived as Ukrainian independence was, these peoples' commitment to liberty and freedom has not faded or weakened. Today, their devotion to freedom, which was kindled during those 2 short years, draws inspiration from this country and her commitment to self-determination for all oppressed peoples.

On this 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, all of us join our Ukrainian friends in looking forward to the day when the Ukraine will have regained the freedom and national identity which is rightfully hers.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE HATCH ACT TO THE COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM AND VISTA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced S. 2908, which extended the Hatch Act to cover employees of the community action program and the VISTA volunteers who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds. I am most pleased with the enthusiastic reception that this amendment has received. Already nine Senators have agreed to cosponsor this bill, and, of course, I expect many more from both sides of the aisle. Those who have already added their names are Senators PROUTY, MUNDT, DOMINICK, THURMOND, FANNIN, MORTON, LAUSCHE, SALTONSTALL, and ALLOTT. Since the measure will be on the desk for 10 days, I urge my colleagues to join with us in this effort.

Mr. President, as I said yesterday, this is not a partisan bill and, in my judgment, this is a much needed amendment which will help to alleviate the main problem that has been plaguing the poverty program and help to assure that the benefits of the program will reach the country's needy citizens.

Today in the Washington Daily News there appeared an editorial entitled, "'Hatch' the Poverty Bunglers." This editorial strongly supports my amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

"HATCH" THE POVERTY BUNGLERS

Since the outset, some phases of President Johnson's war on poverty have been complicated, if not disrupted, by squabbling and grabbiness among local politicians.

Senator GEORGE MURPHY, of California, thinks he may have a remedy, although probably not a cure.

He said he will introduce a bill to apply the Hatch Act to all administrators in the so-called community action and VISTA aspects of the program. These are the places where the most trouble has turned up.

The Hatch Act, on the books since 1939, bars Federal employees from using their offices to influence voters or taking an active part in politics or political campaigns.

Senator MURPHY doubts his proposal would "solve all the problems," but he hopes it would "make them pay more attention to the needs of the poor," and less to politics.

There isn't any sound reason at all why Congress shouldn't apply the same limitations to antipoverty employees as to other Government people. In fact, in the case of the antipoverty employees, the restrictions are especially needed.

WHERE WERE THE PICKETS?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the continuing public debate of the role of the United States in South Vietnam it is important that we recognize the efforts of our Government to meet the Communist leaders to discuss an end to the fighting.

The Welch, W. Va., Daily News, in an editorial on January 29, 1966, asked the question "Why did we not see a march on Washington, or at least a few pickets outside the White House, to dramatize support for these efforts of the Government?"

The question should be answered by those marchers and pickets who are now criticizing our Government for its efforts to protect the lives of our Armed Forces.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE WERE THE PICKETS?

Any time during the past month would have been an ideal time for a demonstration by the Vietnam war protesters—a demonstration not against the United States but against the Hanoi regime.

It was that long and more since this country first halted bombing raids over North Vietnam. For 4 days during the Vietnamese new year's celebrations our troops maintained a strictly defensive posture, although the Vietcong's unilateral cease-fire did not include Americans.

In the meantime, Presidential peace emissaries continued to scurry between Washington and a dozen world capitals seeking the diplomatic formula that could lead to an armistice.

Why did we not see a march on Washington, or at least a few pickets outside the White House, to dramatize support for these efforts of the Government? Why no mass meetings putting a bit of pressure on the North Vietnamese who, as they themselves said, have been heartened by the activities of peace-loving American students?

Why indeed?

The silence of the past weeks has done more than the noisiest demonstration to expose the double standard of the Vietniks and to prove the shallowness, naivete and essential futility of their cause.

This is not to charge them with the blame for the failure of the peace offensive. They are not that important, and in any event a demonstration in support of the Government at this stage would probably have counted for little in the international balance.

It would, however, have been a welcome gesture of moderation and conciliation at home and have gone far toward reversing the trend that seems to be driving Americans into two extreme camps.

EFFECTIVE CHEMICAL PESTICIDES

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, we are talking very seriously about helping feed a world where hunger is almost as great a threat as that of nuclear warfare. The need is so great that we must also help the underdeveloped nations to modernize their agriculture. One indispensable tool in this modernization is effective chemical pesticides.

Nevertheless, these indispensable tools have been under persistent attack since the publication of "Silent Spring," the book by the late Rachel Carson in 1962.

This book, while brilliantly written, is primarily a propaganda tract, and the charges it brought against pesticides have been refuted time and time again. Nevertheless, our Government itself has taken punitive action against pesticides, and damage to the milk industry, to forests, and to other crops has resulted. Outmoded and unnecessary restrictions remain in effect regardless of the facts spread upon the record.

I think it is time to treat this whole matter in a commonsense manner, and to those who want to know what has happened and is still happening, I recommend the reading of a brilliant address by K. T. Karabatsos, director of government relations of the Velsicol Chemical Corp., of Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Karabatsos' speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(By K. T. Karabatsos, director of government relations, Velsicol Chemical Corp.)

I am stating a truism when I say that the advent of synthetic pesticides has heralded a new era both in health and in agriculture. The production of most of the important farm commodities is impossible without pesticides, and if we did not have them, such diseases as malaria and typhus—nonexistent in the United States—still would be helping fill our hospitals and cemeteries. We depend so much on pesticides that we take them for granted. Consequently, it is amazing to find these chemical agents under attack in this country by agencies of Government itself, and for reasons which, when closely examined, turn out to be ephemeral.

Nowadays we move at an increasingly fast pace in many areas. The past decade has seen marvelous achievements in science. Man has taken a walk in space, lived for weeks under the sea, developed a vaccine to protect against the crippling disease, polio, and is building airplanes which move much faster than the speed of sound. One of the places which he intends to visit in the next few years is the moon, and perhaps other planets.

Yet none of these is more fantastic than the agricultural technological revolution in our own Nation.

Within the past 25 or 30 years, the production of most major agricultural commodities has either doubled or tripled. For example, corn production in the 1925–29 period approximated 26 bushels per acre; in 1965 it is estimated at 72.1 bushels per acre. One reason that we have enough wheat for consumption here at home and hundreds of millions of bushels for export every year is that in the 1925–29 period we averaged 14 bushels per acre; in 1965 production per acre is estimated at 27.2 bushels. Or, to put it another way, we can grow approximately as much wheat as we produced 30 years ago on half the acreage. Cotton production today per acre is about three times what it was 30 years ago. Milk production per cow is not far from double that in 1929—and so it goes in almost every area of farm production.

There are many factors which have entered into this technological revolution—more fertilizer, better seed, the substitution of the machine for the horse, and the elimination of the burdensome drudgery involved in hand harvesting by the substitution of such efficient instuments as the reaper and the corn and cotton pickers. But close up front in the list of tools on which man increasingly depends for modern agricultural production are synthetic pesticides. They save billions and billions of dollars every year. It has been estimated that, without them, 50 percent of the labor force could be needed on the farm, instead of the less than 8 percent which we find there today.

Once again, let me emphasize that it is simply amazing that we find an unremitting and sustained attack on the use of these indispensable chemicals. Today millions of people accept as gospel the conclusions by the late Rachel Carson that the widespread use of pesticides threaten death and destruction to the human race. These conclusions were drawn in the face of the fact that not one case of death or serious illness in this country has been traced to pesticides, where the latter were used as prescribed. Since Miss Carson had a magic way with words and since her book was widely read, it is understandable that many laymen suspect and fear pesticides. It is almost incomprehensible the responsible agencies of Government back the propaganda in Miss Carson's book, "Silent Spring," and are conducting a persistent campaign against the agents which help make modern agriculture possible.

Agricultural efficiency has a tremendous meaning to all of us. Let us look at it in terms of one very sensitive nerve, the pocketbook nerve. Food costs in the United States amount to about 18 cents of every dollar left after taxes and other fixed costs. Compare that to Russia where only 50 cents is left; Nigeria, 70 cents; Japan and Yugoslavia, around 45 cents. Or, if you feel that these countries do not offer fair comparisons, look at Italy, 43 cents; France, 31; and Britain, 28.

To give you a more startling example, last year Americans spent $80 billion for food. Payment of taxes to Federal, State and local governments at the same time totaled almost $157 billion. So the cost of Government was just at double the cost of food. Most human beings throughout history, and even prehistory, have been primarily engaged in getting enough to eat. Even today 2 billion persons go to bed hungry in our food-short world.

Unlike most nations in the world, our major problem isn't the grocery bill or having enough to eat, but the tax bill instead. However, I am not here today to talk about dollars and cents, but rather numbers and commonsense. The numbers are the parts per billion that are raising havoc in agriculture. With new and very sensitive devices, pesticide residues can be found now where none could be found before. Some of the residues found are in billionth parts, or even trillionth, in relation to the whole. In the case of foods like milk where any residues (zero tolerance) are banned, these new instruments and their application have resulted in some costly and unpleasant results. We need commonsense to straighten out this mess.

This mess affects you, the sugarbeet growers, directly. You were told by one department of Government to use certain pesticides to protect your crop from damage due to soil insects. You followed those recommendations only that another branch of the same Government wants to seize your crops because of what it terms illegal residues.

You haven't been told that these residues would be harmful to the public health. Actually, they pose no health hazard. This is Government gobbledygook and redtape in full flower. And, as is customary, the innocent bystander—you, in this instance—gets hurt.

Fifteen years ago Congressman DELANEY, of New York, instigated an investigation on chemicals in food. Briefly, that committee heard charges that chemicals—pesticides in particular—were possibly (a word that covers a world of territory) the cause of polio, stomach cancer, hepatitis, virus X, and just about anything else for which science had not yet been able to determine a cause.

Because of these possibilities, there was a public clamor for legislation. As administrative assistant to Dr. A. L. Miller, then a Member of the House, I was called upon to help direct the so-called Miller amendment through the Congress. Nearly everyone considered it an excellent bill. It was, according to the experts, ideally drawn, taking into consideration all facets of control, with safety the primary concern. It was hailed as the most significant legislation in the food and drug field of modern times. To this day it has served as the model for ensuing legislation regarding food additives, hazardous substances, and pesticide registration.

It has been about 10 years since that legislation became law. Unfortunately, as you here today can attest, the results were quite different from our anticipations.

Perhaps there is no one more aware of this than Dr. James H. Jensen, chairman of the "Zero—No Residue" Committee of the National Academy of Sciences. This committee this year issued a report saying zero tolerance is unworkable. It certainly must have looked into the legislative history of the Miller amendment and must know that the congressional intent differed sharply from administration of the act.

Mr. Miller and I were invited to the White House when President Eisenhower signed the amendment. Doc said to me at that time that, while he thought the bill was a good one, he feared that unless it was properly administered, it might stifle industry research. It has, in my opinion, had that undesirable effect.

In that connection, over 10 years have elapsed since a major new insecticide has been developed and placed on the market. I don't know that we can blame the amendment entirely, but certainly it has been a contributing factor in hindering exploration. Today, as the Miller amendment and related legislation is administered, the launching of a new pesticide is a task which is discouraging to many scientists and manufacturers. And the furore in the wake of "Silent Spring" made the job much, much harder.

Another discouraging factor is the interdepartmental struggle to determine which agency will be given the most responsibility over pesticides. For with that authority goes bigger appropriations and more personnel. The question is not whether pesticides should be regulated (that was answered a long, long time ago), but rather who should regulate them and, more important, where should regulation end?

Often when I tell an audience that more agencies of government concern themselves with pesticides than any other product of industry, I encounter disbelief. More testing and premarketing clearances are required for pesticides than anything else available to the American public. This is true even though, as I have stated, there has not been one case of illness or death traced to pesticides when the latter were properly used. I feel there is overregulation, which is cause for real concern and alarm.

Under the terms of the Miller amendment, the Department of Agriculture is to determine how much of a residue may remain on a raw agricultural product when it is harvested. The Food and Drug Administration then, if it finds no health hazard, will establish a numerical tolerance for that specific crop. Residue studies must be made on every crop for which the chemical will be used. In other words, the tolerance applies directly to the crop.

This point has created a problem which has been ably described by Representative JAMIE WHITTEN, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

He pointed out that, under the law as interpreted by Government agencies, a residue of

7 parts per million of DDT would be perfectly legal on certain crops, but if a 10th of a part per million were detected on another crop, the latter would be subject to seizure. This is in direct conflict with the intent of the Miller amendment. It throws both scientific judgment and commonsense to the winds.

Earlier I mentioned some of our startling scientific achievements in space and communication, as well as health. I pointed out the most startling, in my opinion, were the achievements we have made in agriculture.

My company, Velsicol Chemical Corp. is considered a leader in the field. The chemical industry has developed insecticides which kill crop-devouring insects on contact. It has developed: Those which kill over a long period of time; those which give us more complete control of weeds and disease; those which actually regulate the growth of plants, or those which defoliate crops for simpler harvesting.

As I have indicated, these pesticides, with fertilizers and other techniques, have created the technological revolution in agriculture.

Nowhere but in America can one farmer produce enough to feed himself and 30 other persons.

Today we are in a great conflict with the Communist world. One of our strongest weapons is our superiority in agriculture.

Do you realize that the Soviet Union needs 4½ times as many farmworkers as we have in the United States, and still it produces only one-third as much meat and three-fifths as much grain? And over there they don't have acreage limitations. Instead of cutting back on intensive production, they regularly add more land to the plow.

I was born and reared in a small agricultural community in Nebraska. My city cousins in the East don't think much of the rural western areas but, believe me, this is ignorance on their part. Because there are many more people living in the cities than there are on the farm, the Congress and the Government agencies tend to have a citified approach to farming.

I don't know what the figures are today, but 5 years ago Dr. Karl Brandt, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, reported that there were then 15 million trucks, cars, and combines, plus many millions of electric motors, on fewer than 4 million American farms. He noted that the total horsepower of this mechanical equipment was equal to all the power used by all the factories and railroads in the Nation put together.

The American farmer is the largest consumer of gasoline, tires, steel and, as the rate of fertilizer use increases, he will soon be the largest consumer of chemicals.

Next to the atomic bomb, the most serious threat facing mankind is hunger. It is calculated that today, as we meet here, 165,000 children will be born, while 8,000 other people may die of malnutrition, and billions will go to sleep hungry. And so it will be tomorrow, and the next day, and the next.

Our population is about 195 million, and at the present rate of increase it will be about 340 million by the year 2000. That means there will be 145 million more people seeking shelter, transportation, heat, light, clothing, schools, churches, and recreation. Biological man being what he is, these millions will also seek weddings and food. So we shall have nearly 75 percent more mouths to feed.

In the face of these near calamitous thoughts, I am amazed at the continuing attack on pesticides and the Government's attitude toward certain necessary chemicals.

It is this attitude which is, in effect, depriving you of the economical and effective use of the chlorinated hydrocarbons—DDT, aldrin, dieldrin, and heptachlor. Yet, let me repeat once more, there is no case on record of injury from pesticides where the latter are properly used. Moreover, all the evidence available indicates that there is nothing to the theory that pesticide residues continue to accumulate in animal and human tissue until they reach dangerous proportions. This is the fundamental basis for the attack on the chlorinated hydrocarbons, or persistent pesticides, and without going into detail, let me say that not one of the antipesticide theories seems to hold up.

About 3 years ago the late President Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee issued a report on pesticides which made a number of recommendations. Many of these recommendations were immediately accepted by the various Government agencies handling pesticides and by the scientific community at large. As is the case with many reports coming out of Washington, the agricultural interests had not been considered. As far as that goes, the Food Protection Committee of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council—was not even consulted. The Department of Agriculture and Food and Drug Administration were summoned only to answer specific questions.

It was alarming to me that while the report recognized the essentiality of pesticides in modern agriculture, the point was admitted reluctantly by the Committee. The report actually advised that one objective should be the elimination of the use of the chlorinated hydrocarbons. However, the report presented no evidence to support this conclusion, and I have already stated that the available scientific data points in the other direction.

Also there was a lack of balance of values in that the report appeared to be oriented to a substantial degree to the protection of fish and wildlife, while placing a secondary value upon the adequacy of our food supply in quantity and quality.

Now, to quote Senator JAMES PEARSON, of Kansas, a member of the Senate committee which conducted hearings on the report, he said: "Without conclusive scientific basis, it set as a national goal the elimination of persistent pesticides. And this was done without defining persistency, without attempting to evaluate the impact of such a goal upon our food supply, the national income, or our competitive position in the export markets of the world."

The fact is, persistent pesticides, as we know them, represent 75 percent of those used in the United States and throughout the world.

Some would lead you to believe that persistence is bad per se and that the only reason we have them is because industry has not been able to develop other types of control.

Well, this just isn't so.

They must be persistent because insects are persistent, and the only effective way to control them is to use a compound which will have an effect over a full period of growth and maturity.

What is the alternative to persistent pesticides?

Simply this, the repeated use of more expensive chemicals and often a much greater hazard to the grower. I don't believe you want this—I know my father-in-law who farms in Nebraska certainly doesn't want it.

Following the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, the Academy of Sciences, the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Agriculture, land-grant colleges, and industry conducted extensive studies.

Working independently, these groups gave new assurances that the public health is not in danger from pesticide residues.

Another recommendation of the President's Science Advisory Committee was to review the tolerances of chlordane. Velsicol Chemical Corp. is the sole manufacturer of technical chlordane, and we monitor that product continually—not only in the environment but also as to its toxicity to man. These studies are published and available to the scientific community for review. The special committee of experts named by the Food and Drug Administration, in conjunction with the Academy of Sciences, studied all phases of chlordane and its uses and reported the product was less toxic to man today than when tolerances were originally established. Also, the product had been used extensively for over 15 years without harm to man. In other words, it was given a clean bill of health.

Certainly this report casts grave doubts upon the other recommendations of the President's Committee, and one wonders just how much study went into the report.

Another example stems from the recommendations on "zero" and "no residue" requirements of the Miller amendment. I have already said that the Academy of Sciences in a strongly worded report stated the concept was scientifically untenable. Dr. Emil Mrak, chancellor of the University of California, stated: "We are being asked to give up proven benefits because of unproven fears."

Senator PEARSON commented further on the latter report, stating: "I am advised that these last two reports have met with general acceptance in the scientific community, and some scientists have observed that the whole question of pesticides should be resolved by the National Academy of Sciences rather than the President's Scientific Advisory Committee which was, in fact, established in response to the Russian sputniks and was originally charged with the responsibility of relating science to our military establishment."

The Academy of Sciences' report states that "zero" should mean "negligible" and that "permissible" residues should be determined on the basis of actual daily acceptable intake. Now that we have been shown the road, it is our job to demand that the public policy on pesticides follow this mandate.

By way of reminder, the primary purpose of the Miller pesticide residue amendment was to insure the public health. Safety and only safety was its aim.

In the beginning, zero tolerances and no residue registrations had to be based on available methods, which were only able to determine residue levels of around 0.1 ppm. The scientific community, chemists, and pharmacologists were aware that while these were the limits of detection, they believed some residue remained. Then along came the new analytical methods utilizing more sophisticated machines—machines that purported to determine billionths and trillionths of a part.

This, gentlemen, is when we got into the big numbers game. What is the significance of a billionth or trillionth? I defy anyone to explain it clearly enough for a layman to comprehend.

We should dismiss these mathematical exercises. We are the unsuspecting victims of our scientific achievements.

Rather than being fearful, we should be reassured that we can measure amounts so small, even if the results are doubtful. For this can give us an unprecedented early warning of any significant build-up of chemicals in our environment.

Meantime, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and a segment of the Public Health Service should stop issuing reports which attack pesticides by inference and innuendo.

In 1964, the Public Health Service blamed the death of over 5,175,000 fish on endrin, a chlorinated hydrocarbon. This charge was denied, and PHS changed its story on the circumstances which led to its conclusions several times. Five million of the fish were menhaden, a salt water variety, which died in the lower Mississippi and which ordinarily would be out of range of any

pesticide residues that might be in the water. It developed that PHS analyzed only one menhaden and that little could be told from the condition of that fish.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has issued several releases which inferred that certain species of birds might be vanishing because of pesticides. Yet in 1964 the Fish and Wildlife Service asked for over $600,000 to combat the depredations of birds in the rice-growing areas of the Arkansas-Mississippi Delta where persistent pesticides are intensively used. On the one hand to blame pesticides for the scarcity of certain bird species, and on the other to ask for money to combat birds in a territory where the chlorinated hydrocarbons drench the soil puts the Fish and Wildlife Service in a farcical position, but apparently the Service does not mind. In a Senate speech on October 22, 1965, Senator DIRKSEN said of this situation:

"Offhand, it would seem that the Department of the Interior is going out of its way to make itself ridiculous. On the one hand, it solemnly issues warnings that pesticide residues may be exterminating the bald eagle, ospreys, the whooping crane, and so on, and on the other, it solemnly goes to Congress to ask for money to combat the millions of birds which are eating rice and other grain in a section where chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides—the great bugaboo of the Department of the Interior—are used more widely than in almost any other part of the country."

The Department of the Interior had banned the use of the chlorinated hydrocarbons on lands it administers, although, as I have pointed out, there is nothing which warrants such a ban. There is evidence that the substitutes for the persistent pesticides are not doing the job, although they are costing more. As a consequence, damage to the forests and lands under the administration from pests is mounting, but the ban on the persistent pesticides remains. In my opinion, it will be lifted only when ravages to forest lands become so costly that the Department will have to retreat.

In September 1965, the Public Health Service put out a press release which announced it was going to help New York State health authorities try to determine whether pesticides were a factor in cancer deaths in that State. Down in the statement it was said there was no evidence to connect pesticides and cancer, but, as Senator DIRKSEN pointed out: "The release is couched in language designed to arouse alarm and apprehension over the use of pesticides."

One has only to look around him to see that birds and other forms of wildlife are flourishing in the sections where pesticides are put into the ground and on growing crops. This alone, it seems to me, should allay the apprehension which Fish and Wildlife and Public Health Service are trying to arouse.

The most important thing the agricultural community can do during the coming year is to put forth all its efforts to see to it that the residues report is fully implemented. This report says that the zero concept is foolish and that residue content should be based on safety factors. This makes sense:

If this is done, many of the problems you have been facing the past couple of years will fade away, and you will be able to get back to the business of producing wholesome, free from insect damage, sugar beets.

THE JAYCEES' FINEST HOUR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the January edition of the U.S. Jaycees Future and JCI World, the lead article is entitled "The Jaycees' Finest Hour."

The article refers to the 20th Junior Chamber International World Congress held in Sydney, Australia, in November 1965. The article lists the election of Edward A. Merdes, of Fairbanks, Alaska, as international president as one of the reasons for the glowing description of the conference.

I concur, for I know Mr. Merdes personally and am confident that he will be an excellent representative of the organization and of his nation in his world travels as president of Jaycees International. As an example of the dedication with which he approaches his office, Mr. Merdes requested that I help arrange a series of briefings with State Department officials on the countries he was to visit. I was happy to do so.

Mr. Merdes is currently on a tour of Central America. Before he left, he spent 2 days meeting with officials of the Central America desks at the State Department. In March he will tour South America. Before he leaves on that trip he will receive a briefing at the State Department.

It is a source of pride for all Alaskans that a Fairbanks resident was the first American to be elected president of Jaycees International since 1956–57. It should be a source of pride to all Americans that this Fairbanks attorney approaches his duties with such dedication. It is comforting to know that the State Department took such a strong interest in briefing a man who while representing an international organization will also be representing the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the first part of the article entitled "The Jaycees' Finest Hour" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE JAYCEES FINEST HOUR: A REPORT OF THE 20TH JCI WORLD CONGRESS

(By Stokely Hays, manager, international relations, the U.S. Jaycees)

There are 130 U.S. Jaycees who will remember the 20th Junior Chamber International World Congress because of the warmth and hospitality of the Australian people.

There are over 1,500 members of Junior Chamber International who will remember the 20th World Congress because of the strong contributions made to the organization by Jaycees from the United States.

For the U.S. Jaycees, the 20th World Congress of Junior Chamber International was their finest hour. Not since the founding of JCI in 1944 have the U.S. Jaycees played such an important role at an international congress, nor have they accomplished so much. The accomplishments will long be felt and remembered with satisfaction by all members of JCI.

U.S. Jaycee President Jim Skidmore summed it best when he said, "We not only have an obligation to extend leadership to U.S. Jaycees, but also to share our talents and many years of experience throughout the world."

Ed Merdes, past U.S. Jaycee vice president, and present general legal counsel of Junior Chamber International, was elected world president of JCI.

Ed is the first U.S. Jaycee to run for or be elected president of JCI since Ira D. Kaye of San Francisco in 1956–57.

Ed was elected to this honor unanimously and without opposition, but not until after two very strong and popular Jaycees gave strong consideration to standing for JCI's highest office. The fact that they chose not to run shows the great respect Ed Merdes has built for himself and the U.S. Jaycees within the international organization.

In his acceptance speech, Ed said in part: "Being elected president of Junior Chamber International is, I believe, the finest tribute a young man, his family, and his country can receive. There is an awesome feeling and deep sense of humility just considering the possibility of being elected president of this dynamic organization. I approach this coming year with an attitude of determination and dedication to give my best and all as your president.

"We surely all agree that the Jaycees have just barely scratched the surface in finding ways to build our communities in this ever-changing world so that freedom, justice and the better way of life prevail.

"It is my intention to work for these goals and at the same time, serve our organization so that I may in some small way repay Junior Chamber for the inestimable benefits it has showered upon me. I pray that with your help and that of Junior Chamber members throughout the free world, to discharge the obligations of world president with dignity."

Ed was born near Pittsburgh, Pa. on January 12, 1929, one of 13 children. He is now married and the father of six.

A graduate of Cornell University of Law, Ed is a partner in the law firm of McNealy & Merdes in Fairbanks, Alaska.

Besides his Jaycee activities, Ed is the general legal counsel to the president and regents of the University of Alaska. He is the former deputy attorney general of the State of Alaska and is now the city manager and city attorney of Fairbanks.

He is the past president of the Alaska Junior Bar Conference, past president of the Alaska National Guard Officers Association, an officer of the Knights of Columbus, a scoutmaster, and serves on the board of directors of the Alaska State Bank and Alaska Airlines.

In 1956, he was a charter member and initial vice president of the Juneau (Alaska) Jaycees. One year later, he organized the State organization and was the first president of the Alaska Jaycees. In 1958, he was elected the first vice president of the U.S. Jaycees from Alaska.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the University of Missouri—the first State university to be founded west of the Mississippi—has for over 100 years been of tremendous service to the people of Missouri. The growth and development of our State has been deeply intertwined with the history of this great university.

In 1954, Elmer Ellis was promoted from professor to president and the school began an important and vigorous movement toward higher standards in curriculum, facilities, and students.

A recent Time article traces the advances made under the administration of Dr. Ellis and looks ahead to the challenges that will be facing Dr. John Carrier Weaver when he succeeds to the presidency on the retirement of Dr. Ellis.

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

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

UNIVERSITIES: MISSOURI'S UPWARD REACH

Six Ionic columns, cracked and ivy-covered, remind students at the Columbia campus of the University of Missouri that they attend the oldest State university west of the Mississippi. The columns are all that remain of the university's first academic hall,

opened in 1843 and destroyed by fire in 1892. Ironically and ionically, age was almost the only distinction that the university could claim 15 years ago. Now Missouri is making up time vigorously and fast.

Missouri's early growth was hindered first by envious legislators from other counties who refused to appropriate funds for it, later by the belief that the university was a seedbed of rebel sentiment in the Civil War. In 1907 Missouri's medical school was one of many singled out in a study by Education Critic Abraham Flexner as scandalously incompetent, and was cut back to a 2-year course.

In the late 1920's President Stratton Brooks faced a year-long student-faculty revolt, triggered by his suspension of three sociology instructors for having asked 600 students if they thought the low economic status of women had any effect upon sexual relations. By then Missouri had long been caught, as President Elmer Ellis puts it, "between northern aspirations and southern methods of taxation."

TOUGH AND FOLKSY

The university's upward reach began in 1954 with the promotion of Ellis, a placid history professor and dean, to the presidency. He turned into a tough administrator who managed to excite his faculty even while driving it hard, yet remained folksy enough to coax money out of a rural legislature. A new 4-year medical center, opened in 1956, now trains 316 students, treats 10,000 hospital patients and 6,500 clinic patients a year. Ellis worked to promote a $75 million State bond issue in 1958, a third of it going to finance 17 new buildings. His energetic lobbying helped boost operating funds from $18 million to $82 million a year. In the same period, money devoted annually to university research multiplied ninefold to nearly $20 million, and enrollment tripled to 30,000 full-time students.

In addition, Missouri changed from a school that had largely served agricultural interests into a many-faceted science-conscious institution trying to meet the needs of the State's urban growth. It took over the impoverished private University of Kansas City in 1963, made it a coequal university campus with schools of dentistry, pharmacy, and music. It elevated a St. Louis junior college, to similar status, will convert it to a 4-year curriculum this fall. Another campus in Rolla, which is about 100 miles southwest of St. Louis in the Ozarks, was created out of a school of mines and metallurgy.

This statewide system now boasts the Nation's largest university nuclear reactor (10 megawatts), will offer a Ph. D. in nuclear engineering next fall, has a forward-looking space science research center exploring the possibilities of creating permanent settlements on the moon. Its pioneering school of journalism, first in the Nation when founded in 1908, produces a citywide daily newspaper and operates the only television station in Columbia. The university is looking for a topflight dean of graduate studies to direct its growing research activities—and is willing to pay $30,000 to get him.

TOWARD FERMENT

Whether Missouri now moves into the top rank of public universities will depend largely on John Carrier Weaver, 50, vice president for academic affairs and dean of faculties at Ohio State, who will succeed Ellis next August. Son of a former speech department chairman at the University of Wisconsin, Weaver holds a Ph. D. in geography from Wisconsin and has spent most of his career in Midwestern public universities, including Minnesota, Kansas State, Nebraska and Iowa. These schools, he insists, represent "the full flowering of the public land-grant concept—education, research and service combined."

Weaver has no doubts about which of these comes first. He contends that "teaching is a university's prime reason for being" and that "what really matters in higher education is individual young people and their individual minds." A teacher's aim, he argues, is "to produce disquiet, make students question dogma. Good education doesn't produce stability. It should produce ferment." Unlike Weaver, the lowly undergrad is not likely to be forgotten, and the ferment is already going.

HISTORY AND ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND THE SERVICE OF VICE ADM. H. ARNOLD KARO AS DIRECTOR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to speak to you in behalf of myself and Senator JACKSON, about the oldest scientific organization in our Federal Government, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, on this 159th anniversary of its founding, and of the remarkable record of its former Director, Vice Adm. H. Arnold Karo.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND THE WEATHER BUREAU

The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau, both of the Department of Commerce, were consolidated on July 13, 1965, to form the new Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—of the Department of Commerce. The Central Radio Propagation Laboratory of the National Bureau of Standards was transferred to ESSA in October 1965. ESSA now provides a single national focus for all of the environmental science activities of the Department of Commerce, and is moving vigorously ahead in meeting the expanding environmental science and service needs of the Nation. These activities are essential to the Nation's industry and commerce, and they are of critical importance to its overall scientific effort including the space programs. The primary activities of ESSA include surveying and charting services, weather services, the use of satellites for weather observation and other environmental uses, and scientific exploration and study of the oceans, of the lower and upper atmosphere, of the size and shape of the earth, of seismology, the earth's magnetic field, in fact all of the geophysical sciences.

The consolidation of these two old-line scientific agencies of the Government, and part of a third, into one larger organization was a logical step in recognition of the complexity of present-day science and technology, and of the need to pool the instrumental and human resources of a number of scientific specialties to attain better direction and greater efficiency for the overall effort. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau have retained their names as major components of the new organization, and President Johnson nominated Dr. Robert M. White, Chief of the Weather Bureau, to be Administrator of ESSA, and Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be Deputy Administrator of ESSA with the rank of vice admiral. These appointments were confirmed by the Senate on July 20, 1965. Both of these gentlemen are eminently qualified and I am sure that we can look forward to great accomplishments from this new organization.

Each of these agencies has a long and enviable record of service to this Nation. It is for this reason that I note with a certain nostalgia the end of their existence as individual bureaus in our Government, since the consolidation in a very real sense means the loss of the individual identity of the Weather Bureau and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. For this reason, I speak to you today of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey and its recent Director, Vice Adm. H. Arnold Karo, and to officially recognize his more than four decades of dedicated service.

HISTORY OF THE U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

On the 10th of this February, the Coast and Geodetic Survey will have completed 159 years of service to this Nation. Beginning early in the 19th century this agency started and developed the science and art of higher surveying and cartography in the United States and has maintained one of the world's leading higher surveying and charting organizations for nearly a century and a half. The Coast and Geodetic Survey and its leaders played a prominent part in the 19th century development of science and technology in the United States. They were identified with a great variety of scientific developments such as the organization of the National Academy of Sciences, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Bureau of Standards. I repeat here the proclamation of the President of the United States of February 1957 in honor of the 150th anniversary of the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by an Act of Congress approved February 10, 1807 (2 Stat. 413), President Thomas Jefferson was authorized and requested to cause a survey to be taken of the coast of the United States and to take such further action as he deemed proper for completing an accurate chart of every part of these coasts; and

Whereas the observance of the 150th anniversary of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which traces its origins to the above-mentioned act, will honor the services of the officers and employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who have maintained so zealously the reputation of our Nation in the development of mathematical and physical sciences related to higher surveying and cartography; and

Whereas the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in surveying uncharted coastal waters and in mapping virgin regions of our country and its territories and possessions, has been safeguarding life and commerce for a century and a half; and

Whereas the devotion, industry, efficiency, and enterprise of Coast and Geodetic Survey personnel throughout the years have set an enviable record of public service: Now, therefore,

I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of February, 1957, as Coast and Geodetic Survey Month, and I call upon my fellow citizens to salute the Coast and Geodetic Survey during that month with ceremonies designed to give appropriate recognition to one of our oldest and most respected Federal agencies on the occasion of its sesquicentennial anniversary.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 10th day of January in the year of our Lord 1957, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 181st.

(Signed) DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

First called a Survey of the Coast, later the Coast Survey, and, since 1878, the Coast and Geodetic Survey—this organization had its origin in the recognition of Federal responsibility to provide nautical charts and related publications to insure the safety of maritime commerce. This is still a major function of the Bureau and practically all of today's activities are an outgrowth of the scientific and engineering work required to produce and maintain up-to-date nautical charts for the coastal waters of the United States.

Before charts could be compiled and printed, however, a great amount of surveying had to be done to measure the coastline and the adjacent waters. The field surveys required to produce nautical charts included: Geodetic surveys to establish the latitude and longitude, and elevation above sea level, of selected places or points—so that each place on each chart would be uniquely related to all other places on the earth, and so that each chart would fit exactly into a perfectly connected series of hundreds of charts that would be required to cover the coastal waters of the United States; topographic surveys to map the coastline and to position features of importance to navigation; hydrographic surveys to determine the depths of the waters, to locate submerged dangers to navigation, and to find and position the safe passages for shipping; tide observations and tidal current observations to reduce the soundings to least depths and to provide the navigator with information about the tidal forces affecting his movements; and observations of the earth's magnetism to map the direction and force of the magnetic field so that the mariner could know the relationship between magnetic north and true north at any place.

The fact that this small organization, from its very modest beginning in the early 19th century, was able to provide a rapidly growing Nation with a Master Surveying and Charting Agency and has been able to provide a continuing service to science and commerce for more than 150 years is due in no small part to the fortunate circumstances of its early history. Many men of high talent and ability grace the pages of its early record—men such as George Davidson, who authored the "Pacific Coast Pilot" of 1889, the most complete record of the coast ever to be published for the use of the mariner; Rollin Harris, who pioneered in the field of tidal research, and published a voluminous manual of tides in which a new and comprehensive theory was formulated; Henry Whiting, who served the Bureau with distinction for 59 years and whose professional excellence as a topographer was internationally recognized; Charles Sanders Peirce, who pioneered in the development and use of pendulums in gravity measurement, and who laid the foundation for the philosophy of pragmatism; Charles Schott, who for 50 years directed all the intricate computations and adjustments of field observations required in the geodetic, magnetic, cartographic, and tidal operations; and John Hayford, whose investigations of the size and shape of the earth resulted in the derivation of a new figure—the International Ellipsoid of Reference. These are only a few in a long roll—a roll of honor in the annals of the Survey. But particular mention should be made of two early leaders—Ferdinand Rudolph Hassler and Alexander Dallas Bache—who stand in the front rank of those who left the greatest impress on the bureau's work during its difficult, formative period, and under whose direction the Survey evolved from a mere concept into an organizational entity with a fully developed plan of execution that became easily adaptable to a developing and expanding America.

Ferdinand Hassler, the first Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, was selected with the assistance of the American Philosophical Society. This was a fortunate and historical choice. Professor Hassler was a Swiss geodesist and mathematician. He recognized the vast surveying effort, and the quality of surveying that would be required to produce the charts for a new nation in such manner as to be a permanent asset. He knew how to bring the instruments and the techniques needed from Europe and to train the engineers and scientists that would be needed here. Further, he was a person who could not be stampeded into haphazard work, or hasty decisions, in order to attain spectacular but impermanent results.

Alexander Dallas Bache, the second Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, was a noted scientist of his day and an able administrator. He understood the foundations laid down by Hassler and he was able to maintain those standards in the great period of expansion that occurred during his administration. The 10-year period following Bache's appointment in 1843 saw more territory added to the United States than any other decade of American history. Texas and the entire Pacific region were added during his tenure. Surveys were started along the gulf coast in 1845, and in California in 1848.

When the Bureau was authorized in 1807, the tidal shoreline of the Nation comprised about 30,000 statute miles along the Atlantic seaboard. The acquisition of new territories on the gulf coast and the Pacific coast, the acquisition of Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands, and the stewardship that we assumed over the Philippine Islands increased the shoreline of the country to 110,000 statute miles. Bordering this extensive coastline was a belt of over 2,500,000 square miles of coastal waters that required surveys in the interest of waterborne commerce and navigation.

The plan of operations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey as set forth by Hassler and developed by Bache and his successors includes three broad phases: First, scientific study and investigation to develop knowledge, procedures, and instruments for surveying and charting the continent; second, a diversified system of surveys to literally measure the earth and to obtain the data required for charts and for other scientific and engineering purposes; and third, the cartographic activities required to compile, reproduce, print, and distribute charts and other information.

Today, the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey includes these primary activities:

A geodesy program to determine the size and figure of the earth, including measurement of the earth's gravity, and to establish the basic geodetic control—monumented stations of known latitude and longitude and bench marks of known elevation above sea level—that provides the framework for all mapping and charting, for many types of surveys, and for engineering works including projects dealing with long-range missiles and space exploration.

Aeronautical and nautical charting programs to produce aeronautical and nautical charts of the United States including all of the survey activities required for this purpose such as hydrographic surveys, the mapping of land areas, tide observations, and the measurement of the velocity and direction of tidal currents.

An oceanography program to survey, to explore and to study the physical, chemical, and biological properties of the world's oceans and the underlying topography—to produce charts for subsurface navigation, and for the discovery and better utilization of the mineral and food resources in the oceans.

A program in geomagnetism to make magnetic surveys and operate magnetic observatories to chart the distribution of the strength and direction of the earth's magnetic field, and to study the fluctuations as well as the long-term changes in the magnetic field. The results are used as an aid to navigation and surveying; they also constitute a part of the national and international effort to understand, to predict, and to utilize the magnetic field in connection with geophysical exploration, radio propagation forecasting, physics of the solid earth, and the exploration of interplanetary space.

A seismology program to operate a worldwide system of seismograph stations for the location of earthquakes, and to study the nature and magnitude of destructive earthquake motions—to provide information for the design of buildings and structures in earthquake areas, and eventually to find some means of predicting the place and time of occurrence of destructive earthquakes. This activity also includes the operation of a seismic seawave warning system in the Pacific to protect life and property on the islands and around the rim of the Pacific Ocean.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey has in the past and continues to render many public services in addition to the specific programs mentioned above. In the early years it included the Office of Weights and Measures until the Bureau of Standards was organized in 1901. It has been associated with the demarcation of our national boundaries since 1857. One of

the three commissioners appointed for the joint effort of Mexico and the United States to remonument their common boundary was from the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey represented the United States on the Alaska Boundary Commission, for the joint undertaking with Canada, to perpare maps for the Alaska boundary tribunal and later to lay out that boundary on the ground. Under the treaty with Canada of 1908, the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey represented the Government of the United States for the demarcation of the boundary between Canada and the United States from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific Ocean except for the water boundary through the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes. The Coast and Geodetic Survey has surveyed many State and local boundaries, as for example the Mason-Dixon Line. Recently this Bureau surveyed and marked the boundary between Arizona and California.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey rendered extremely important technical services to the Nation during the Civil War and during subsequent wars. Fifty-five percent of the commissioned personnel of this bureau and six of its major survey vessels were transferred to the Armed Forces during World War II, and most of the remaining facilities of the bureau were devoted to various phases of the war effort, particularly to the preparation of both aeronautical and nautical charts for the armed services. Support of the military services has continued since the war. The Coast and Geodetic Survey assisted the Department of the Army in organizing and conducting the field work for the extended arc of triangulation along the 30th meridian in Africa. It readjusted the entire triangulation network of Western Europe for the Department of the Army and assisted that Department in organizing and starting the Inter-American Geodetic Survey. It conducts geodetic surveys for the location of optical and radar tracking stations along the missile ranges for the missile and space effort.

VICE ADM. H. ARNOLD KARO

I come now to the career of Vice Adm. H. Arnold Karo and to his outstanding record as Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from August 1955 to July 1965 when the Coast and Geodetic Survey was merged into ESSA.

When Admiral Karo became Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, that agency was at one of the low points of its long career. Because of financial and staff limitations since the end of World War II, the bureau had dropped out of the mainstream of modern scientific effort of our Government. Its accomplishments in the production of surveys and charts were still impressive, but research and development were being neglected and the Coast and Geodetic Survey was not filling its rightful place in the scientific community of our Government and Nation; the place for which it was so well fitted by tradition and experience.

Karo changed this situation, he changed it completely. With great energy, tireless effort, rare judgment, and unusual dedication—he pried the necessary support from a sometimes reluctant executive and a sometimes reluctant Congress—and he literally took the Coast and Geodetic Survey by the scruff of its neck and shook it out of the past into the modern scientific period. He retooled and reorganized the Bureau for a new scientific and engineering effort. He effected the greatest change in the Coast and Geodetic Survey that has occurred in nearly a century. The job is done—the Coast and Geodetic Survey for the last several years has a new spirit and a new look; it is now well prepared to take its proper role as a part of the new ESSA organization. Time does not permit me to enumerate all of Admiral Karo's accomplishments as Director, but I would be remiss not to mention some of the most noteworthy of these. Hydrography and oceanography are major activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and of increasing importance to this Nation, but, in 1955 when Admiral Karo became Director, the Bureau's fleet of vessels was completely inadequate for present day needs—there were too few of them and many were too old for effective and efficient service. The new ships construction program, initiated by Admiral Karo and still in progress, comprises the most extensive modernization and enlargement of the survey fleet in the history of the Bureau. Nine new ships now in various stages of construction will join the fleet within the next few years and thus follow three that have been completed since 1960. These new vessels will be equipped with the latest electronic, navigational, and surveying instruments available. Three class 2 hydrographic survey ships and two class 1 oceanographic ships are now under construction. Also under construction are two additional class 3 hydrographic survey ships and two class 4 wire drag vessels. Bids have been requested for an additional class 1A oceanographic ship. The class 1 ship *Oceanographer* now nearing completion is 303 feet long and is the largest ship ever to be constructed in the United States specifically for oceanography. This vessel will have the most modern oceanographic and navigational equipment with adequate laboratory space for ocean surveys, over 4,000-square feet of laboratory space.

Realizing that the Bureau could not stand still in science and technology but must either advance or regress, Admiral Karo reorganized the Coast and Geodetic Survey completely to permit a new emphasis on oceanography and the physical sciences. He established an Office of Research and Development for research and development in oceanography, geodesy, seismology, terrestrial magnetism, and supporting disciplines; and invited prominent and well-qualified scientists to join the Bureau's staff. This staff now includes a group of highly qualified scientists and engineers, and the Bureau programs are being conducted with a new emphasis and within the mainstream of the Nation's scientific activity. Scientists from other nations have been invited to the Bureau, have accepted, and are making valuable contributions to Bureau programs.

The Coast and Geodetic Survey, under Admiral Karo's direction, has taken a prominent part in the Nation's newly emphasized oceanographic program. The Bureau's part in this program will increase as the new ships are completed, but a notable start has already been made. Surveys by the ships *Explorer* in the South Atlantic, *Pioneer* in the Indian Ocean, and *Surveyor* and *Pathfinder* in the Central and North Pacific, together with the new research effort in oceanography, are indicative of the Bureau's future in this program.

Admiral Karo invited Dr. Hellmut Schmid, one of the world's foremost geodesists, to join the Bureau's staff—and the Coast and Geodetic Survey with the assistance of Dr. Schmid and its own staff of experts has devised and put into operation a system of satellite triangulation that permits the accurate measurements of long distances, even across the oceans, to connect the continents and the many different geodetic datums of the world. This system of satellite triangulation is now being used by the Coast and Geodetic Survey in cooperation with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense to establish a system of triangulation that will encircle the earth.

Admiral Karo expanded and broadened the Coast and Geodetic Survey programs in terrestrial magnetism and seismology to meet present day needs for basic information for geophysical exploration, radio propagation forecasting, space exploration, for the design of structures against earthquakes, for the maintenance of a seismic seawave warning system around the Pacific basin, and finally to work toward the development of means of forecasting destructive earthquakes. During his term as Director, the Bureau has built 10 observatories for geomagnetic and seismological observations and research. These observatories are now operating at Fredricksburg, Va.; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Dallas, Tex.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Castle Rock, Calif; Newport, Wash.; at Anchorage and Adak, Alaska; Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands; and on Guam. The Bureau is cooperating in the U.S. Antarctic research program and in 1960 Admiral Karo went to Antarctica and to the South Pole to inspect Coast and Geodetic Survey installations and to encourage the Bureau personnel stationed there.

Admiral Karo was born December 24, 1903, at Lyons, Nebr., where he attended elementary and high school. He was graduated from the University of Nebraska with the degree of bachelor of science in civil engineering in 1923 and entered on duty with the Coast and Geodetic Survey immediately thereafter. He has devoted his entire professional career of over 42 years to service in the commissioned corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Admiral Karo is a graduate of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Washington, D.C., and in 1958 he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Science from Union College,

New York, in recognition of his national and international leadership in surveying and cartography.

Admiral Karo served for more than 3 years as Chairman of the Committee on Cartography of the National Academy of Sciences, which advised the State Department on matters concerning international cartography. He was Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Second United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Asia and the Far East held in Toyko in 1958, and headed the U.S. delegation to the Third United Nations Cartographic Conference held in Bangkok in 1961. He represented the United States at the British Commonwealth Survey Officers Conferences at Cambridge, England, in 1951, in 1959, and in 1963. He participated in the conference of the International Federation of Surveyors at Cracow, Poland, in 1959. In 1963, he served as the U.S. representative for geodesy and mapping at the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas, at Geneva, Switzerland, and later in 1963, he served as Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Regional Cartographic Conference for Africa, at Nairobi, Kenya.

Admiral Karo was national president of the Society of American Military Engineers in 1957. He is a past president of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, vice president of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, Department of Commerce member of the Federal Council's Inter-Agency Committee on Oceanography and has served as a U.S. member of the Consultative Committee, delegate to the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, UNESCO, and in 1965, as Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the Fourth Session. As the Coast and Geodetic Survey member of the Mississippi River Commission, Admiral Karo plays an important part in furthering the national program of developing and improving one of the great waterways of the world. He is also a registered professional engineer in the District of Columbia.

During World War II, Admiral Karo was transferred to duty with the U.S. Army Air Forces. He held various assignments, including commanding officer, beginning in 1943, of the Air Forces Aeronautical Chart Plant at St. Louis, Mo., with the rank of colonel. As a result of Karo's administration and guidance, outstanding achievements were accomplished in organizing the plant which today is recognized as being among the most important reproduction plants in the world. Special commendations by the commanding general of the Air Forces and members of the Air Staff were received for work completed under his command.

Admiral Karo received special recognition for his important comprehensive treatise on "World Mapping," completed during his course of study at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. He was awarded the Philippines Legion of Honor, degree of Officer, for eminently meritorious service in the Philippines during two tours of duty there early in his career. He is a member of the American Geophysical Union, the Cosmos Club of Washington, the U.S. Naval Institute, American Society of Photogrammetry, American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, Society of American Military Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, Explorers Club, Sigma Xi, and Sigma Tau.

In closing this account of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and its director, I salute Adm. H. Arnold Karo as one of our able administrators and one of our most dedicated public servants.

SENATOR JORDAN RECEIVES SILVER BEAVER SCOUT AWARD

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as part of the national observance of Boy Scout Week, I think it is fitting for me to announce at this time to the Senate that my colleague, B. EVERETT JORDAN, has recently been presented the Silver Beaver Award of the Boy Scouts of America.

The Silver Beaver Award is the highest scouting award that can be bestowed by the local councils throughout the Nation, and it was presented to Senator JORDAN by the Cherokee Council of North Carolina. The award was established in 1931 in the Cherokee Council, and in the 35 years since that time, the council has awarded it to only 76 men.

Those North Carolinians who are familiar with the scouting program are aware of the fact that Senator JORDAN has been active in scouting during his entire adult life, and he has brought truly outstanding leadership and inspiration to the scouting movement in our State and elsewhere.

The Silver Beaver Award was presented to Senator JORDAN in ceremonies at Leaksville, N.C., on January 21, 1966, and I would like to include as part of my remarks excerpts from the citation accompanying the award. The citation was read by Mr. Allan Lewis, of Wentworth, N.C., who is an outstanding scout leader himself.

The excerpts are as follows:

Senator JORDAN might be classed as an oldtimer since he made his appearance in the universe before the turn of the century. He served for his country during the First World War and then organized his own company during the 1920's. He has been involved in the textile business ever since. His civic activities have been too numerous to cover all of them here but particularly noteworthy are his services to the Tuberculosis Association, the Red Cross, the County Hospital, Duke University, American University, Elon College, Rotary, the Masons, and the Methodist Church where he serves in many capacities.

He first served in Scouting as a scoutmaster in the Piedmont Council of North Carolina. He later moved to the Cherokee Council and helped to organize a troop in his own community in 1942. This troop continues to be one of the strongest in the council. Our recipient continues to be active on the troop committee and in addition has served on the executive board of the Cherokee Council. He is currently registered as an honorary member of the executive board.

He was recently instrumental in the erection of a building for scouting purposes in his own community and has honored Eagle Scouts from his community's Scout units with 4-year college scholarships.

It is impossible to do justice to this man in the little time I have here tonight. Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor for me to present to you the Honorable B. EVERETT JORDAN, U.S. Senator.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the National Dental Health Assembly meeting in Washington February 7, concentrated on its concern for the dental health of Americans. The meeting was cosponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service and the American Dental Association. The subject matter was mostly limited to the question of fluoridation of water supplies.

The dinner audience of over 500 delegates was treated to a remarkable address given by Dr. Robert Felix, now the dean of the School of Medicine at St. Louis University, but known to many of us in Washington and in the Senate because of his service as Director of the National Institute of Mental Health.

As Dr. Felix said:

We have had extremism with us from our earliest days as a Nation. We can even testify that some of these extremists, such as Samuel Adams and Henry David Thoreau, were not only not enemies of the Republic, but even, paradoxically, contributors to its strengths, directly or indirectly.

At this meeting, members of our own Public Health Service contributed much by participating in panels, and the dentists themselves gave scientific witness to the effectiveness of controlling dental caries.

Dr. Felix' address is not only a convincing argument for fluoridation, but is an enlightened treatise on the subject of extremism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Felix' address be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

THE PSYCHIATRIST LOOKS AT EXTREMISM

(By Robert H. Felix, M.D., M.P.H. dean, School of Medicine, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., formerly Director, National Institute of Mental Health and president of American Psychiatric Association)

I can sympathize with the bruises you have received, and console you by reminding you that the intensity of feeling can be no greater, nor the edge of the invective heaped on you can be no sharper than what we in my chosen field of mental health have and still are experiencing.

If you think you have had problems from people with extreme points of view, I refer you to the testimony on the Alaska mental health bill or much that has been said both pro and con about psychoanalysis. I suppose one reason why we in mental, and you in dental health, find so much in common is because the two words differ only by one letter; and, anyway, in both cases the trouble is in the head.

Webster has a simple definition for extremism: "The quality or state of being extreme: radicalism."

It may be true that the instant images you bring to this consideration of Webster's definition are such as these: hooded Ku Klux Klan members and fiery crosses; attacks upon former President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Warren by certain quasi-political groups, college students on a sit-down demonstration; antifluoridationists, especially the

"little old women in tennis shoes,"—flambuoyantly waving their poison pamphlets.

Let us keep one or two points ever before us, however. In many cases, today's extremist is tomorrow's conservative, and sometimes he can be as extreme in his conservatism as he was in his extremism. To be extreme is not necessarily to be wrong any more than to be conservative is necessarily to be right. To be irrationally extreme is dangerous but to be out in front of the majority may be evidence both of wisdom and bravery. By the standards of this day, the barons who forced King John to sign the Magna Carta were extremists. Those who tossed the tea into Boston Harbor were extremists. The women who demonstrated for suffrage were extremists. To be an extremist usually is to be a nonconformist, but not necessarily to be evil or stupid. By the same token, some extremists are both. The problem is to tell the difference between them.

A ROSE BY OTHER NAMES

General use of the word, "extremism," is rather new. As the late Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., wrote, in a posthumously printed article in the Saturday Review:

"The presidential campaign of 1964 introduced the word 'extremism' into our political vocabulary as a synonym for ultraconservatism but the phenomenon itself is anything but new. Throughout our history it has lurked under the surface of public life, finding an escape hatch at more or less definite intervals. Psychologically the outbreaks have also borne striking resemblances, even though the professed objectives have shifted as occasion required."

Thus, we have had extremism, or its equivalent by some other name, with us from our earliest days as a Nation: The Antimasonites in the early 1800's; the Know-Nothings of the middle 19th century; both the carpetbaggers and Ku Klux Klan after the War Between the States; and the latter again in the post-World War I era, and today in their third resurgence; and the American Protective Association in the late 19th century. It is interesting to contemplate on the fact that in my final draft of this manuscript, I included other examples of extremism from more recent times, but that I eliminated them finally, because they are still so feeling-laden that I could possibly distract some to whom these words eventually might come because of the emotions those examples could trigger off.

We have had eminent men in our history who, at one time or another, were classified as extremist types: Samuel Eliot Morison describes respectable Samuel Adams of Boston, master of the town meeting and member of the Massachusetts Assembly as "alone among leaders of the American Revolution a genuine revolutionary, resembling in several respects the Communist agitators of our time." Henry David Thoreau, the New England writer and philosopher whose books became the great inspiration for the action patterns of Mahatma Gandhi, was censured for his unorthodoxy and imprisoned for his opposition to paying taxes. It was Thoreau who wrote a rather lovely defense of individualism:

"If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

We can say at this point in our discourse that the prospect of evidences of extremism on our landscape today is not a bleak one. The Republic has stood. Young though we feel our Nation is, ours is the oldest stable government in the world. In the words of Schlesinger, "The outcome of all the extremist movements was in every case the same, for each upon reaching its peak speedily declined, as if the public, surprised at itself, suddenly recovered its balance."

We can also say that some of our impassioned spokesmen who have, indeed, heard a different drummer, and who have recommended to their audiences a radical approach, have not only not been enemies of the Republic but even, paradoxically, contributors to its strengths, directly or indirectly.

ALL OPPONENTS OF FLUORIDATION ARE NOT EXTREMISTS

Before we delve more deeply into the issue, I believe I should make clear that all the opponents of fluoridation are not extremists; on the other hand all extremists are not opponents of fluoridation. We can cite sincere individuals, some of them men of science, not yet able to swallow fluoridated water if they know what they are drinking. We can ask how much of this is due to poor health education and how much is due to basic prejudice against water which has been "tampered with."

I am sure that we are all aware of the fact that we tend to label as extremist, those who oppose our point of view most vigorously. Thus, those who oppose fluoridation but exhibit some restraint and decorum, even though they may write professional tracts, or letters to the editor, we tend not to include under the label. They do not make such immoderate statements as "fluoridation is a Communist plot." They do not ride the bus lines, as I am told was done in one western city, and fan out from the main arteries to every home carrying the word, "poison" as if to light a bonfire of desperate opposition. The fact I would speak as I just have demonstrates how deeply ingrained in most of us is opposition to the behavior of extremists who disturb our accustomed way of life. It is not difficult to recall instances from our own history of similar behavior by men now considered national heroes.

Are there individuals showing extremist behavior in the ranks of the antifluoridationists? To be sure. They are there in the ranks of the opponents of mental health clinics, and many other institutions established for social good and for progress of the human race.

Have we overestimated the strength of the violent opposition to our favorite health measures and other institutions? Probably. We find it necessary to hold a national conference to hasten the implementation of fluoridation; the obstacles to universal acceptance of this great public health benefit are considerable. And yet, last November a national poll of usual accuracy showed that 63 percent of the citizens interviewed declared that they favored fluoridation; 20 percent said "no"; 17 percent had no opinion. A fraction of that opposing 20 percent may deserve its extremist spurs. See, then, how a noisy few can intimidate susceptible people and can actually slow the forward march of society. And this in spite of scientific discoveries which have been proved by meticulous scientific investigation to be safe and effective.

THE COMPLAINTS OF THE EXTREMISTS ARE ROOTED IN REALITY

Drs. Lowenthal and Guterman, in their "Portrait of an American Agitator," affirm that the chronic, vehement opposer of our commonly accepted social institutions, beliefs, and practices does not manufacture his grumblings out of thin air:

"His feelings are rooted in social reality.

"The modern individual's sense of isolation, his so-called spiritual homelessness, his bewilderment in the face of seemingly impersonal forces of which he feels himself a helpless victim, his weakening sense of values—all these simply supply the basic motifs of the greatest writers of our time. This malaise reflects the stresses imposed on the individual by the profound transformations taking place in our economic and social structure.

"Correlated with this phenomenon are such developments as the replacement of the class of small, independent producers by gigantic bureaucracies, the decay of the patriarchal family, the breakdown of primary personal ties between individuals in an increasingly mechanized world, and the substitution of mass culture and traditional patterns."

All of us can respond to that picture of today's rocketed, computerized world and its effects.

WHO ARE THE CLASSICAL EXTREMISTS?

It is excessive reaction and excessive demonstration against the changes we are all experiencing which causes concern and even anxiety.

The extremist attempts to transmit his strong emotional feelings to all whom he can reach. He encourages distrust of those in positions of power and consequence; he describes the helplessness of the average individual in the face of fancied dilemma; he suggests that the citizen is barred from the councils of power and decision; he pictures dire disasters to come; he invites disillusionment, implying that under the cloak of humanitarianism and justice current leaders perpetrate sinister plans.

Emotion, clearly, is the extremist's instrument. We are told that Grand Wizard Simmons of the early Ku Klux Klan movement said quite plainly: "The Klan does not believe that the fact that it is emotional and instinctive, rather than coldly intellectual, is a weakness. All action comes from emotion rather than from ratiocination."

It cannot be argued that the extremist is ipso facto anti-American, frightening though his words and behavior may be, and though his deeds may run the gamut from character assassination to actual assassination. The extremist has been described neatly as "a well-meaning person believing earnestly that he is fighting dragons that threaten catastrophe to himself and his country."

Doctors Marmor, Bernard, and Ottenberg have done interesting work on the "Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs." They describe the vehement opponents as leaders who fall into two main groups: Those who are motivated by factors of personal power, prestige, or gain; and those who are motivated by powerful anxieties or hostilities, the true sources of which are unconscious. They are often individuals of great ability, intelligence, and the capacity to arouse intense fervor and passion in others. In extreme forms they assume the role of the godlike crusader, the charismatic leader, who is ready even to endure martyrdom for the sake of "the cause."

SOME POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS

The psychiatrists who have participated in the study mentioned believe that the potential extreme opponent may be: "Any individual whose life experiences have been such as to leave him with deep feelings of vulnerability, either physical or psychological, in the struggle for existence; he is apt to respond with anxiety to anything which he perceives as a threat to his sense of intactness—or which, by virtue of being coercive, arouses in him, fears of being overwhelmed or dominated by forces which are endowed by him with mysterious or superhuman power.

"It is our conviction that the basis for most of the irrational anxiety that some health measures arouse in certain individuals is that the measures are perceived as constituting a threat either to their sense of bodily wholeness, or their sense of psychic wholeness including freedom of choice, or else to the wholeness of what we might call their life space.

"This is the common denominator which explains why we find the same individuals passionately defending themselves against the forcible entry of any foreign body—whether it be a vaccination, a mental health proposal, interracial contact, or a wave of immigrants from overseas.

"Measures which involve introducing something foreign into the human body, such as the fluoridation of water, are seen by such individuals as threatening their bodily integrity. On the other hand, the intense fear that mental health proposals arouse in certain people seems to derive from feelings of being threatened psychologically. The reactions of some of these individuals seem to reflect a fear that any psychiatric insights may expose their own underlying mental instability."

"Often these people," the team continues, "come from homes in which rigid, repressive, and authoritarian patterns have dominated their early developmental years, with consequent patterns of deeply repressed hostile strivings. To protect themselves against the emergence of these impulses, such individuals develop patterns of intense characterological rigidity, repression, and an ever-ready tendency to discharge their repressed hostility, or project their repressed strivings, whenever a convenient cultural scapegoat is presented to them."

THE CARE AND HANDLING OF EXTREMISTS

There are things we can do about extremism. We cannot wish it away. We cannot simply condemn it. We cannot even, logically, contain it unless the Nation's security is in jeopardy; for to do so is to jeopardize our own freedom. We can, of course, deal with the individual extremist who commits violence, but this is not getting at the whole problem.

The extremist invites militant opposition. He may feel that someday the masses will turn to him as a voice crying in the wilderness. Do you not know violent opponents of fluoridation, who have lost their cause to prohibit the fluoridating of a local water supply, who look to the day when something will go wrong with the machinery, or someone's demise is traced to fluoridated water? Today, that opponent sees himself as a prophet wrongly abused; tomorrow, he prays he may gain the victory.

Quoting again Drs. Marmor, Bernard, and Ottenberg: "Sometimes proponents of scientifically grounded health programs react to unreasonable opposition, not by withdrawal, intimidation, counterattack, or unperturbed determination, but by intensified advocacy. Apparently the experience of being attacked in these ways can stimulate deep personal anxieties and unconscious patterns of defense. As a result, a person's prior scientific basis for supporting a health measure may shift to a blindly emotional espousal of a cause, with all the concomitant drawbacks that this entails." Well said. We must be careful how we battle for our social benefits.

Here, then, are some general suggestions:

1. Guard against treating the vociferous opponents as though they were stereotypes, not individuals. Abandon the terms "crackpot," "lunatic fringe."

2. Stop trying to outreason the opponents, however satisfying this might be to you. This approach is a double-edged weapon. To outreason another is an aggressive act, creating frustration and disequilibrium in the intellectually overpowered individual. Listen with patience and magnanimity, or try cooperative thinking.

3. Guard against projecting your own conflicts onto the opponent. Projection is a complex, psychological device by which the individual frees himself from conflicts by blaming others for attitudes he dislikes in himself.

4. Avoid creating a stereotype of the dangerous, all-powerful anti. It is a seductive escape from reality. Too often it is an excuse for not taking a courageous stand, for not trying alternative action that will achieve constructive goals.

5. Develop a more flexible and intelligent approach in dealing with individuals and groups. You can proceed with greater soundness by breaking the mass into its constituent individuals, and by approaching each person as a distinct individual—a person with a name and a face.

THE COMMUNITY CLIMATE FOR MENTAL HEALTH

We are at a juncture now where I could expand for hours did I not realize it would be an extreme thing to do. I want simply to plead for emphasis on building a strong community climate for health. The great health programs which are developing today at all levels of government constitute a promise, eventually, of the elimination of the kind of obstructive forces we have been considering tonight.

For instance, you realize that the proposed mental health clinics have been as embattled as fluoridation. You understand, I am sure, that valuable research has been slowed by seemingly senseless opposition to these forward-looking, intensely human, programs.

Yet I believe, with all my heart, that answering the extremist critics of the mental health plans will gain us no advance. Ceaseless, dedicated, determined action, and constant interpretation to those in authority and those around us, can gain us the funds, the manpower, and the facilities that will develop the resources for individual help and, in the process, begin the creation of the kind of community climate that generates mental health.

BACKGROUND READING

"Battle for the Mind," William Sargant.
"The Ordeal of Change," Eric Hoffer.
"People in Quandries," Wendell Johnson.
"Science and Sanity," Alfred Korzybski.
"A New History of the United States," William Miller.
"Prophets of Deceit," Leo Lowenthal and Norbert Guterman.
"Extremism in American Politics," Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., Saturday Review, November 27, 1965.
"Psychodynamics of Group Opposition to Health Programs," Judd Marmor, M.D., Viola W. Bernard, M.D., Perry Ottenberg, M.D., American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, April 1960.
"Papers by Robert H. Felix," American Journal of Psychiatry, Community Psychiatry, Rhode Island Medical Journal.
"Checkmate for Rabble Rousers," Solomon Fineberg, Commentary, September 1946.
"Language Habits in Human Affairs," Lee.
"From Death Camp to Existentialism," Viktor E. Frankl.
"Oxford History of the American People," Samuel Eliot Morison.

SENATOR RIBICOFF AND TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, during the last year, as a member of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization, I have had the privilege of working closely with its able chairman, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], on the problem of traffic safety. His creativity and diligence in attacking this critical problem have been exceptional. He has contributed immeasurably to the recent heightening of public awareness of the fact that this is a problem that we really can do something about. And he is in large part responsible for recent efforts elsewhere in the Government on the part of the automobile industry to develop safer automobiles and other safety measures.

Two recent articles recognized the magnitude and significance of Senator RIBICOFF's contributions. One is an editorial in the Washington Post for Sunday, February 6, 1966; the other is Raymond Moley's column in the issue of Newsweek dated February 14, 1966.

Although Mr. Moley places more emphasis on driver behavior and less on the building of safer cars than I would, his recognition of Senator RIBICOFF's contributions is gratifying, as is that of the editorial writer in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that these two articles be inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 6, 1966]

CREATIVE SAFETY PROGRAM

Senator RIBICOFF is right in insisting that the new approach to traffic safety shall reach beyond the commonplace proposals that have been kicking around legislative halls and executive desks for a decade or more. It is true that there has been a serious lag in the adoption of standard safety measures. The country must now make up for past neglect by putting into effect many practices that it has heretofore merely talked about. But it also needs a more creative approach. For this reason we have great sympathy with Senator RIBICOFF's provocative stance.

A good case can be made for a crash program of research into the building of safer cars. Meanwhile much could be done through Federal legislation requiring safety devices that are known to be useful in averting sudden death on the highways. The National Safety Council seems to place too much emphasis on State and local measures. When local communities have done all that they can by way of improving their traffic laws, making their highways safer, providing for driver education and for automobile inspections, there will still be an important field for Federal legislation.

In our view, cars should meet minimum safety standards laid down by Congress or an expert body set up for that purpose. New cars failing to provide the required equipment should not be sold or utilized in interstate commerce. Of course, imports should be held to the same standards. It is not yet clear what kind of legislation President Johnson has in mind, but his promise of comprehensive regulations designed "to arrest the destruction of life and property on our highways," may well include a safety code for manufacturers as well as for motorists.

Congress recently passed laws permitting the Federal Government to require safety standards on the automobiles that it buys and to aid the States in setting up safety rules. We do not agree with those who say that these laws are adequate. But the task ahead is for a united drive against mayhem by motor and not merely a debate or controversy among the safety-conscious forces.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 14, 1966]

PERSPECTIVE: AUTOMOTIVE SAFETY

(By Raymond Moley)

Some years ago residents of and visitors to the State of Connecticut came to realize that there was a Governor there who was determined to take vigorous action to reduce the high rate of motor vehicle accidents. Among the measures he adopted were drastic policing, road improvements, public education, and warnings to drivers by signs and other methods. After the initiation of Governor RIBICOFF's "crusade"—his word—I was one of those who noted vast improvement in the behavior of drivers. There has been

substantial statistical evidence of this change, for Connecticut has less than a third of the number of serious accidents that afflict a State such as Nevada.

For a time RIBICOFF was chairman of a Governors' committee on automotive safety. Later, as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, he initiated many studies of the subject. Still later, as Senator he continued his crusade as chairman of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations. Last year he held extensive hearings which received testimony from many agencies, government and private. He has a bill before the Senate which provides for very considerable Federal study and regulation. This bill may be supplanted soon by a Presidential message and bill which was promised in the annual message.

TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

This investigation, together with the President's interest, makes the subject one of the most important public questions that will be faced this year. Such efforts as have been made will provide a vast amount of public education which, in itself, will have a salutary effect, I hope, upon the millions of automobile drivers and owners, government officials, at all levels, and also manufacturers.

A laborious examination of the testimony in those hearings, as well as material supplied by many public and private agencies interested in the subject, leads me to a number of very tentative conclusions:

1. In almost every accident there are three components: the driver or drivers, the environment outside the vehicle, and the vehicle itself. By the environment I mean the roadway; the regulatory agencies, including the police; and, in some cases, the weather and terrain.

2. Of those three, the driver almost always is the major cause of accidents. The environment is next, and the vehicle is third.

3. Measures to assure more safety must be directed at all three, with most emphasis upon the first two. And here the leadership must come from Government and the automotive industry.

4. Accident reporting is sketchy and varied, according to the jurisdiction in which the accident occurs. Thus, the raw data on which remedial conclusions can be reached are insufficient.

5. This lack of data greatly handicaps the many research activities that have been conducted for years by the automotive industry, the governments and various private agencies. The result is that those concerned have inadequate information upon which methods of improvement can be built.

6. In the automotive industry a great deal has been spent in money and talent, in individual companies and cooperatively, to create better and safer cars, to provide information for the guidance of many public agencies, and for the purpose of education in the schools and research institutions.

7. It must be realized that the tremendous impact of the automobile on our civilization has created problems which have accumulated so fast that all those concerned have had difficulty in mastering them.

8. The pressing needs are not only for more information, study, and research but, on the basis of what we now know, for more uniform and stricter tests for drivers; for more driving education, especially for the young; for inspection of all cars by public authority; for national standards in road construction and improvements and for more safety devices in new cars. Whether any or all of these should be done by the Federal Government or by cooperation among the States and local governments or, in the case of car design, be left to the industry are major issues in 1966.

THE GREAT URBAN CHALLENGE—ARTICLE BY MR. MORRIS KETCHUM, JR.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Morris Ketchum, Jr., the distinguished President of the American Institute of Architects recently wrote a most interesting article urging sound planning and the energetic cooperation of private business, local government, and the Federal Government as partners in building livable and beautiful towns and cities. Speaking from long experience as a distinguished architect and designer, his article makes clear that we can and must make our cities places of delight and beauty rather than dreary barracks and neon-lighted slums. At a time when the vast majority of Americans live in urban areas, Mr. Ketchum's call for sound planning and creative thinking for our cities is a message that cannot be repeated too often, and I am sure his thoughtful comments will be of interest to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The Great Urban Challenge," which was published in the G. E. Forum, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT URBAN CHALLENGE

(By Morris Ketchum, Jr., F.A.I.A., president, American Institute of Architects)

[NOTE.—Morris Ketchum, Jr., is president of Morris Ketchum, Jr. & Associates, an architectural firm which has designed buildings in 30 American States and several nations. Among the firm's recent projects are the U.S. Embassy in Rabat, Morocco; campus planning and buildings for the State University of New York; and several large schools and housing projects in New York City. Besides his position as president of the AIA, he is past president of the Architectural League of New York and the Municipal Art Society of New York. A recognized authority on department store planning, Mr. Ketchum has been a lecturer or critic at Yale University, Pratt Institute, New York University, and the Cooper Union.]

The greatest domestic challenge we face today, this distinguished architect believes, is the future of the city. For practical solutions to urban problems, he says we must:

Redefine the political and economic philosophy concerning use of public and privately held land.

Reorient our urban technology to solving, rather than creating, metropolitan problems.

Enlist the wholehearted commitment of business, local government, and the design professionals to create livable, beautiful communities.

The next 10 years may be the most critical in the history of our Nation, not excluding the wars which have attended its founding, consolidation, and defense of the free world. During this next decade, our mounting population, expanding technology, and the rapid decay of our urban centers will force radical changes upon the form, function, and appearance of the American city.

In the next few years, we may prove to the world that, for the first time in man's history, a democratic people can build cities that are efficient, livable, and beautiful—in short, an urban environment of excellence. It is equally possible, however, that in these same few years, we may, through default and apathy, create the most terrifying urban mess that man can imagine. America the Beautiful may, in all its glory and technical excellence, go down the drain.

HAVE WE GROWN TOO FAST?

My own feeling is that we have created the mess around us because we have grown so fast. In the headlong process of learning new things, we have forgotten a great deal.

An architect I know says of this: "It isn't that we're stupid. We just have lousy memories." It is a cogent statement. We have a rich and valid heritage in community design. Thomas Jefferson, our third President and an architect, designed not only Monticello and the campus of the University of Virginia, but several towns. He also made a design for the city of Washington before L'Enfant did, and he proposed a national public works program. William Penn's original design for Philadelphia was strong enough to guide the orderly development and redevelopment of that city to this day.

For whatever reason, these and other early communities were designed and built according to a plan. We design our mechanical contrivances and space vehicles and we plan our business affairs. The businessman who did not plan would be considered a fool. Yet, we continue to rebuild our towns and cities, expand our metropolitan areas, and tear up the suburban countryside without plans. We try to control unwholesome uses of land with nothing more than the weak and negative tool of zoning. We are just beginning to see the result.

The greatest domestic challenge we face today, I believe, is the future of the city. The problems are apparent, and the solutions, at least in outline form, are beginning to appear. In my view, they include: (1) a redefinition of our political and economic philosophy concerning the use of public and privately held land; (2) a reorientation of our urban technology; and (3) the energetic and wholehearted commitment of the business community, local government, the architectural profession—as partners—creating livable and beautiful towns and cities.

The political issue is no longer one of planning versus haphazard growth. Only the most misguided sort of person would argue today that community design is undesirable. We have seen and are still seeing the kinds of urban ugliness and disorder that result from the philosophy that land can be treated as a commodity for random, unlimited exploitation.

COMBINING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE RESOURCES

Now we face a fundamental decision. We know that our present system of unlimited and uncontrolled speculation is disastrous; yet we tend to find repugnant the policy of sweeping Government control which planned and built the new towns of Great Britain and Scandinavia.

We combine the use of public and private resources when the Government condemns, assembles, and clears a tract of land under the urban renewal program and then sells it to a private entrepreneur. One of the best recent examples of this process is Constitution Plaza, in Hartford, Conn. Roger Williams, the astute vice president of the Travelers Insurance Co., which invested $40 million in the project, recently pointed out that the site, prior to development, contributed $90,000 per annum to the city in taxes. As of 1965, it will contribute $1,456,000 per annum, and it has created a substantial building boom around it, literally rejuvenating the city.

There is no good reason why government should not participate in the redevelopment of the American city. Similarly, there is no good reason why private enterprise should not participate more fully and expertly than it is doing at present. Government could encourage this a great deal by granting tax rebates for property improvements, to name but one of many possibilities.

This, of course, would touch only a part of the problem. It is possible, as was suggested by an architect at the American Institute of Architects 1965 convention on the future of the city, that landowner corporations might be formed to make large-scale redevelopment projects both feasible and profitable, with development funds coming from both private and public sources.

SOLUTIONS THROUGH URBAN TECHNOLOGY

The technical issue is the present orientation of our urban technology. We have rarely used it to solve our massive problems of urban transportation—only to create them.

The size and scale of our cities are growing to a point that conventional cars and roads must, inevitably and soon, be considered obsolete as transportation tools of the 20th century. Thus, in our transportation plans we are turning to refinements of the train; in our transportation studies, we are considering new systems that combine the functions of private car and public train.

COMMUNITY COMMITMENT NEEDED

Finally, and perhaps most crucial of all, we urgently need the absolute commitment of the community leadership to this task if we are to make any significant progress. We have the resources in virtually every community to eliminate ugliness and create an efficient and beautiful environment. Government has the power to utilize programs available at Federal, State, and local levels. It has the power to make regulations and enact ordinances which control the use to which land can be put; it has the authority to launch large-scale design projects and to do many smaller but useful things such as regulating the size and appearance of store and street signs, establishing a municipal tree-planting program, and seeing to it that power lines are placed underground.

The city planning commission is generally the only agency with the authority to create the master plan which the progressive community needs to guide its development. The business leadership, with its demonstrated ability to get things done, is often the only cohesive element within the community which can provide the necessary inspiration, finances, and staying power. Architects and their fellow design professionals are the only ones who can provide the design skills needed to translate social and economic needs into structures, spaces, and beauty.

PUBLIC SUPPORT IS ESSENTIAL

Each of these three forces—local government, the business community, the architectural profession—has a second role to play. It is the common duty of each to help awaken the interest and then to educate and finally to enlist the continuing support of the public.

The American Institute of Architects, for example, has launched a nationwide war on community ugliness to awaken and inform the general public. Architects in 160 Institute chapters are being armed with technical information and promotional tools. We recently produced a major motion picture entitled "No Time For Ugliness." A series of "aesthetic responsibility" conferences has been held with business and government leaders in many communities throughout the Nation. Three filmstrips have been placed in thousands of high schools. We are planning a new program to create an appreciation of the urban environment in primary-grade children. All of these activities have been backed up by a continuing publicity effort in newspapers, magazines, and broadcast media.

Given an enlightened public, a sympathetic Government, and the unrelenting leadership of the business community, what is it that we can aspire to? We can create great compositions of urban design to remake the urban core, separate pedestrians and vehicular traffic, and attract people to the center of the city as we did many years ago at Rockefeller Center in New York and recently at Constitution Plaza in Hartford.

We can replace the gray areas around our midtown districts with greenbelts which rival the beauty of those in Stockholm. We can create great parks such as those of Rock Creek Park in Washington and the Boston Commons; shape delightful small parks and squares as we have done in San Francisco and Philadelphia; enhance the beauty of our small manmade waterways, as in San Antonio; and transform blighted and rundown streets into gay, stimulating malls, as those of Canton, Ohio, and Fresno, Calif.

We can at last create great outdoor spaces of the stature of the Spanish Steps, the Campidoglio, and St. Peter's Square in Rome; the Piazza San Marco in Venice; and the Place Vendome and Place de la Concorde in Paris. Such a great urban space is part of the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan for our Capital City.

We can create new, self-contained satellite towns with appropriately related houses, townhouses, apartment buildings, business structures, village centers, and open spaces, as is being done at Reston, Va.; Columbia, Md.; and Irvine Ranch, Calif. We can make dynamic plans for the redevelopment of great cities, as is being done in Detroit and Boston. And we can, as we have done in Canton, Fresno, and a few other places, demonstrate how well-designed benches, pools, trash baskets, telephone booths, street lighting fixtures, and textured pavements can enhance urban living in the most modest of circumstances and smallest of spaces. These cosmetic improvements are highly desirable, and can add gaiety and stimulation to the city. But they must not be confused with the need for large-scale design changes in our urban centers.

THE CITIES WE DESERVE

The city is the natural gathering place for our thinkers, our innovators, and our specialists. It is where education flourishes and art is born. It is the generator of our national wealth. There is no earthy reason why it should be dirty, dull, urgly, and generally unlivable. It should be, in fact, our greatest work of art.

It has been said that the values and accomplishments of any age can be measured by the quality of the architecture it leaves behind. Another way of saying this is that people get the kind of urban life they deserve. But if they never have a chance to know what city life can be like, then we cannot justly blame them for spending their lives in drab and ugly surroundings.

If, after experiencing urban beauty and stimulation, the Nation's citizens reject it at the polls and in their citizens' meetings and elect to ride through the neon jungle eating chicken-in-a-basket, we can say they got the ugly cities they deserve. But not until that day. It is our mission to give them the opportunity to make an informed choice. For myself, I have no doubt what it will be.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MEDICARE ENROLLMENT PERIOD

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have today asked my able and distinguished colleague from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] to add my name as a cosponsor to his bill S. 2882, which would amend title 18 of the Social Security Act to extend to June 30 the period for enrollment in the program of supplementary benefits for the aged as provided under part B of that title. This program is an important part of the medicare legislation which we enacted last year.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, despite the miracle of modern instantaneous communications, many older citizens who are eligible for the part B program do not realize that the deadline for enrollment in it, which is March 31, is virtually upon us. If they fail to sign up, they will have to wait 2 more years before they again become eligible.

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, many elderly people are not fully aware of the fact that there is more to medicare than the hospitalization program in which they have been automatically enrolled. Pennsylvania's able and compassionate secretary of public welfare, Arlin M. Adams, has told me that he has appeared on television several times in an effort to spread the word about the supplementary benefits of medicare and about the imminence of the March 31 deadline for signing up.

S. 2882 has been referred to the Committee on Finance. I respectfully urge its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to schedule early consideration of this urgently needed measure. Meanwhile, I urge my fellow Pennsylvanians who are 65 or older to enroll in the part B program before the March 31 deadline.

VIETNAM VICTIMS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a revealing article entitled, "The People Beneath the War," by Raymond R. Coffey, appeared in a recent issue of the Nation magazine. Coffey has just returned from a 4-month reporting assignment in Vietnam for the Chicago Daily News.

This article, which is a straight piece of reporting, is one more illustration of the folly of our military commitment in southeast Asia, a folly the enormity of which will be increasingly apparent as this undeclared war goes on.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "The People Beneath the War," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PEOPLE BENEATH THE WAR

(By Raymond R. Coffey)

Representative ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois, was winding up a 2-day visit to Vietnam when he was encountered one afternoon armed with a movie camera and loping down Saigon's Le Loi Boulevard in a late November downpour. One of the more obscure Members of the Illinois congressional delegation, MCCLORY had dropped in for a firsthand look at the war as it can be seen from the well-traveled VIP path being worn into the Vietnamese terrain these days.

"I find the (Vietnamese) people range from indifferent to hostile," MCCLORY began as he came in out of the rain, joining a reporter in the shelter of an arcade. "But things are going well for us," he concluded. Though he appeared oblivious to the paradox in what he said, MCCLORY had neatly stated one of the saddest facts of the war.

Everyone talks about this being a political war in which the key to victory is, as the weariest cliche in Saigon goes, to "win the hearts and minds of the people." And yet, as the fighting grows in scale and intensity, there appears to be more and more inclination to judge progress in military terms alone. What's happening to the Vietnamese people, what they're getting out of it all, and what they think about the war appears to be of ever-diminishing concern.

The shooting war is coming to be such a full-time job that political and social problems get shuffled to the bottom of the pile. And, almost imperceptibly, people like McClory—and others with considerably more experience and responsibility in Saigon—develop the notion that the war can be going well even if the Vietnamese are indifferent, hostile, apathetic, or unhappy. The fact is, the long-suffering people have been given little reason to support the Government side of the war. The U.S. goal, supposedly, is to guarantee them liberty and an opportunity to establish some kind of free and representative government. But if the shooting stopped tomorrow, the populace of Vietnam would still be stuck with a military dictatorship, a system that is astonishingly corrupt and incompetent.

It's probably true, as U.S. officials in Saigon insist, that the military is the only organization in the country capable of running a government in the current situation. It is also perhaps true that the last thing the country needs for a while is another coup. But it does seem that, with all the leverage our economic and military presence gives us, the United States should be able to lean on the Saigon government a lot harder to make it more responsive to and more concerned with the people.

The Vietcong are hardly popular heroes, despite what many of the antiwar demonstrators at home appear to think. They can be harsh and terroristic, they conscript labor and troops by force, they bleed the peasantry for rice and taxes. But they do, as one U.S. counterinsurgency expert in Saigon put it, have an "image of morality" and they do promise the people a better life, even if they haven't delivered. That puts them far ahead of the Saigon regime, with its generals roaring around in big black limousines and their wives getting rich by speculating in real estate near American bases.

Premier Nguyen Cao Ky, the jaunty little air force general who heads the present government, is considered to be personally honest and to have a genuine concern for his country. His own position, however, is precarious and he is trapped with very little personal power in a sick system that almost daily gives the people another reason to doubt in victory and its rewards.

Several weeks ago the U.S. mission pulled its aid representatives out of Binh Tuy Province on the basis of evidence that the province chief, a Lt. Col. Pham Dinh Chi, had diverted to his own uses a substantial amount of U.S. money. The aid men also had reportedly been threatened with death if they exposed the situation. Ky hemmed and hawed for weeks under U.S. pressures to oust Chi. Finally he did—but only to give him another post in the defense ministry where the pickings may be even better.

The government also talks a good game of political freedom. Ky informs student groups, for example, that they are free to discuss and criticize the government. Anyone who takes him at his word is looking for trouble. "We are not going to have seminars [demonstrations] in the streets," Ky says. One of Saigon's English-language newspapers was recently slapped with a 5-day suspension because a censor decided that it was printing news stories comforting to the Vietcong. Anyone who shows promise of leadership or of developing a following is looked upon as a dangerous threat to the incumbents, instead of as an asset to a county that needs leaders as much as it needs peace.

Shortly before leaving Vietnam, I wrote a story about a political-social action project in one of Saigon's worst slum quarters. A small group of dedicated young army officers and government officials had persuaded Ky to let them try a new approach among the poor who are most vulnerable to the Vietcong and have the least reason to believe in the government. They had recruited hundreds of part-time student volunteers who were helping the people to build schools, establish dispensaries, organize hog-raising coops, even to hold unofficial hamlet elections to choose their own spokesmen. The project greatly interested the United States; it was a hopeful new effort to "win the hearts and minds of the people." Ky and U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge themselves had visited the project.

But less than 24 hours after the story about the project had gone through the government-run cable office, a young army lieutenant, who is one of the leaders of the project, was called upon by a representative of the national police and reprimanded for getting "too much personal publicity."

The Vietcong promise the people land reform and a better break in life. Now and then the Ky government talks about reforms, too, but mostly it simply lectures the people sternly about how it is everyone's duty to support the war and the government. No one bothers even to tell the people what they might expect in the way of improvement if and when the war ends.

"They (the government) don't trust the people," the young lieutenant who was reprimanded said. "The crisis in our country is that no one has confidence in anyone any more. We cannot have a (social) revolution just by changing the actors in the scenario. We must start at the bottom with the people." The people, according to the lieutenant, don't believe anything the government says. They want to see action—the kind of action they were getting from the student volunteers in the slum project—before they will start believing words again.

The most discouraging thing about the whole situation is that the government, from Saigon to the remotest district, is indifferent to what the people want or expect. Every province and district chief is appointed by Saigon and is a military man with command responsibilities, as well as civilian administrative duties. U.S. military and civilian representatives out in the country complain that often they have a hard time even getting their Vietnamese counterparts to stand around and look interested in village civic action programs, such as visits by American medical teams. The U.S. representatives take great pains to make it appear that such aid comes from and is arranged by the Vietnamese Government. But their efforts are often futile, because the local Vietnamese government man makes plain that he knows nothing about the program and cares less.

A U.S. adviser, giving one typical example, said that his district chief agreed to take part in a food and clothing distribution program only after he was permitted to take for his wife a few of the surplus WAC blouses that were to be distributed among the needy women of a village.

If, then, the job is winning over the people, it is a job that is going very badly. And, despite McClory and the U.S. military brass whose opinions he was obviously echoing, the military side of the war is not going a great deal better. It's perhaps true, as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara says, that we've "stopped losing," but we're still a long, long way from winning, even militarily.

Astonishment is sometimes expressed that Hanoi does not seem exactly panting for the chance to negotiate. The reason seems plain enough; the other side is nowhere near convinced that it has lost all chances for victory. American and Vietnamese troops are inflicting tremendous casualties on the enemy. But our own losses are mounting, and, despite the thousands of enemy soldiers killed in the past year, enemy strength has grown. The Vietcong now control a greater part of the countryside than they did a year ago. Thus the Saigon Government is invisible and unknown in many areas of the country. How can people be persuaded to support something they can't even see, a government that offers them no security against the Vietcong?

The U.S. forces in Vietnam, now totaling around 200,000 men, are performing splendidly. They are brave, tough, resourceful, well motivated in battle. Beyond that, they generally exhibit more interest in and compassion for the people they're living amongst than does the Vietnamese Government. The same, unhappily, cannot be said of the Vietnamese military. They continue to suffer many more casualties than do the Americans, and that indicates something about their willingness to fight. However, many of their casualties still result from an apathetic unwillingness to learn the lessons of guerrilla warfare, and from a lack of aggressiveness and leadership among their officers.

The officer corps is very weak, excessively occupied with keeping Saigon happy and inclined to duck a fight. Vietnamese commanders are always more than ready to break off an engagement in time to get back to camp for lunch. They tend to look upon their jeeps as something they have been given to get their kids to and from school. Beyond all this, it is a fact that Americans don't really trust the Vietnamese who fight beside them. American commanders privately complain that security is often compromised as soon as the Vietnamese are informed of a military operation.

Another factor that weighs against the "things are going well" judgement of McClory and others is the massive increase in enemy arms and men being infiltrated from the north. The enemy is no longer a ragtag bunch of poorly armed guerrillas wearing black pajamas and wondering where their next bowl of rice is coming from. In the recent major battles in the Ia Drang Valley, for example, the U.S. 1st Air Cavalry Division tangled with North Vietnamese regulars who were well equipped and well armed with Russian and Chinese weapons, including a high proportion of automatic weapons that can be deadly against low-flying aircraft. The enemy troops were carrying, in many cases, a basic load of 120 rounds of ammunition per man. That is more than a whole platoon of Vietcong guerrillas would often have in days not long past.

The one great weapon we have that the enemy still lacks is air power. But air power, the way it is being used in this war, is not always an asset. There have been many calls for an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, but it appeared to some in Vietnam that a more urgent problem was restricting the "in-country" bombing of South Vietnam.

Our pilots have done a magnificent job of providing close air support for troops engaged with the enemy on the ground. And no one argues with the use of air power in those situations. However, there are also hundreds of air strikes every day against villages and other targets "suspected" of harboring the Vietcong in cases where there is no ground engagement. Thus one day just outside Saigon six Vietcong were reported seen among a string of thatch huts lining a canal. Hours later, long after the enemy had left, I rode along with a forward air controller in a light Cessna who directed a flight of eight Skyraider dive bombers in an attack on the target. Four huts were destroyed, four were damaged and huge black craters were torn in the surrounding rice paddies. Should it take eight airplanes and thousands of pounds of bombs to knock out eight flimsy huts? And what evidence was there really that the huts and rice paddies were owned by the Vietcong?

On another day, a paratroop unit approaching a small village drew half a dozen rounds of small-arms sniper fire. The unit halted and called in an air and artillery strike that level the village. It seemed an extraordinary response to a few rounds of sniper fire, and one not likely to "win the

hearts and minds" of any innocent civilians in the village.

Many of the Vietnamese jamming the refugee camps all over the country make clear that they came into the government areas not out of any particular fondness for the government and not to escape the Vietcong, but to get out from under our bombs. Top military authorities in Saigon say great care and discrimination is exercised in selecting targets. But some of the top counterinsurgency experts in the U.S. mission, and some of the advisers working out in the countryside, still believe the "in-country" bombings in some cases are hurting our cause among the uncommitted people.

But, as Congressman McCLORY's distressingly innocent comments made so discouragingly plain, there are people who somehow believe the war can be going well regardless of what the Vietnamese people think or feel or want.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION IN 1965

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in this year of water shortages in so many areas of our Nation, and with our growing awareness of the clear and present danger of food shortages resulting from the population explosion, a report from the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, summarizing its accomplishments during 1965, will be of interest to all of the Members of the Senate.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I ask unanimous consent to have this summary report printed in the RECORD.

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

RECLAMATION BUREAU'S 1965 ACCOMPLISHMENTS SUMMARIZED IN STATISTICAL REPORT

Accomplishments of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation during fiscal year 1965 played a significant role in establishing the new high level attained by the economy of the Western States and the Nation, Reclamation Commissioner Floyd E. Dominy said yesterday.

The agency chief made this comment in connection with releasing statistics on operations of the Bureau during the 12-month period ending June 30, 1965.

A highlight of achievement during the year was completion of Glen Canyon Dam on the Colorado River in Arizona. The second highest dam in the United States, Glen Canyon won the Outstanding Engineering Achievement Award—1964, which is presented annually by the American Society of Civil Engineers to "the engineering project that demonstrates the greatest engineering skills and represents the greatest contribution to civil engineering and mankind."

The multipurpose dam is the principal feature of the farflung Colorado River storage project, and revenues from its powerplant will pay the lion's share of the cost of the entire project, including the participating projects. The reservoir behind Glen Canyon Dam, Lake Powell, with its unique, beautiful scenery and its many-faceted outdoor sports opportunities, has already become one of the leading recreation areas in the Nation.

The other five dams completed in 1965 are: Norman Dam on Little River in Oklahoma; Clark Canyon Dam on Beaverhead River in Montana; Cheney Dam on the North Fork of the Ninnescah in Kansas; Norton Dam on Prairie Dog Creek in the Republican River Basin in Kansas; and the Willard Dam on Bear River in Utah.

These bring to 216 the number of Bureau storage dams and dikes. The reservoirs behind the structures have a total capacity of nearly 127 million acre-feet of water, or more than 40 trillion gallons.

The water stored in these lakes, when they are full, would be sufficient to supply all the water needs of every man, woman, and child in the United States for approximately 3 years.

During 1965 the Bureau of Reclamation also completed power facilities capable of generating 450,000 kilowatts. It operated 48 hydropower plants with a combined capacity of 6,248,800 kilowatts of electricity, and from these and 6 other federally operated plants it marketed more than 33 billion kilowatt-hours, realizing revenues of $100.9 million from the sales and other power income.

Reclamation's benefits to recreational opportunities and fish and wildlife enhancement were also cited by Commissioner Dominy, who said that 34.3 million visitor-days were recorded during the 1964 tourist season at 210 recreation areas on reclamation projects.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, when we created the Community Relations Service in 1964, we did so in the belief that one of the major hurdles in implementing the Civil Rights Act would be in the field of public accommodations, primarily in the South. This has not developed as we had anticipated.

We placed the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce because we felt it would be an instrument for assistance in public accommodations compliance, and the Commerce Department would be an appropriate place to carry out this mission. Now experience has shown that the Community Relations Service has not had to devote nearly as much of its efforts to conciliating disputes over public accommodations discrimination as we had expected.

The experience of the Service also has shown that there is an area where the Service increasingly has been called upon to provide assistance. And that is the area of our large urban centers where racial problems are on the rise. Just about everyone who has been concerned with the problem foresees now that this trend is likely to continue. Our legal instruments for dealing with racial problems are, of course, lodged in the Department of Justice. And just as we turned here for law enforcement when the problems were centered mainly in the South, Northern problems also land in the Attorney General's office. Unhappily, the problems that beset urban and Northern areas cannot always be approached through law enforcement.

As the Attorney General and his staff more and more ponder what they can and cannot do in these broadening areas, let us provide them with an alternative. Let us place the Community Relations Service where it can best function in the light of our emerging needs. Let us place it closer to the frequent point of entry of most of Federal Government's concern in civil rights matters. Let us equip this Government so that it can carry out its responsibilities in the most flexible, coordinated and swiftest manner.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege for me to join our distinguished colleague of Kentucky, Senator COOPER, in cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 133 designating February of every year as American History Month.

Today our greatest concern is the struggle for freedom in Vietnam. Our heritage demands the presence of American boys in that distant country. My concern is that some Americans are not fully aware of this heritage and why it requires that we honor our commitments in foreign lands. Setting aside 1 month out of the year to recognize American history will emphasize its importance and relevance to current affairs.

In the history of mankind, this country has played a recent but nonetheless vital and significant role. Here man has found freedom and has established a form of government to secure that freedom. Here man has found economic freedom and has devised an economic system to perpetuate that freedom. Here man has found freedom of opportunity and has organized a social order in which he has been able to extend this freedom to all levels of society.

This is the story of American history, a story which does not grow old with its retelling.

It was just 200 years ago that the liberties which we take for granted today were few indeed. This establishment and growth of freedom, which is the history of America, must be understood to be defended. As a writer once said, it is necessary that freedom be won by each generation of Americans or it will die. In order to win freedom anew, each generation must be vitally aware of its heritage and have such a stake in its preservation that they will offer their lives if necessary in freedom's defense.

Making February American History Month will stimulate a greater interest in our history in all parts of the country. Local and State historical associations and private individuals could effectively advance programs to stimulate and to further this interest generated by a Presidential proclamation.

February is the ideal month. It is the birth month of two of our greatest Presidents—George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Both of these men played monumental roles in the establishment of this Nation, Washington as the father of our country and Lincoln, who kept the Nation united and who helped to bind up the Nation's wounds after a bitter Civil War. It is difficult to imagine what the United States would have become had not these men come to the front to guide the Nation through turbulent times. February is also the month in which the U.S. Supreme Court held its first session back in 1790 when John Jay was the Chief Justice.

One historian reminds us that "out of the world of yesterday the world of today has grown; out of the world of today will come the world of tomorrow." Mr. President, how true those words are. Knowledge of the past is a prerequisite to wise action in the present. And the

actions which we take today will determine the future of tomorrow.

With this compelling obligation to know the past and to understand the consequences of our actions upon the future, it is right that renewed interest in American history is encouraged and stimulated.

We have been counseled that those who fail to know the past are doomed to relive it. Designating February as American History Month is a proper response to that counsel.

History teachers in schools throughout this country have continued to play their essential role in exposing young people to the American story. American History Month would serve to call attention to this profession and its vital work. It would give recognition to those dedicated men and women whose labors in the classroom are so necessary to freedom's preservation. They have our deepest appreciation for a job well done. American History Month would be an expression of our gratitude and assist their future efforts.

It is indeed satisfying to me to join Senator COOPER in his proposal that February be designated American History Month.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I commend the selection of the new name for this program—food for freedom. It grows logically out of the history of the program.

You may recall that when the food aid program was originally established, it was known almost entirely by its legislative designation—Public Law 480—and still is so known by many of the people associated with it.

But the people of the United States do not think in numbers—they think in meaningful concepts. So the name food for peace came into being as a fuller means of identifying the food aid program. It has been a fine name, a useful name. It is known by millions of Americans and by people all over the world.

Now, however, we are proposing to expand the program—to meet a greater depth of human needs. Food for peace does not fully delineate the new concept and the new framework of the expanded program. We need a name that indicates our broadened thinking and aspirations.

So the President has given us a new name—food for freedom. It suggests a program designed to meet the needs of the ultimate human aspiration: personal dignity under free institutions.

A STUDY OF DURHAM RATIONALE COMMITMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a controversy has been evident for some time in the District of Columbia regarding the so-called insanity test, or test of criminal responsibility established by the Durham decision written in 1954 by Judge David L. Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

I have received complaints from both professional people and private citizens in Washington, charging that too many of these insanity acquittals take place on the basis of the Durham rule.

I have heard charges that too many criminals are back on the streets too soon after a brief stay at the St. Elizabeths Hospital for the mentally ill.

I have heard numerous proposals for changing the Durham rule.

And I have even heard suggestions and recommendations that we go back to the M'Naghten test of knowledge of right and wrong in determining criminal responsibility of mentally disturbed offenders.

As you know, under the Durham rationale a person is held not responsible for a criminal act if at the time of commission of the act he suffered from a mental disease or defect, and if the act was a product of such disease or defect.

I am very concerned about the complaints concerning this rule.

I am concerned because whatever we do in controlling crime and delinquency in the Nation's Capital has wide repercussions throughout the rest of the country.

I am concerned because I believe that our Capital City must have the best, the most enlightened methods of crime control and the most advanced procedures for the administration of justice.

And I am concerned because the mental patient and his status under criminal law constitute a problem that has defied solution throughout history; indeed, it is a problem that remains unresolved even today.

Mr. President, because I consider the Durham decision a remarkable step forward in the administration of justice, I do not want to see this advance dismissed lightheartedly. I do not want us to adopt less satisfactory procedures because of peripheral rather than substantial difficulties involved in maintaining this one. I do not want the courts to revert to injustice because it is too difficult or too expensive or too inconvenient to make justice work.

To avert these dangers, I have studied the Durham rationale. I have studied the court procedure and have deliberated the insanity defense as it is seen by jurists, psychiatrists, and other specialists in the field of crime control. I, and staff members of the committee, have gone to the Metropolitan Police; we have talked to the professional staff of the St. Elizabeths Hospital, and we have asked the Federal Bureau of Investigation to check its files regarding the subsequent behavior of individuals who have invoked the "Durham rule" in the District courts.

We have done all this because I want to make certain that we do not condemn the Durham rationale for the wrong reasons.

We have done this because I consider the Durham rule more than just a rule of procedure or just a test of criminal responsibility.

We have done this because I suspect that the Durham decision has brought to the fore certain basic difficulties involved in using the insanity defense.

I believe that it has illuminated difficulties and raised questions which were hidden from view under the older insanity rules. These are questions that go to the very heart of the matter of determining who is legally insane and of proving it in court.

Under other insanity rules, these basic problems are often obscured by definitions of terms, by rules of procedure, by instructions to the jury, and by attitudes of the court and the law which are still imbedded in the age-old "classical" approach to crime that presumes, in all but the most extreme cases involving complete lunatics, that man's behavior is always governed by free will.

I do not want to belabor the free will question, but I believe that these are difficulties and problems connected with the insanity defense that should not be "swept under the rug" by rearranging unclear definitions and burdensome court procedures.

The Durham rule and our experience with it has confronted us with certain questions that need broader answers and with problems that require more basic solutions than are supplied by even such alleged refinements of the decision as those contained in the case of McDonald against United States, which raises standards for some evidence of insanity introduced by the defendant, lessens the burden to prove sanity for the Government and simplifies the causal connection between mental disease and crime.

I believe that these redefinitions and reformulations may have some value. However, I want to make certain that we do not attempt to eliminate substantive problems going beyond matters of definition and procedure with superficial solutions confined to definition and procedure.

It is true that today we still do not know exactly what to do with the psychiatrist in court. We do not know how to make the jury understand psychiatric testimony and most important of all we do not know how to bring legal and medical concepts in line with one another to serve the cause of justice rather than to frustrate the court.

Today we may deliberate the burden of proof issue and we may note the difficulties involved in explaining to the jury the meaning of such terms as "productivity," "substantial capacity," and other similar concepts. These are problems of definition and procedure.

But beyond this there is an even more basic problem. We do not know how many crimes are actually caused by mental disease or defect of the individual, nor do we have a standard of comparison by which we can judge whether the insanity plea is used excessively, or whether it is not used enough.

All we know today is that this society has recognized some offenders as being so mentally disturbed that they cannot be held responsible for their criminal behavior.

Should we persist in this recognition, it seems imperative that we exert our juridical and crime control efforts with respect to mentally disturbed offenders in two ways.

First, we should abolish obviously inadequate or erroneous tests of criminal responsibility or of insanity as such inadequacies or errors are discovered and reported by experts in the field of psychiatry and jurisprudence. A classical example of such inadequate tests is the "knowledge of right and wrong" test established by the M'Naghten decision.

Second, in order to assure protection for the public and justice for the defendant, in testing criminal responsibility we should rely more on psychiatric examinations in hospitals by staffs of experts than on legal maneuvering and manipulations in court. We should attempt to identify all mentally ill or defective offenders.

What I am saying is that we should be more concerned with determining whether or not an offender is mentally incompetent than with inventing techniques, definitions, and procedural devices to keep insanity pleas to the minimum.

In line with this, I believe that the test of the effectiveness of an insanity rule should not be established by counting the individuals who use the insanity plea in court, but it must rather be established by gaging the behavior of these offenders subsequent to their release from the mental hospital. These are important considerations in the overall picture because of imperfections both in our scientific knowledge in psychiatry on the one hand and in our legal concepts and court procedures on the other.

The thin line between criminal responsibility and irresponsibility because of mental disease is not always clearly visible.

Thus, we are confronted with questions of policy regarding how we want to react to marginal cases. It seems that the general public and certain segments of the legal profession and law enforcement would like to treat them as criminals rather than as patients.

And yet, if we send even marginal cases to the mental hospital and rehabilitate them so that they no longer break the law, we have scored a success.

On the other hand, if we send such marginal cases to prison, they may come back to haunt society after their release, more mentally disturbed, more irresponsible, and more crime prone than ever before, because whatever the prison does to men, it does not cure mental illness.

This is the type of reasoning which has led me to support in principle a rather general and inclusive rule of criminal responsibility instead of a narrow and restrictive one.

This is the type of reasoning that has led me to undertake a study of the extent of lawbreaking by individuals released from St. Elizabeths Hospital subsequent to a mandatory commitment after an insanity defense.

The important thing is to render the dangerous person harmless. And it is best to do this by correction rather than simply by incarceration.

I have attempted to determine to what extent the Durham rule offenders contribute to the crime problem here in the District subsequent to their release from a mental hospital. I have tried to determine what steps must be taken to protect the community from the violent and destructive acts of mentally disturbed persons, and what must be done in turn to protect these sick people from gross injustice and mistreatment because of a lack of understanding on the part of law enforcement officers, the administrators of justice, and the public.

We found that between 1954 and 1961, 324 persons were committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital after the court found their crimes to be "products" of mental disease or defect under the Durham rationale. From these 324, 116 who were subsequently released from the hospital became the subject of the subcommittee's inquiry.

During these 7 years, insanity acquittals under the Durham rule increased from 4 in 1954, to 110 in 1960, which was the peak year. The number of successful insanity defenses dropped to 90 in 1961 and have ranged annually between 50 and 90 through 1965. Many critics pointed to the initial overall increase as proof that mentally competent criminals were using the insanity plea as a device to evade the law. However, I submit that these figures have no real meaning since they neither show that some of the insanity pleas were unwarranted nor do they show that the insanity defense has been used to excess.

The statistics we obtained are not spectacularly revealing because they lack a standard of comparison. However, certain insights can be gained from a closer look at the figures.

A repeated complaint has been that the Durham rule offenders who are released prematurely contribute seriously to the crime problem in the District of Columbia. Some complaints went so far as to ascribe the mounting crime rate in this city in large part to the releases from St. Elizabeths.

I would like to rebut this as an irrational and largely groundless contention. The 50-or-so offenders that were involved with police subsequent to their release from St. Elizabeths, and this study covers a decade, hardly compose even an appreciable segment of the thousands of offenders tried in the District courts during this same period of time.

Another charge has been that one inducement to plead insanity might arise from the knowledge that the mandatory commitment to St. Elizabeths Hospital can be expected to last for a shorter period of time than a respective commitment to a Federal penitentiary.

The records show that for 26 persons acquitted under Durham for felonies, the mean period of incarceration was 15.2 months, and the median was 10.4 months. For 12 persons acquitted of misdemeanors, the mean period of incarceration was 10.5 months and the median was 8.0 months. Had these persons been found guilty and sentenced to a penal institution, they could expect to have been incarcerated for substantially longer periods of time. Such crimes as housebreaking and larceny carry penalties of 2 to 4 years, while robbery carries a penalty of 4 to 5 years.

If such statistics were known to defense attorneys and defendants themselves, this might induce some to rely on an insanity defense. On the other hand, the stigma attached to such a plea and the subsequently uncertainty regarding the length of hospitalization could just as easily discourage its use in other cases.

Another set of statistics obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation which are important for a broad evaluation of the Durham rule, concerns the subsequent behavior of the 116 persons released from St. Elizabeths Hospital. We found that 54 of these persons, or 46.5 percent, had been subsequently involved with law enforcement agencies at the time our study was concluded. Records indicate that 28 of these 54 releasees were arrested on felony charges, while 35 were arrested for misdemeanors. In addition, 10 of these individuals were charged both with felonies and misdemeanors. Thus, between them, these 54 individuals were arrested 63 times for a total of 48 felony charges and 87 misdemeanor charges.

I felt it would be significant to determine how the subsequent crimes of these 54 individuals compared with the original offenses which resulted in their insanity pleas and commitment to St. Elizabeths Hospital. We found that 18 individuals were charged with more serious types of crimes than those for which they went to court in the first instance; 18 of them were charged with approximately the same type of crime as before, and 18 were involved in less serious types of crimes. The average period of time between release from St. Elizabeths and the commission of the first offense was 1 year; 30 persons committed their first subsequent offense in 1 year or less; 20 persons from 1 to 3 years; 4 persons after 3 years or more.

In an effort to obtain as complete a picture as possible, we also submitted the Durham case names to the Metropolitan Police Records Bureau. From this check, we obtained relatively detailed information regarding 38 of the 54 persons handled by the Metropolitan Police Department. It is of some importance that 25 of them had felony and misdemeanor arrests and convictions before their insanity pleas and their commitment to St. Elizabeths Hospital. Subsequent to their release from the hospital, 10 of these 38 persons were charged with more serious offenses than the ones which led to their insanity plea; 14 persons were charged with the same type of crime and 14 others were charged with lesser offenses. The District figures are not in addition to, but are included in the figures supplied us by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

In reviewing these figures with respect to judging the effectiveness of the Durham rule, one must conclude that they are somewhat inconclusive. The 46.5 percent of those St. Elizabeths inmates sentenced under Durham who have subsequently been charged with crime compares well with the much higher percentage of repeaters among inmates released from State and Federal penitentiaries. The increasing use of the insanity defense under Durham likewise

seems a normal manifestation of a new law or procedure. It can probably be viewed as an expected growth occurring as defense attorneys and defendants become gradually familiar with the new defense.

Most of the figures we have obtained do not indict the Durham rule.

However, these figures do reveal a problem.

They show that certain potentially dangerous individuals find their way into society before they are cured, rehabilitated or made harmless to society in still some other way.

They show that close to a half of the Durham rule offenders released from St. Elizabeths are charged with subsequent offenses.

I note these figures because the primary purpose of our legal and correctional procedures is the protection of the public, protection of the men, women, and children on this city's streets, in our schools, in our homes, and on our playgrounds.

And, if we are to carry out this responsibility, we must make sure that all individuals who are dangerous to others are rendered harmless.

But we must make sure that in reaching for this goal, we do not bark up the wrong tree. We must make sure that we do not attack the law when the deficiency, may lie elsewhere, for example, in the release procedures from our institutions.

I believe that in evaluating the effectiveness of the insanity defense established under the Durham rule, we must be concerned with what happens to the offender before and after court, rather than what happens in court.

The following are my suggestions on the basis of the study I have carried out as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency:

I see no justification for a dramatic modification of the Durham rule, or as is sometimes suggested, for a return to the M'Naghten rule. The argument has been advanced that the language of the Durham rule is confusing to the jury, that it does not give concrete guidance to the jury, although there is some clarification under the more recent case of McDonald against the United States.

Mr. President, I believe that mental disease is a complex and intricate matter and we cannot make it simple and understandable to everyone just by inventing simple words or phrases to describe it.

I must emphasize once more that in criminal cases where insanity is used as a defense, we will have to rely more and more on the examination of experts regarding the substantive aspects of the case and less on litigation.

We may even have to force the psychiatric witness to decide the case, as it were, but we will not achieve justice by merely reducing our psychiatric and legal concepts to such simple and concrete terms or definitions that they can be understood by lay jurors, but at the same time no longer portray the true complexities of the factors involved in the case.

I believe that the Durham rule must be maintained because, with all its shortcomings, it is far superior to the M'Naghten test of criminal responsibility. If we retreat from this advance in our legal practice, we are playing a game in our courts according to arbitrarily established rules rather than according to the facts set forth by a reputable and growing science of human behavior.

I want to emphasize, however, that handling mentally ill offenders as patients rather than as criminals does not absolve us from our responsibility to protect the public. We must recognize that a mental patient can be as dangerous as the most deliberately vicious hired killer of the underworld.

I cited figures showing that 46.5 percent of offenders committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital under the Durham rule and subsequently released have been arrested again and charged with an offense. I also have figures which show that a considerable number of persons have escaped from the hospital and have been arrested and charged with an offense.

These figures do not signify that the Durham rule should be abolished or that it is ineffective. But they do signify that the security measures at St. Elizabeths Hospital or any other facility handling dangerous mental patients must be similar in some respects to those maintained in prisons.

In line with this, I think it is of the utmost importance that the administration of St. Elizabeths Hospital have the necessary staff, facilities, and resources to establish adequate security, classification, and evaluation measures. The director of the hospital should be able to maintain court-committed patients in the institution until such time as they are pronounced sufficiently cured by the staff of experts retained by the hospital.

I hope that the administration of the hospital and the Metropolitan Police Department can maintain sufficient liaison and cooperation so that we do not have to be confronted with the situation we have seen in the past where the hospital did not know that some of its inmates who had escaped were rearrested and the police were not aware that the persons they arrested were escapees from the hospital.

I recommend that if the necessary security measures cannot be adopted to general mental hospitals, funds should be made available to build special new facilities either at the hospitals or separate from them to house mentally disturbed offenders subsequent to a court commitment. By definition, a mentally ill person must be committed to an institution for an indeterminate period of time. We owe the public the protection of keeping him there until cured. Conceivably, some such patients must remain in the institution for life.

In my support of the principles contained within the Durham rule, I do not fail to recognize that some difficulty is involved concerning the burden-of-proof question. It has been said that since the prosecution needs to prove sanity, while the defense does not actually have to prove insanity, many offenders who plead on this issue are committed to a hospital not because they are in fact insane, but rather because the prosecution could not prove otherwise beyond a reasonable doubt.

We can appreciate the logic in this argument. However, there is no question in my mind that we must go beyond this type of logic.

First, let me stress that if we can rely at all on the competence of psychiatrists we can rely on their ability to reflect a patient's mental disease in their expert testimony, despite the fact that many times they are unable to indicate the depth and intricacy of the ailment.

Second, let me stress that if we can more effectively return a disturbed person to a normal life through means other than penal commitment we have achieved our objective.

We are increasingly proposing laws that provide treatment to criminal offenders in place of penal commitment and punishment. A case in point is the administration's Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1965, which is presently before a special judiciary subcommittee of which I am chairman.

The individuals covered under these proposals are not insane by any conventional definition of the concept of insanity.

Yet, we are committing them for treatment because their crimes are often, we feel, products of a mental or emotional condition over which they have little control. There are I am sure other types of offenders who could be effectively rehabilitated by procedures other than those which are strictly punitive.

Therefore, I would not question the kind of leniency that allows marginal cases to be handled as mental patients rather than as willful criminals.

However, if we want to protect the public from destructive acts of mentally disturbed persons, and I believe this is our foremost obligation, then failing to put them in prison as we do with convicted felons, we must keep them in sufficiently secure institutions as if they were felons. And we must make certain that when they are released, the hospital records show substantial cause for proclaiming them cured or rehabilitated.

I believe this is a sound procedure because it affords protection to the public and it gives the treatment to the mental patient which he would not receive in a penal correctional institution.

I believe this procedure is by far sounder than the "ostrich approach" of sending mentally diseased men and women to prison, hoping that they will be miraculously cured and rehabilitated in a place we know to be traditionally incapable of producing such resurrections.

Mr. President, to help carry out these suggestions on a nationwide basis and to determine additional ways of handling persons whose crimes are found to be products of mental diseases or defects or other special conditions, I propose that a conference be held under the auspices of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including representatives of the bar, the medical profession, the judiciary, law enforcement agencies and the staffs of mental and correctional institutions to review and evaluate present policies and

procedures for implementing the Durham rule and other tests of criminal responsibility especially in light of the experiences in this regard in the District of Columbia.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT OF 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CASE, HART, JAVITS, MORSE, MCNAMARA, PROXMIRE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, DODD, MCCARTHY, SCOTT, YOUNG of Ohio, HARTKE, NEUBERGER, BAYH, NELSON, RIBICOFF, MCINTYRE, MONDALE, and KENNEDY of New York, I introduce the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

We had hoped, when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were passed, those acts would be the last for a period of time that it would be necessary for Congress to pass in the field of civil rights.

What has happened is that, despite the judicial findings of the Federal courts and despite the affirmations by Congress in the form of legislation, it has become extremely difficult for individuals to advocate their constitutional rights in certain sections of the South. In fact over a large portion of the country, men and women do not feel free in asserting their legal and constitutional rights.

NEED FOR BILL

It is not my purpose today to call the roll of the brutalities and murders which have been committed, nor cite the instances in which juries have refused to convict when the evidence would seem to the outsider to be clear, or to go into too much detail and discussion of the composition of those jurors and of the influences which were being brought to bear upon them.

I have assembled a large number of such cases and, if challenged, they can be submitted. But in the some 17 years in which I have debated this issue on the floor of the Senate and spoken about it to the country, I have been careful not to use any language which might inflame the passions or set one race against another or one section of the country against another.

I know that this is a real world, and that passions exist and the injustices occur, and; as a human being, I, like the vast majority of my fellow Americans, feel keenly about these issues. However, I believe we have been successful in conducting the discussion in the Senate on the basis of logic, with a minimum appeal to the emotion-arousing instances which could be multiplied at great length.

DIFFICULT TO ASSERT RIGHTS

Nevertheless, we as Senators cannot pretend to be ignorant of what as men we know is real. We read the newspapers. We have friends over the country. We talk to aggrieved parties. We even have friends in the South. And so we know what has been going on. What has been happening has been that it is a matter of great risk, in certain sections of the South—I do not say in all—for people to assert their constitutional rights, and excessively difficult, even when the case is overwhelming, to get action in State courts, and sometimes in Federal courts.

Those are the clear facts of the situation. They can be documented in great detail. I am not indicting any section of the country. The great crime of slavery, and for that crime we have been paying for a century after the abolition of slavery, has poisoned the relationships of people, not merely in the South, but over wide areas of the rest of the country as well. We in the North are not at all sinless in this respect.

I have often said that if the situation were reversed the people in the North would not behave any better than the people in the South and would have acted in a similar way.

The bill, which 20 of us have introduced today, is a relatively simple bill. It is designed to assure due process of law and the equal protection of the laws where crimes of intimidation, violence, and murder against Negroes and civil rights workers lawfully seeking to enforce the Constitution now go unpunished. I emphasize the words "lawfully seeking to enforce the Constitution."

The bill would carry out many of the proposals of the Civil Rights Commission.

In going over the report of the Commission on Civil Rights, I would say that virtually every enforcement provision of the present bill merely carries out a recommendation previously made by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. I have on my desk the report for 1963 and the report for 1965.

IMPROVE JURY SELECTION

In the first place, the bill is designed to improve the selection of juries in both State and Federal courts. Jury lists are sometimes manipulated in a strange way to obtain virtually all white juries or such overwhelmingly white juries as to make any other representation merely token and of no account. It provides for a representative cross section of the population on jury lists, and to avoid discrimination on grounds of race or color in the selection of juries.

That is buttressed by provisions which would set up jury commissions in each Federal district court, which would put into effect a sampling plan subject to the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, which would furnish a representative cross section of the population of the Federal district without exclusion on the basis of race, color, sex, religious or political affiliation, or economic or social status.

In addition, literacy tests are banned for Federal juries, but the judge may exclude illiterate jurors from particular cases where reading is a significant factor, except that no person shall be excluded on this ground who has completed the sixth grade in an English-language school.

CAN APPLY TO STATE COURTS

With regard to the State courts, when a Federal district court finds that there has been discrimination on the ground of race or color, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts would take over and would administer the selection of juries under the Federal system created by this act, and he might use the Federal jury list if that were practical. In other words, discrimination on grounds of race or color is the trigger for Federal action, but where this discrimination is found, the jury rules for fair juries apply.

These can be ordered into effect only by a Federal judge and upon appeal of the Attorney General. Of course, the assistance of the Bureau of Census can be called upon in the preparation of representative cross-sections.

JURISDICTION OF AND REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURTS

The second feature is an important one because it makes it possible for the Federal courts to have jurisdiction of certain crimes when Federal prosecution is necessary to assure equal protection of the laws. That may seem to some of those who read the RECORD, as well as to those who are listening to my speech, to be a very radical proposal, but I would like to read from the report of the Civil Rights Commission for 1963, page 125, recommendation No. 4. The Commission recommended:

> That Congress amend section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code to permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a District Court of the United States in cases where the defendant cannot, in the State court, secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State or because of the acts of individuals administering or affecting its judicial process.

So, we are merely carrying into effect the very important recommendation on this point by the Civil Rights Commission That was a unanimous recommendation.

If we may put this in simple terms, if a county or other political subdivision should exclude Negroes from juries, or deny the voting process to them, or otherwise discriminate in the administration of justice, State crimes against Negroes or civil rights workers would be triable in Federal court. But in order to give the Federal court jurisdiction there must be proof of such a segregated system of justice and, in the second place, a certificate by the Attorney General of the United States that prosecution in the Federal court would fulfill the responsibility of the U.S. Government to assure equal protection of the laws.

Under similar circumstances, the Attorney General may remove to Federal court a case which has already been commended in a State court. These provisions last for only 10 years and expire on the 1st of January 1975, or perhaps more technically speaking, 10 years after the date of enactment of this measure.

I hope that this will stimulate the States to purify their own jury systems and to improve their own systems of justice so that the transfer of jurisdiction need not occur in many cases, but will be held back in reserve and can be employed if the States and the civil subdivisions thereof continue to be derelict.

BROADENS FEDERAL OFFENSES

This title would also amend section 241 of the United States Code to broaden Federal offenses in the area of civil rights. It is believed that this broaden-

ing of Federal offenses may be the less important part of the title. The killer of a civil rights worker ought to be tried for the crime of murder rather than for depriving someone of his constitutional rights. Basically, that is what this title does.

EXTENSION OF OLD PART III

In addition, we have part III, which provides civil preventive relief to those who exercise rights under the 14th amendment to the Constitution. In a sense, this is the old title III or part III of the 1957 bill, which was debated before this body for many weeks, and upon which there was a rather close vote. It permits an individual or the Attorney General to obtain injunctions against violations of constitutional rights. This is now true in many circumstances, such as segregation in the schools, segregation in public facilities, the denial of voting rights, and the rest; but the proposed authority would also provide protection against police violence and private violence, and do it in advance, rather than to have, as so often occurs at present, futile subsequent trials, almost universally resulting in acquittal.

REMOVAL OF DEFENDANTS

The fourth title provides for the removal of defendants in certain cases from State to Federal district courts. This is where a county or other political subdivision provides a segregated and discriminatory system of justice.

Where a county or other political subdivision provides a segregated and discriminatory system of justice, those who attack Negroes and civil rights workers have almost universally done so with impunity, and Negroes and civil rights workers who themselves are charged with crime have not received fair trials.

Just as title II of this bill provides for the prosecution in the Federal courts of those who attack Negroes and civil rights workers in areas of segregated justice, so title IV permits the removal to Federal courts by Negroes and civil rights workers who are subjected to prosecution in such areas.

CIVIL INDEMNIFICATION

A somewhat novel feature is introduced by title V, which I think is crucial. It provides for civil indemnification awards by a Federal board in certain cases where a person is injured in his person or property or is deprived of his life while he is lawfully exercising rights protected by the Constitution. This would be done by creating an indemnification board within the Civil Rights Commission to indemnify persons killed or injured or who have lost their property because of lawful civil rights activities. Just as the Federal Government assists those who have served their country, and just as States provide compensation for injured workmen, so those hurt in the struggle for civil rights should also be compensated.

Under this title, the Federal Government would make payments to the injured person and would then have the right to collect such payments from the person who caused the injury and from the State or political subdivision where the injury was caused by a person acting under color of law.

The idea that persons injured by unlawful acts should be allowed to bear the full burden of their losses, physical and financial, is being gradually replaced by the idea that the community owes some responsibility to those people. This proposal is an attempt to apply that principle to the field of civil rights.

FEPC EXTENDED TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Title VI provides that the FEPC provisions of the 1964 Civil Rights Act shall now be made applicable to State and local governmental units. It is only by integrating State and local personnel engaged in the administration of justice that equal protection of the laws can be made a reality.

BROAD SUPPORT OF PROVISIONS NEED IS GREAT

As I have said, the Civil Rights Commission supports most of these provisions.

A recent study by the Southern Regional Council cites 93 deaths between 1955 and 1965.

The American Friends Service Committee, the National Council of Churches, and the Southern Regional Council have documented more than 500 cases of violence from January 1961, to May 1965.

The Civil Rights Commission reports 150 serious racial incidents in Mississippi.

The NAACP has forwarded hundreds of complaints to the Department of Justice.

I do not call the roll of these complaints, for the reasons I have mentioned; but the solid evidence indicates that there is a need for action. It may be that not every feature of the bill is perfect, but I hope that it will be seriously considered, not only by the appropriate committee, but also by the general public, and that we shall recognize the deep practical problem which underlies this whole matter.

We sometimes say that justice delayed is justice denied; but justice which operates under the threat of fear, intimidation, physical violence, and the rest is a justice which largely tends to be inoperative. We can enact all the laws we want; the courts can hand down all the decisions they wish; but if there is no will to obey those decisions, and if those who resort to the crudest of methods and then deny them are often almost certain to be freed in any court before which they may be brought, we have an inoperative system.

BILL MAY STIMULATE LOCALITIES

I do not believe anyone is more desirous of preserving the functions of localities than I am. I started my political life in a humble way as an alderman in a city. I have always felt the importance of local self-government.

It is my sincere hope that this threat of the removal of cases to the Federal court may serve as such a stimulus to State action that it will be seldom invoked.

I live in the hope that a new spirit is rising in the country underneath the ashes, and that more and more the American people in their hearts want to make these principles of equal rights a reality and are not condemning people because of their race or color.

This requires a good deal of change in our thoughts.

My mind goes back to 1956, when we were able to get only six votes in the Senate for a civil rights measure. However, something was started with that discussion, which helped to bear some fruit in 1957, 1960, 1963, 1964, and 1965. I hope that the measure we are introducing today may have a somewhat similar effect.

In conclusion, I should like to read a telegram which I have just received from Mr. Clarence Mitchell on behalf of some very fine American groups. It reads:

The bipartisan civil rights bill that you have introduced today offers hope and reassurance to millions of our fellow countrymen who are appalled by the unpunished, wanton, and destructive acts of violence against Negroes and other persons who work for the implementation and strengthening of civil rights. The objectives included in the legislative package offered by you and your colleagues have been discussed extensively and with deep concern by legal and lay representatives of the following organizations:

American Civil Liberties Union, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Veterans Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, Anti-defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Congress of Racial Equality, Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Council of Catholic Women, National Urban League, Protestant Episcopal Church Division of Christian Citizenship, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Fellowship for Social Justice, United Automobile Workers of America, United Steelworkers of America, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. All of us hope that these principles will become the law of the land.

Thank you for taking this historic step.

Additional organizations supporting your civil rights bill are: A. Philip Randolph Foundation, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Negro American Labor Council, and Clarence Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

I thank all my colleagues who have joined me in sponsoring this measure on both sides of the aisle. I am very grateful to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD and that it lies on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

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

The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk for 1 week, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 2923) entitled "The Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966," introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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 Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966."

TITLE I—JURY SELECTION IN FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS

Jury selection in Federal courts

SECTION 101. Section 1864 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1864:

"DUTIES, COMPENSATION AND METHODS OF SELECTING AND DRAWING JURORS.

"(a) JURY COMMISSION.—A jury commission shall be established in each judicial district, consisting of the clerk of the court or a duly qualified deputy clerk acting for the clerk and one or more jury commissioners, appointed by the district court. The jury commissioner shall be a citizen of the United States of good standing, a resident of the district, and, at the time of his appointment, shall not be a member of the same political party as the clerk of the court or a duly qualified deputy clerk acting for the clerk. If more than one jury commissioner is appointed, each may be designated to serve in one or more of the places where court is held, and the clerk and the jury commissioner so designated shall constitute the jury commission for that part of the district. In the event that a jury commissioner is unable for any reason to perform his duties, another jury commissioner may be appointed, as provided herein, to act in his place until he is able to resume his duties.

"(b) JURY SELECTION.—(i) In the performance of its duties, the jury commission shall act under the direction and supervision of the chief judge of the district.

"(ii) The names of persons who may be called for grand or petit jury service shall be obtained under a sampling plan prepared by the jury commission with the approval of the chief judge and designed to provide a representative cross-section of the population of the judicial district without exclusion on the basis of race, color, sex, political or religious affiliation or economic or social status. The plan for obtaining such names and the method for carrying out such plan shall be prepared in consultation with and approved by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, who may call upon the Director of the Bureau of the Census for advice and assistance.

"(iii) From the names obtained under subsection (ii) of this subsection, the names of not less than 300 qualified persons, publicly drawn by chance, shall be placed in the jury box, wheel, or similar device.

"(iv) The names of jurors for service on grand and petit juries shall be publicly drawn by chance from the jury box, wheel, or similar device.

"(v) In determining whether persons whose names are to be placed in the jury box, wheel, or similar device are qualified as jurors under section 1861 of title 28, as amended, the jury commission may use such questionnaires and other means as the chief judge, with the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, may deem appropriate, including the administration of oaths. The questionnaires may be filled out by the individual or by another on his behalf. With the approval of the chief judge, the jury commission may designate deputy clerks and other employees in the office of the clerk of the court to assist the commission in the performance of its duties, and to perform under its direction such of the detailed duties of the commission as in the opinion of the chief judge could be assigned to them.

"(c) RECORDS.—The jury commission shall keep records of the names obtained under subsection (b)(ii) of this section, the names of persons placed in the jury box, wheel or similar device, the questionnaires, if any, returned by said persons, the names and race of the persons drawn from the jury box, wheel or similar device, the names of those performing jury service and the dates thereof, and such additional appropriate records as the chief judge may direct. Such records shall be retained for a period of not less than four years.

"(d) ENFORCEMENT BY COURT OF APPEALS.—On application of any citizen residing in, or litigant in, any judicial district or of the Attorney General of the United States, alleging that the jury selection procedures or record-keeping requirements set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of this section are not being fully implemented, the United States Court of Appeals for the judicial circuit in which said judicial district is located shall, upon a showing thereof, appoint jury commissioners responsible to said Court of Appeals and direct such jury commissioners in the selection of juries and the keeping of records in accordance with such subsections (b) and (c) of this section. Where evidence is required for a determination by the Court of Appeals, the court may hear the evidence itself or appoint a master to act for it in accordance with law.

"(e) RETURN OF JURY SUPERVISION.—The Court of Appeals may, on its own motion or on application of the chief judge of the judicial district, direct the return of supervision and control of the jury selection procedures to the chief judge and to the jury commission for said judicial district at any time when the Court of Appeals finds that there is reasonable cause to believe that the jury selection procedures and record-keeping requirements prescribed in subsections (b) and (c) of this section will be fully implemented.

"(f) COMPENSATION.—Each jury commissioner appointed on a part-time basis shall be compensated for his services at the rate of $25 per day for each day in which he actually and necessarily is engaged in the performance of his official duties, to be paid upon certificate of the chief judge of the district.

"Each jury commissioner appointed on a full-time basis shall receive a salary to be fixed from time to time by the Judicial Conference of the United States at a rate which, in the opinion of the Judicial Conference, corresponds to that provided by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for positions in the executive branch with comparable responsibilities.

"Each jury commissioner shall receive his traveling and subsistence expenses within the limitations prescribed for clerks of district courts while absent from his designated post of duty on official business.

"(g) DELEGATION.—Any of the powers or duties conferred upon the chief judge under this section may be delegated by him to another judge of the district: *Provided, however*, That where part of a district by agreement or order of court is assigned to one particular judge and he customarily holds court there, as to such part of the district he shall perform the functions and fulfill the duties conferred upon the chief judge in this section."

SEC. 102. Section 1861(2) setting forth qualifications of Federal jurors is amended by striking out the words "read" and "write."

SEC. 103. Section 1863 is amended by adding the following sentence to subsection (b): "If the district judge determines that the ability to read or write English is reasonably required in order for jurors to perform their duties in any particular case or cases, he shall be empowered to exclude those who cannot read or write English, except that no person shall be excluded on this ground who has completed the sixth grade in an English language school."

SEC. 104. Section 1871 is amended by striking the words "$10.00 per day" and inserting in their place "$15.00 per day or loss of pay, whichever is greater"; and by striking the words "$14.00 for each day" and inserting in their place "$20.00 per day or loss of pay, whichever is greater for each day"; and by striking the words "subsistence of $10.00 per day shall be allowed" and inserting in their place "subsistence allowance given to Federal employees shall be allowed"; and by striking the words "jury fees in excess of $10.00 per diem" and inserting in their place "jury fees in excess of $15.00 per diem."

Jury selection in State courts

SEC. 105. RECORDS.—Each State or local court shall keep records of the names of all persons on the jury list for said court, names of those persons placed in the jury box, wheel or similar device, questionnaires, applications, or documents of any sort used in the selection of jurors, the names and race of the persons drawn from the jury box, wheel or similar device, the names of those performing jury service and the dates thereof, and such additional appropriate records as the judge or judges of said court may direct. Such records shall be retained for a period of not less than four years.

SEC. 106. JURY DISCRIMINATION.—(a) On application of any citizen residing within the area of, or any litigant in, any State or local court, or of the Attorney General of the United States, alleging that persons have been systematically excluded from grand or petit juries on grounds of race or color in such State or local court or that the record-keeping requirements of section 105 are not being fully implemented, the Federal district court for the district in which said State or local court is located shall, upon a showing thereof, direct the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, directly or through subordinate officials, to assume responsibility for the selection and administration of juries in that State or local court and the Director shall administer and supervise the selection of juries in accordance with the procedures set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 101. The Director may, if practical, use the Federal list or part thereof of jurors for the area in which said State or local court is located. The Director shall act without regard to State and local laws and regulations applicable to jury selection and service in said State or local court and all judges therein shall apply Federal law governing jury selection and service. The Director may, in accordance with civil service laws, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys and employees, and make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out his duties under this section. The Director may call upon the Director of the Bureau of the Census for advice and assistance in carrying out his duties.

(b) Any final judgment of any Federal or State court within five years prior to the filing of the application in the district court and whether prior to or after the effective date of this Act, determining that there has been systematic exclusion from jury service on grounds of race or color in any State or local court, shall establish such exclusion unless the State or local court, through its clerk or other appropriate official, satisfies the district court that such exclusion no longer exists.

(c) Whenever it is shown that over a period of two years the ratio which the number of persons of any race or color within the area of any State or local court bears to the total population of that area exceeds by one-third or more the ratio which the number of persons of that race or color serving on grand and petit juries bears to the total number of persons serving on such juries, this shall be deemed to establish systematic exclusion on grounds of race or color: *Provided, however*, That in case all or part of the two-year period antedates the effective date of this Act, the State or local court, through its clerk or other appropriate official, shall be given the opportunity to demonstrate that such exclusion no longer exists.

SEC. 107. The State or local court may make application for reinstatement of State procedures to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia which may approve the reinstatement of said procedures if it finds that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be excluded from jury service by reason of race or color, or that there will be continued failure to keep records.

SEC. 108. Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that any change in the qualifications, standards, or limitations on the right to a jury trial, operation of the jury system, or the selection of, or challenges to, individual jury members or panel, for any case or class of cases in any State or local court different from those in force and effect on January 1, 1966, will have the purpose or effect of circumventing this title, he may bring an action in the Federal district court for the district in which such State or local court is located to enjoin such change in qualifications, standards, limitations, operation, selection, or challenge and the district court may grant such temporary or final relief as may be necessary to prevent such circumvention of this title.

General

SEC. 109. Sections 106(c) and 202(f)(ii) shall not apply in any area unless a racial or color minority constitutes at least 10 percent of the total population of the area.

SEC. 110. Any person who willfully fails to comply with the record-keeping requirements of this title shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

SEC. 111. The provisions of 42 U.S.C. 1974 (a), (b), (c), (d), shall apply with respect to jury records required to be maintained under this title.

SEC. 112. This title shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment.

TITLE II—PROSECUTION IN AND REMOVAL TO FEDERAL COURTS

Federal trial of State offenses

SEC. 201. The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, concurrent with the courts of the States, of all prosecutions for offenses (whether felonies, misdemeanors or other offenses) defined by the laws of the State or of any subdivision of the State where acts or omissions constituting the charged offense occur, whenever prosecution of such offenses in a Federal district court is necessary and proper to assure equal protection of the laws.

SEC. 202. (a) Objection to the jurisdiction of the district court conferred by section 201 shall be entertained only if made before trial and in the manner authorized by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure in effect at the time of the objection. If such objection is not made before trial, the jurisdiction of the district court shall not thereafter be questioned in any manner or by any court.

(b) In the event of a properly presented objection to the jurisdiction of the district court under section 201, the question whether the prosecution of the charged offense in a Federal district is necessary and proper to assure equal protection of the laws shall be promptly decided by the district court sitting without jury, and its decision sustaining or overruling the objection shall be reviewable by interlocutory appeal to the Court of Appeals within ten days after the entry of the order.

(c) If any one of the circumstances specified in subsection (d) of this section and any one of the circumstances specified in subsection (e) of this section are established by a preponderance of the evidence, the district court shall find that prosecution of the charged offense in a Federal district court is necessary and proper to assure equal protection of the laws.

(d) The circumstances first referred to in subsection (c) of this section are that the victim of the offense is:

(i) A member of a racial or color group subject to the discrimination set forth in subsection (e) of this section; or

(ii) A person who, by words or action, was advocating or supporting at or near the time of the offense the exercise or enjoyment by any member or members of such group of equal protection of the laws.

(e) The circumstances second referred to in subsection (c) of this section are: that in any county or other political subdivision, where, under applicable State law the offense might be tried, the members of any racial or color group are—

(i) Systematically excluded from actual service on grand or petit juries in the State or local courts, whether their absence be caused by exclusion from the venires, or by excuses or challenges peremptory or for cause, or otherwise; or

(ii) Systematically denied in any manner the franchise in elections at which any prosecuting official or judge in the county or other political subdivision, or any official who appoints any such prosecuting official or judge, is elected; or

(iii) Systematically segregated in, or discriminated against in any manner in connection with the services or facilities of, State or local jails, prisons, police stations, courts or other public buildings related to the administration of justice; or

(iv) Systematically subjected to harsher punishment upon conviction of crime than those to which persons generally convicted of crime are subjected; or

(v) Systematically subjected to more onerous terms or conditions of bail or conditional release than those to which defendants generally are subjected.

(f)(i) Any final judgment of any Federal or State court within five years prior to the commencement of the prosecution under section 201 determining that there has been, on grounds of race or color, systematic exclusion from jury service in the State or local courts of the county or other political subdivision, or systematic denial of the franchise in any election in the county or other State political subdivision shall establish the circumstance described in subsection 202(e) (i) or (ii), as the case may be, unless the defendant satisfies the court that the circumstances described in said subsection (i) or (ii) no longer exist.

(ii) Whenever it is shown that over a period of two years the ratio which the number of persons of any race or color within the county or other political subdivision bears to the total population of said county or other political subdivision exceeds by one-third or more the ratio which the number of persons of that race or color serving on grand and petit juries bears to the total number of persons serving on such juries, or the ratio which the number of persons of that race or color registered to vote bears to the total number of persons registered to vote, this shall be deemed to establish the circumstances described in subsection 202(e)(i) or (ii); provided, however, that in case all or part of the two-year period antedates the effective date of this Act, the defendant shall be given the opportunity to demonstrate that such exclusion from juries or franchise no longer exists.

SEC. 203. (a) Prosecutions under the jurisdiction conferred by section 201 shall be commenced by indictment by a Federal grand jury in all cases in which the Constitution requires that prosecution be by indictment; in other cases, prosecution may be by indictment or by information.

(b) The district court shall not proceed in the exercise of jurisdiction conferred by section 201 unless, as or prior to final arraignment in the district court, there is filed with the district court a certificate of the Attorney General of the United States that prosecution of the cause by the United States in a Federal district court would fulfill the responsibility of the United States Government to assure equal protection of the laws. Upon the filing of such a certificate, the jurisdiction given by section 201 shall become exclusive of the courts of any State, and the prosecution shall thereafter be conducted exclusively by the Attorney General of the United States or his designate. Upon the filing of the certificate, no State court shall have or retain jurisdiction of any offense charged against the defendant prosecution for which would constitute jeopardy in respect of the offense described in the certificate. The certificate of the Attorney General shall not be subject to review by any court.

(c) If the certificate of the Attorney General described in subsection (b) of this section is not filed at or prior to final arraignment in the district court, the district court shall dismiss the prosecution without prejudice.

(d) Notwithstanding the certificate of the Attorney General described in subsection (b) of this section has not yet been filed and no judicial finding has yet been made sustaining the jurisdiction of a Federal court under section 201 of this Act, Federal judicial, executive, administrative and law enforcement officers and agencies, including but not limited to Federal judges, commissioners, marshals, grand juries, prosecuting attorneys, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation may exercise all powers given them by the laws of the United States in order to prevent and investigate any offense within the jurisdiction conferred by section 201 and to apprehend and prosecute the offender or offenders. In any case where such powers by the general laws of the United States are restricted to felonies, the same powers may be exercised in cases involving misdemeanors or other offenses within the jurisdiction conferred by section 201. The authority given Federal executive, administrative and law enforcement officers and agencies under this subsection shall be exercised subject to the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, but if the delay of their exercise until a direction of the Attorney General is received is impracticable in order effectively to prevent or investigate any offense within the jurisdiction given by section 201 of this Act or to apprehend or prosecute the offender or offenders, they may be exercised without direction of the Attorney General. The Attorney General is authorized to issue rules and regulations for the implementation of this subsection.

Removal by the Attorney General

SEC. 204. (a) Where a prosecution has been commenced in any court of a State in respect of any offense within the jurisdiction conferred by section 201 of this Act, the United States may at any time before jeopardy attaches remove the prosecution for trial to the district court for the district embracing the place wherein the prosecution is pending.

(b) Such removal shall be instituted by the filing in the district court of the certificate of the Attorney General described in section 203(b) of this Act, which certificate shall identify the prosecution to be removed. The filing of this certificate, together with the filing of a copy thereof with the judge or clerk of the State court in which the prosecution is pending (which filing may precede or follow or be contemporaneous with the filing of the certificate in the district court) shall effect the removal, and the jurisdiction of the State court shall thereupon terminate and all State court proceedings

thereafter shall be null and void for all purposes unless and until the case is remanded. Following removal under this section:

(i) The jurisdiction conferred by subsection (a) of this section shall be exclusive of the courts of any State, and the prosecution shall be conducted exclusively by the Attorney General or his designate; and

(ii) No State court shall have or retain jurisdiction of any offense charged against the defendant, prosecution for which would constitute jeopardy in respect of the offense described in the certificate.

(iii) The certificate of the Attorney General shall not be subject to review by any court.

(c) Where the offense charged is one required by the Constitution to be prosecuted by indictment and no such indictment was returned prior to removal, indictment by a Federal grand jury shall be required within a reasonable time or the proceeding shall be remanded to the State court.

Sec. 205. (a) The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure shall apply to proceedings under sections 201 through 204.

(b) Any person convicted in proceedings under sections 201 through 204 shall be sentenced to the fine, term of imprisonment, or both, prescribed by the State law applicable to the offense of which he is convicted. For all other purposes of imposition or execution of sentence, including but not limited to the payment of fine, custody, probation, parole, and pardon, he shall be treated as a person convicted and sentenced under the criminal laws of the United States.

(c) Sections 201 through 205, inclusive, shall become inoperative on and after January 1, 1975.

Investigation of jury exclusion

SEC. 206. (a) The United States Commission on Civil Rights shall investigate the service on grand and petit juries by members of racial or color groups in the State and local courts of any county or other political subdivision in which it believes that there may be disparate treatment of members of different racial or color groups.

(b) Before publishing the results of any such investigation, the Commission shall furnish a copy of its proposed findings to the State or local court, the jury commissioners and any other officials responsible for jury selection in the county or other political subdivision concerned and shall give them an opportunity to controvert any of the proposed findings. Upon consideration of their responses and such consultation with the affected commissioners and officials as may be indicated, the Commission may revise its proposed findings. If any of those proposed findings remain controverted, the Commission shall cause a public hearing to be held in the county or other political subdivision concerned to consider the remaining issues of fact. Such hearing may be held by the Commission or by a person or persons designated by it who may but need not be a member or members of the Commission or its staff; the person or persons thus designated shall have all the powers the Commission would have in regard to the conduct of such a hearing. If any such hearing is not held by the Commission itself, the person or persons conducting it shall prepare a report which shall be forwarded to the Commission together with such comments thereon as local officials may make and with the record of the hearing. The Commission shall thereafter publish its findings and a detailed summary of the data on which those findings are based. Judicial notice of the findings of the Commission and the data contained in its detailed summary shall be taken in any judicial proceeding in any court.

(c) In any action or proceeding under this Act, the Commission's findings and summary of data under subsection (b) of this section shall constitute evidence of the facts presented therein and, except to the extent that the party controverting those facts satisfies the court, by evidence on the record as a whole, that particular findings or data are not correct, the courts shall accept the Commission's findings and data as adequately probative of all facts contained therein and shall make its findings in accordance therewith.

(d) In proceedings under this section, the Commission shall have all the powers granted it under all other statutes; and the powers conferred on it by this section are in addition to its powers under such other statutes.

Federal offenses

SEC. 207. 18 U.S.C. 241 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever, whether acting under color of law or otherwise,

"(1) Willfully injures, oppresses, threatens or intimidates any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or

"(2) Intentionally commits an assault or an assault and battery upon any person exercising, attempting to exercise, or advocating the exercise of, any right, privilege, or immunity secured or protected against discrimination on the grounds of race or color by the Constitution or laws of the United States; or

"(3) Intentionally commits an assault or an assault and battery upon any person using directly or indirectly, the facilities of interstate commerce, or traveling therein, or upon any person where the assailant uses, directly or indirectly, any facility of interstate commerce, or anything that has moved in interstate commerce, in the commission of the assault or assault and battery, when the purpose or reasonably foreseeable effect of such assault or assault and battery is to prevent any person or class of persons from exercising or advocating equal rights or opportunities free from discrimination on the grounds of race or color, or to intimidate any person or class of persons in the exercise or advocacy of such rights or opportunities; shall upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both; except that if in the course of the act or acts for which he is convicted he inflicts death or grave bodily injury, he shall be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for not more than twenty years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege or immunity covered by subsection (a) of this section, they shall, upon conviction, be subject to the penalties in subsection (a) of this section."

TITLE III—CIVIL PREVENTIVE RELIEF

SEC. 301. Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person because of race or color, of any right, privilege, or immunity, granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, such other person in his own right or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, may institute a civil action or other proper proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, order requiring the posting of a bond to secure compliance with any order of the court, or other order.

SEC. 302. Whenever any person has engaged or there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of, or hinder him in the exercise of, the right to speak, assemble, petition or otherwise express himself for the purpose of advocating equality of persons or opportunity free from discrimination because of race or color, such other person in his own right, or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, may institute a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, order requiring the posting of bond to secure compliance with any order of the court, or other order; provided that such other person above mentioned is a person described in subsection 202(d)(i) or (ii) and any one of the circumstances specified in section 202(e) is established by a preponderance of the evidence. The provisions of section 202(f) shall be applicable in proceedings under this section.

SEC. 303. In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this title and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

TITLE IV—REMOVAL BY CERTAIN DEFENDANTS

SEC. 401. Any defendant in a criminal action or in a civil or criminal contempt action in a State or local court may remove said action to the district court of the United States for the district embracing the place wherein it is pending if the defendant is a person described in either subsection (i) or (ii) of section 202(d) and if any one of the circumstances specified in section 202(e) is established by a preponderance of the evidence. The provisions of section 202(f) shall be applicable in proceedings under this section.

SEC. 402. Any defendant in any action or proceeding (civil, criminal or otherwise) in a State or local court may remove said action or proceeding to the district court of the United States for the district embracing the place wherein it is pending if the action or proceeding is maintained for or on account of any act or omission in the exercise of the freedoms of speech, of the press, of assembly or of petition guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States for the purpose of advocating or supporting racial equality or of protesting the denial of racial equality; or any act or omission protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against abridgment or interference by reason of race or color.

SEC. 403. The procedures set forth in sections 1446 and 1447 of title 28 shall be applicable to removal and remand under this section, except that any order of remand shall be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.

TITLE V—CIVIL INDEMNIFICATION

SEC. 501. (a) There is hereby established within the United States Commission on Civil Rights an Indemnification Board, hereafter referred to as the Board. The Board shall be composed of three members, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one member as Chairman. No more than two members of the Board may be of the same political party.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be five years, beginning with the effective date of this Act, except of those members first appointed, one shall serve for five years, one for three years, and one for one year. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(c) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate of $25,000 per annum, and the

other members at a rate of $24,000 per annum.

(d) Two members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 502. The Board may, in accordance with civil service laws, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, attorneys and employees, and make such expenditures, as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

SEC. 503. The Board shall make such rules and regulations as shall be necessary and proper to carry out its functions.

SEC. 504. The Commission on Civil Rights shall have the authority and duty to receive and investigate or have investigated written complaints from or on behalf of any person injured in his person or property or deprived of his life (i) because of race or color, while lawfully exercising, attempting to exercise, or advocating, or assisting another in the exercise of, any right, privilege or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or for having so exercised, attempted, advocated or assisted or (ii) by any act, the puropse or design of which is to intimidate him or any other person from seeking or advocating equality of persons or opportunity free from discrimination based on race or color.

SEC. 505. (a) The Commission on Civil Rights may request and the Department of Justice shall make available any investigative reports that the Department of Justice has that are relevant to the complaint and investigation.

(b) The Commission may request and the Attorney General is authorized to direct that additional investigation of matters relevant to the complaint be conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(c) The Commission shall supply copies of all of its investigative reports to the Attorney General.

SEC. 506. If, after such investigation, the Commission shall determine that probable cause exists for crediting the complaint, it shall direct the Board to conduct a hearing thereon as provided in section 507; if, however, the Commission shall determine that probable cause does not exist or that no substantial damage has occurred, it shall dismiss the complaint.

SEC. 507. (a) Any hearing may be conducted by the Board or any member of the Board designated by the Chairman.

(b) In the event the Board determines that because of the number of complaints or for other valid reasons it is not in the interest of justice for it or a member to conduct a hearing, it may designate an agent or employee of the Board or a person not associated with the Board to conduct the hearing, provided any such agent, employee or other person so designated shall be a member of the bar of the highest court of one of the States of the United States.

(c) Any person not an agent or employee of the Board shall be reimbursed for services rendered in connection with such hearing as determined by the Board, subject to approval of the Civil Service Commission.

(d) The Board or any member or hearing officer may administer oaths or affirmations.

(e) The Board shall have the same powers of investigation and subpoena as those granted the National Labor Relations Board in 29 U.S.C. 161 (1) and (2).

(f) A full record shall be made and kept of all hearings conducted.

SEC. 508. (a) After hearing, the Board, member or hearing officer conducting the hearing shall make findings of fact based upon the record.

(b) After a hearing conducted by the Board, it shall, if it finds that any complainant has suffered injury referred to in section 504, make a monetary award of indemnification to compensate such complainant for such injury.

(c) After a hearing conducted by a member of the Board or hearing officer, he shall, if he finds that any complainant has suffered injury referred to in section 504, make a recommendation of an award of indemnification. All such recommendations shall be reviewed by the Board. Upon review, the Board shall review the findings of fact and shall affirm, reject or modify findings and such recommendations and enter or deny an award.

(d) All awards made hereunder shall include reasonable attorney's fees.

SEC. 509. (a) In the event that the investigation of the complaint or the hearing thereon indicates the person or persons responsible for the injury for which an award is sought, such person or persons shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in the hearing and to be fully heard.

(b) In the event that such investigation or hearing indicates that the injury resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the political subdivision and/or the State under whose authority such action was taken shall be notified and shall have a reasonable opportunity to intervene in the hearing and to be fully heard.

(c) Notice under this section may be by personal service or by registered mail.

(d) Notice to a State or political subdivision may be given to the chief executive or principal legal officer of such State or political subdivision.

(e) The Board shall, if necessary to secure a full hearing for any intervenor, continue the hearing from time to time.

SEC. 510. The United States may, on the motion of the Attorney General, intervene at any stage of the hearing or appeal.

SEC. 511. (a) The complainant or any intervenor may obtain a review of the final decision of the Board in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the Court of Appeals for the judicial circuit in which the injury occurred or the person seeking review resides.

(b) Such review shall be made on the basis of the record before the Board, and the findings of the Board with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

SEC. 512. (a) In any instance in which the injury or death for which an award is made results in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, or from action whether or not taken under color of law which in any way impedes or infringes upon the exercise or advocacy of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, the United States shall have a cause of action for recovery of the amount of such award against the person or persons responsible for the injury for which the award is made.

(b) If the injury for which an award is made resulted in whole or in part from action taken under color of law, the political subdivision and/or the State under whose authority such action was taken shall be jointly and severally liable with the person or persons responsible for such injury.

(c) In any case brought under this section against anyone notified under section 509, the findings of fact as made, modified, or approved, by the Board pursuant to section 508 shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the facts determined by the findings, and the award of indemnification shall be admissible and shall constitute prima facie evidence of the damages suffered by the complainant.

(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear cases brought under this section.

SEC. 513. (a) In the event the person injured dies, a complaint may be filed by any representative of his estate, or by his or her spouse, child, or dependent and the Board shall determine to whom any award shall be made.

(b) In the event of the inability or incapacity of the person injured to file a complaint, it may be filed by his or her spouse, child, dependent, or counsel.

SEC. 514. All complaints must be filed within six months of the injury for which an award is sought, except that where the injury results in death, the complaint may be filed within twelve months of death.

SEC. 515. Nothing herein shall deny to any person the right to pursue any action or remedy granted him under any other law of the United States or any State, provided that in the event that any person receives in any other action an award of damages for which an award of indemnification has been made under this title, the United States shall have a lien against such award in the amount of the award of indemnification. In the event such other award is made prior to the award of indemnification, the amount of such other award shall be considered by the Board in determining whether to make an award and, if so, the amount of the award.

TITLE VI—AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII OF 1964 ACT

SEC. 601. Title VII of Public Law 88-352 (the Civil Rights Act of 1964) is amended as follows:

(a) Add a new paragraph to section 701(a) as follows: "The term 'governmental unit' means a State or a political subdivision thereof or an agency of one or more States or political subdivisions."

(b) Amend so much of section 701(b) as appears before the word *"Provided"* to read as follows:

"The term 'employer' means: (1) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has twenty-five or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, but such term does not include (i) the United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or an Indian tribe, (ii) a bona fide membership club (other than a labor organization) which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; (2) a governmental unit and any agent of such governmental unit:"

(c) Add the words "or governmental unit" following the word "person" wherever it appears in section 701(c).

(d) Delete the phrase "or an agency of a State or political subdivision of a State," from section 701(c).

(e) Add a comma and the following language after the word "charge" on line 9 of section 706(e): "unless the respondent is a State."

(f) Insert the words "or governmental unit" in section 707(a) following the word "persons" on lines 2 and 12 of such subsection.

(g) Insert the words "for or in the name of the United States" following the word "action" on line 6 of section 707(a).

(h) Insert the words "or governmental unit" following the word "person" on line 4 of section 709(a) on lines 1 and 5 of section 710(c) and on lines 2 and 7 of section 713(b).

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 701. (a) The term "State" as used herein shall include the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "because of race or color" shall mean because of hostility to the race or color of any person, or because of his association with persons of a different race or color or his advocacy of equality of persons of different races or colors.

(c) The term "hearing officer" shall mean an agent or employee of the Indemnification Board or a person not otherwise associated with the Board who is designated by the Board to conduct a hearing.

(d) The term "action taken under color of law" shall include the knowing refusal

or failure to act where action could or may have prevented injury.

(e) The term "injury to property" shall include any financial or economic loss.

(f) The term "judicial district" shall mean a division thereof where the judicial district is divided into divisions.

SEC. 702. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including payment of awards under title V.

(b) If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I have asked that my name be added as a cosponsor to S. 2923, which Senator DOUGLAS introduced a few moments ago on behalf of a bipartisan group of Senators. This bill is an omnibus set of proposals, the main purposes of which are to create a Federal assurance of fair selection of jurors, both Federal and State, and to bring a better measure of Federal protection for the personal security of Negroes and civil rights workers in the South.

Both of these are matters which we in the Congress should deal with this year. In cosponsoring this legislation, I wish to make clear that I am firmly committed not only to enacting a full and effective new civil rights measure this year, but also, as I have stated before, to enacting the kind of legislation which will help the Negro in the ghettos of the North meet his problems and be able to lead a better life.

With reference to S. 2923, I want to make clear that I am not convinced that every one of its provisions is the best way to handle the problem that it deals with. These are difficult and technical problems which involve intricate judgments about what approach will work most effectively. I have been studying this entire matter for some time and I shall offer my thoughts, insofar as they differ from today's bill, at the appropriate time. I know that many other Senators will have useful suggestions to offer to the same end. And we shall all want to study the administration's proposals with great care when they are introduced.

Neverthless, because I agree with the overall purpose of S. 2923, I am glad to join as a cosponsor. It will serve as a useful starting point for the further discussion that we must undertake if we are to enact the most careful and constructive, the most responsible and practical legislation possible.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is my distinct privilege to speak today as a sponsor of the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.

Since I arrived in the Senate I have worked for and voted for legislation to protect the rights of all American citizens to equal justice before the law. I supported the civil rights legislation in 1963, 1964, and 1965 because I believed the legislation necessary to protect the rights guaranteed under the Federal Constitution to all our citizens.

Recent history has shown the effectiveness of this legislation, but it has also shown that further legislation is necessary. This situation was pointed out very clearly last year by the failure of local authorities to protect lives and enforce the law in Lowndes County, Ala.

On Friday, August 20, 1965, Jonathan Daniels, an outstanding young man from Keene, N.H., and a student at the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, Mass., was working on behalf of civil rights in Hayneville, Ala. This young man had graduated at the head of his high school class in Keene, had been valedictorian of his class at the Virginia Military Institute, and had completed 2 years of study at the Episcopal Theological Seminary. He was truly an outstanding man, who at the age of 26 had earned the respect and admiration of all who knew him.

On that Friday he was murdered, struck down by a shotgun blast, because of his work on behalf of his fellow citizens. His murderer was tried, and, after a trial which the attorney general of Alabama himself characterized as a "whitewash" of a "coldblooded, premeditated murder," acquitted.

Later that year I went to Alabama to see for myself what the facts were. I spoke with law enforcement officials, citizens, civil rights workers and opponents of civil rights. I left feeling that Federal legislation was necessary to protect not only the civil rights workers who were acting in full accord with the law of the land, but also to protect the law-abiding citizens of many communities who had a right to expect their laws against murder enforced.

The bill which has been introduced today will, if enacted, provide this needed protection to the law-abiding citizens of our Nation.

This bill represents the thinking and work of many people. I am pleased that it includes some of the ideas which I have urged. It is a fine bill, and after such changes as the Senate may think proper, I hope for its rapid enactment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am happy to join in the latest bipartisan effort with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in introducing the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966. This bill could be called the "Equal Justice Act of 1966," because its main thrust is to bring to an end the discriminatory system of justice and law enforcement which now prevails in many communities throughout the South.

It seeks to bring to an end a system not of justice but of injustice which has denied Negro citizens and civil rights workers the equal protection of the laws and which has for years permitted acts of racial violence including murder to go unpunished.

This legislation has been made necessary because State and local law enforcement officials in some areas have defaulted in their constitutional obligation to provide equal justice to all. By their biased and partial administration of justice, by their misuse of the legal process to harass and intimidate civil rights workers, by their failure to protect those engaged in civil rights activity from violence and by permitting such violence to go unpunished, these officials have made a mockery of justice. This bill would do no more than to restore the balance to the scales of justice which they have weighted so heavily against the Negro citizen and persons lawfully exercising rights guaranteed them by the Constitution.

To those who will contend that this legislation would upset the traditional Federal-State division of responsibility for law enforcement, let me say that the Federal Government has both the obligation and authority to act when persons are denied their constitutional rights by State officials. If State and local officials would recognize and assume their constitutional responsibility and take steps to end the discriminatory pattern of justice, Federal action would be unnecessary. This legislation will not touch a single community where law enforcement officials are administering justice fairly and equitably. It will reach only those officials who persist in abdicating their sworn constitutional duty to uphold the law.

On January 28, I joined in introducing two bills to meet the problem of racial discrimination in law enforcement. One bill would strengthen existing Federal criminal statutes under which civil rights violations may now be prosecuted; the other would put an end to racial discrimination in the selection of juries.

Since then—indeed only on Monday—a three-judge Federal court in Montgomery, Ala., in an unprecedented ruling ordered court officials in Lowndes County, Ala., to cease excluding Negroes from jury duty, to draw up new jury lists from which Negroes would not be excluded and to make periodic reports to the Federal court giving the name and race of everyone found unfit for jury duty along with a statement of the reasons why each had been turned down.

Lowndes County is not unique in excluding Negroes from jury duty. It is only the most glaring example of a continuing and persistent unconstitutional practice of racial discrimination in the jury selection process in violation of the 14th amendment.

In addition to addressing itself to the problem of racial discrimination in the selection of juries and making it a Federal crime to attack or intimidate civil rights workers, the bill we are introducing today would also permit the removal to the Federal courts for trial of State offenses where it can be clearly shown that a pattern of discriminatory justice exists in the State courts and where such Federal court prosecution is necessary to assure the equal protection of the laws.

The bill would also authorize Federal court injunctions to protect citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights. The Attorney General now has the power to bring such injunction proceedings in voting rights and school desegregation cases. This bill would extend his authority to bring such proceedings to prevent the deprivation of constitutional rights generally.

Another key provision of the bill is one which would provide restitution by the

Federal Government to civil rights workers who are injured while lawfully exercising their constitutional rights and make States and counties liable to the Federal Government where police or other local officials are responsible for the injury. This bill would not only recognize the responsibility of government to protect the constitutional rights of its citizens but also its moral obligation to compensate the innocent victims of anticivil rights violence who have suffered physical injury while seeking to vindicate their constitutional rights which the Government is mandated by the Constitution to protect.

There are some, of course, who will call this legislation too far reaching. But the evils of unequal justice and unpunished violence, intimidation, and terror are matters of grave national concern to which the Congress cannot remain indifferent so long as State and local governmental officials persist in defying the plain command of the Constitution.

This bill, which follows closely the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission for new Federal legislation, is essential if all our citizens without regard to race or color in every city and hamlet in our land are to enjoy equal justice and live in freedom without fear of physical violence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am proud to join Senators DOUGLAS, HART, and several of my other colleagues in sponsoring a bill which will, if enacted, close the loopholes which have allowed nightriders and bombthrowers to escape justice in some of our States.

This legislation will apply to the 50 States. But, it can be no secret that the abuses it is aimed at correcting have been prevalent, for the most part, in our Southern States. And that is primarily where the legislation will have an effect.

First, the legislation will insure that southern juries will be selected from a cross-section of the general population. It will end the practice of excluding Negroes and other minority groups from jury service. It will accomplish this by providing Federal guidelines for jury selection and by applying these guidelines to the State courts, when it is determined that there has been systematic exclusion from jury selection because of race, color, sex, religious, or political affiliation, and economic or social status.

This provision will insure each individual his constitutional right to trial by a jury of his peers. It is designed to provide juries which will take an impartial view of the evidence, especially in civil rights cases, and will not flinch from bringing in a verdict of "guilty" when the evidence warrants such a finding.

The second major provision of this legislation will enable the Federal courts, in certain carefully limited instances, to assume jurisdiction over criminal matters when it is determined that such action is required to insure equal protection under State laws. This provision would apply both to defendants who are not receivng equal justice and to the prosecution of civil rights cases where it is clear that justice cannot be served because of a segregated system of justice.

Finally, this legislation provides machinery for compensating those who have been killed or injured, or who have lost their property by the illegal act of those who have tried to keep dedicated civil rights workers from their lawful activities. A Federal indemnification board would be established, within the Civil Rights Commission. That board would make the initial determination of liability and that determination would be reviewed in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia. Further, local and State governments would be made civilly liable for interference with the rights of others, whereas they have previously escaped liability by invoking the doctrine of "governmental immunity."

Mr. President, there may be some who say this legislation goes too far. It does not. This legislation is drafted in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. Moreover, it goes only far enough to put an end to the sorry spectacle of southern juries ignoring the most patent evidence in order to set free murderers, bomb throwers, conspirators, and those who have run the gamut of crimes against civil rights workers and members of minority groups. And it goes only far enough to end the kangaroo courts which have convicted Negroes and civil rights workers on flimsy, sometimes manufactured evidence and then compounded the injustice by invoking exceedingly harsh penalties.

This legislation will go a long way toward translating from myth into reality, the motto which is engraved on the front of the Supreme Court Building across the street: "Equal Justice Under Law."

FRANK E. LIPP

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the bill, S. 1407, for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1407), for the relief of Frank E. Lipp, which were, on page 1, line 8, strike out "any", and insert "the", and on page 1, line 11, strike out "any", and insert "the".

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, lays before the Senate the pending business, the bill which has just been reported by the Committee on Armed Services, which the clerk will state by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2791) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ABRAHAM LINCOLN SUGGESTS FULL DISCLOSURE ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Mr. Harry Golden, a trenchant and perceptive writer whose column appears in the Washington Daily News among other Scripps-Howard newspapers, has provided us with memorable quotations from the speeches and writings of Abraham Lincoln, whose birth date we mark Saturday.

Mr. Golden makes this observation:

Lincoln's simple opening of his House Divided speech in 1859 serves us for today: "If we would first know where we are, and wither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

More than a century after these words, our Nation is again divided on the issue of an undeclared war.

Mr. President, I submit that indeed "we could better judge what to do, and how to do it" if this administration would offer full discussion of the issues in southeast Asia.

Only then can "we know where we are, and whither we are tending."

Only when the people, and the elected representatives of the people, are provided with all the facts can we make a judgment on our policy in Vietnam.

As determined as I am, as determined as we all are, to halt the encroachment of communism, the methods we use in this objective must be worthy of public examination and judgment.

I ask that we have full and open discussion of the issues motivating the decisions being made today, affecting as they do the course of history for years to come.

Mr. Golden reminds us that after three bitter and frustrating years of the

American Civil War, Mr. Lincoln wrote to a friend:

I have been controlled by events.

What a lesson is there here for us today.

Are we being controlled by events, rather than controlling those events?

Is our foreign policy as applied to southeast Asia one of reaction to the Communists? Are we then to be led by them step by bleeding step into a land mass war with Red China in a place and at a time of their choosing?

Mr. President, the American people deserve a more complete exposition of the facts decisive to their destiny.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE KENNAN ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the men most qualified to guide our thinking on American foreign policy is Mr. George Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia, and author of the U.S. containment policy of the post-World War II period.

His statement before the Committee on Foreign Relations today is one of the finest presentations I have seen, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF GEORGE F. KENNAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the subject on which I am invited to give my views this morning is, as I understand it, the complex of problems connected with our present involvement in Vietnam. May I explain, in undertaking to speak to this subject, that southeast Asia is a part of the world for which I can claim no special knowledge. I am not familiar with the official rationale of our policy there, except as it has been reflected in the press. I cannot recall that I have ever, either during my service in Government or subsequently, been consulted by the executive branch of our Government on the problems of our policy in southeast Asia or even been made privy to the official discussions in which that policy was decided. I am sure there are many data relevant to any thoroughly founded judgment on these matters which are not available to me. This being the case, I have tried not to jump to final conclusions, even in my own thoughts, and to remain sympathetically receptive both to our Government's explanations of the very real difficulties it has faced and to the doubts and questions of its serious critics. I have not been anxious to press my views upon the public; but I gladly give them to you for whatever they are worth, claiming no particular merit for them except that they reflect an experience with Communist affairs running back, now, for nearly 40 years, and that they flow from the deepest and most troubled concern that we should find the right course at this truly crucial juncture.

The first point I should like to make is that if we were not already involved as we are today in Vietnam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I can think of several reasons why we should wish not to. Vietnam is not a region of major industrial-military importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive development of the world situation is going to be determined by what happens on that territory. Were it not for the considerations of prestige that arise out of our existing involvement, even a situation in which South Vietnam was controlled exclusively by the Vietcong, while regrettable and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not present, in my opinion, dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention. Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, there is every likelihood that a Communist regime in South Vietnam would follow a fairly independent political course. There is no reason to expect that such a regime would find it either necessary or desirable, in present circumstances, to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power. In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect of a limited Communist success in that area seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that led to our present involvement.

From the long-term standpoint, therefore, and on principle, I think our military involvement in Vietnam has to be recognized as unfortunate—as something we would not choose deliberately if the choice were ours to make all over again today; and by the same token I think it should be our Government's aim to liquidate this involvement just as soon as this can be done without inordinate damage to our own prestige or to the stability of conditions in that area.

It is obvious, on the other hand, that this involvement is today a fact. It creates a new situation. It raises new questions, ulterior to the basic long-term problem, which have to be taken into account. A precipitate and disorderly withdrawal could represent in present circumstances a disservice to our own interests and even to world peace greater than any that might have been involved in our failure to engage ourselves there in the first place. This is a reality which, if there is to be any peaceful resolution of this conflict, will have to be recognized not only by the more critical of our friends but by our adversaries as well.

I have, at the same time, great misgivings about any deliberate expansion of hostilities on our part directed to the achievement of something called victory—if, by the use of that term, we envisage the complete disappearance of the recalcitrance with which we are now faced, the formal submission by the adversary to our will, and the complete realization of our present stated political aims. I doubt that these things can be achieved even by the most formidable military successes. There seems to be an impression that, if we bring sufficient military pressure to bear, there will occur at some point something in the nature of a political capitulation by the other side. I think this is a most dangerous assumption. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have, between them, a great deal of space and manpower to give up, if they have to, and the Chinese can give them more if they need it. Fidelity to the Communist tradition would dictate that, if really pressed to extremity on the military level, they should disappear entirely from the open scene and fall back exclusively on an underground political and military existence, rather than accept terms that would be openly humiliating and would represent in their eyes the betrayal of the political prospects of the causes to which they are dedicated. Any total rotting out of the Vietcong from the territory of South Vietnam could be achieved, if it could be achieved at all, only at the cost of a degree of damage to civilian life, and civilian suffering generally, for which I should not like to see this country responsible. And to attempt to crush North Vietnamese strength to a point where Hanoi could no longer give any support for Vietcong political activity in the south would almost certainly have the effect of bringing in Chinese forces at some point, whether formally or in the guise of volunteers, thus involving us in a military conflict with Communist China on one of the most unfavorable theaters of hostility that we could possibly choose.

This is not the only reason why I think we should do everything possible to avoid the escalation of this conflict. There is another one which is no less weighty. This is the effect the conflict is already having on our policies and interests further afield. Not only are great and potentially more important questions of world affairs not receiving, as a consequence of our preoccupation with Vietnam, the attention they should be receiving, but in some instances assets we already enjoy, and hopeful possibilities we should be developing, are being sacrificed to this unpromising involvement in a remote and secondary theater of activity. Our relations with the Soviet Union have suffered grievously as was to be expected—and this at a time when far more important things were involved in those relations than what is involved in Vietnam, and when we had special reason to cultivate them. More unfortunate still, in my opinion, is the damage being done to the feeling entertained toward us by the Japanese people. The confidence and the good disposition of the Japanese is the greatest asset we have had—and the greatest asset we could have in east Asia. As the greatest industrial complex in the entire Far East, and the only place where today the sinews of modern war could be produced on a formidable scale, Japan is of vital importance to us and indeed to the prospects generally of peace and stability in east Asia. There is no success we could have in Vietnam that could conceivably warrant the sacrifice by us of the confidence and good will of the Japanese people. Yet we abuse that confidence and good will in the most serious way when we press the military struggle in Vietnam, and particularly when we press it by means of strategic bombing.

I mention Japan particularly because it is an outstanding example, both in importance and in the intensity of the feelings aroused, of the psychological damage that is being done in many parts of the world by the prosecution of this conflict, and that will be done in even greater measure if the hostilities become still more bloody and tragic as a result of our deliberate effort. It is clear that however justified our action may be in our own eyes, it has failed to win either enthusiasm or confidence even among peoples normally friendly to us. Our motives are widely misinterpreted; and the spectacle of Americans inflicting grievous injury on the lives of a poor and helpless people, and particularly a people of different race and color, no matter how warranted by military necessity or by the excesses of the adversary our operations may seem to us to be, produces reactions among millions of people throughout the world profoundly detrimental to the image we would like them to hold of this country. I am not saying that this is just or right. I am saying that it is so, and that it is bound, in the circumstances, to be so. A victory purchased at the price of further such damage would be a hollow one in terms of our world interests, no matter what advantages it might hold from the standpoint of developments on the local scene.

These are the reasons, gentlemen, why I hope that our Government will restrict our military operations in Vietnam to the minimum necessary to assure the security of our forces and to maintain our military presence there until we can achieve a satisfactory peaceful resolution of the conflict; and why I hope that we will continue to pur-

sue vigorously the question for such a resolution of it, even if this involves some moderation of our stated objectives and if the resulting settlement appears to us as less than ideal. I cannot, of course, judge the military necessities of our situation; but everything I know about its political aspects suggests to me that General Gavin is on the right track in his suggestions that we should, if I understood him correctly, decide what limited areas we can safely police and defend, and restrict ourselves largely to the maintenance of our position there. I have listened with interest to the arguments that have been brought forward in opposition to his views, and I must say that I have not been much impressed with some of them. When I am told that it would be difficult to defend such enclaves, it is hard for me to understand why it would be easier to defend the much wider areas which expanded hostilities, if successful, would presumably bring under our nominal control. Nor do I understand the argument that our allies will lose confidence in us if we fail to press forward aggressively in Vietnam. In the first place, I am not aware that any serious commentator has been pressing for anything like a total and immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. But even if that were the case, it seems implausible to me that we should suffer much loss of confidence on that account at the hands of a Britain which has wisely and tolerantly liquidated great portions of its former colonial empire since the recent war; of a France which has only recently, in an impressive exhibition of statesmanship, withdrawn from its former North African possessions; or of a Netherlands which, under our urging and encouragement, has had the generosity to give up the great territories in Indonesia. In matters such as this, it is not, in my experience, what you do that is decisive: it is how you do it. I would submit there is more respect to be won in the opinion of the world by a resolute and courageous liquidation of unsound positions than in the most stubborn pursuit of extravagant or unpromising objectives.

And finally, when I hear it said that to adopt a defensive strategy in South Vietnam would be to rat on our commitment to the Government of that territory, I would like to note what that commitment really consists of and when and how it was incurred. What seems to be involved here is an obligation on our part not only to defend the frontiers of a certain foreign political entity but to assure the internal security of its Government in circumstances where that Government is unable to assure that security by its own means. Now any such obligation is one that goes, obviously, considerably further than the normal obligations of a military alliance. If we did not really incur it in any formal way, then we should not be inventing it for ourselves, and assuring ourselves that we are bound by it, today. But if we did, then I fail to understand how it was possible for us, in entering into any such commitment, to bypass the processes of senatorial advice and consent which were meant to come into play when undertakings of even lesser import than this were entered into.

Now just two concluding observations:

First, I would like it understood that what I have said here implies nothing but the highest respect and admiration for the fighting qualities of our forces in the field. I have the greatest confidence in them, men and commanders alike. I have no doubt that they can and will, if duty requires, produce military results that will surprise both our skeptical friends and our arrogant adversaries. It is not their fighting qualities but the purpose to which they are being employed that evokes my skepticism.

Secondly, let me say that I am not looking at this whole problem from the moral standpoint but from the practical one. I see in the Vietcong a band of ruthless fanatics, partly misled perhaps by the propaganda that has been drummed into them, but cruel in their methods, dictorial and oppressive in their aims. Their claim to represent the people of South Vietnam is unfounded, arrogant, and outrageous. A country which fell under their exclusive power would have my deepest sympathy. And I would hope that this eventuality, at least, can be prevented by our present effort.

But our own country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country, and particularly not in one remote from our shores, from our culture, and from the experience of our people. In saying this, I am only paraphrasing, and very poorly, words once uttered by one who had at one time been a Member of the U.S. Senate and who, had a Foreign Relations Committee existed in his day, would certainly have been a member of it. This was John Quincy Adams, and I would like your permission to recall, before I close, the words of his that I have in mind. They were spoken in this city 145 years ago, on the Fourth of July 1821. Some of you may be familiar with them, but they will stand repeating at this moment.

"Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there," Adams said, "will be America's heart, her benedictions, and her prayers. "But she goes not abroad," he went on, "in search of monsters to destroy. She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all. She is the champion and vindicator only of her own. She will recommend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and by the benignant sympathy of her example. She well knows that by once enlisting under other banners than her own, were they even the banners of foreign independence, she would involve herself beyond the power of extrication, in all the wars of interest and intrigue, of individual avarice, envy and ambition, which assume the colors and usurp the standards of freedom. The fundamental maxims of her policy would insensibly change from liberty to force. * * * She might become the dictatress of the world. She would no longer be the ruler of her own spirit."

Gentlemen, I do not know exactly what Adams had in mind when he spoke those lines; but I think that, without knowing it, he spoke very pertinently to us, and very wisely.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m., Monday, February 14, 1966.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday, February 14, 1966.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 16), 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

Miles W. Lord, of Minnesota, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Minnesota vice Dennis F. Donovan, retired.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Environmental Science Services Administration:

To be commanders

Clinton D. Upham
Floyd J. Tucker, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders

Francis D. Moran
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Sigmund R. Petersen
J. Rodney Lewis
C. William Hayes
Seymour R. Kotler
Darrell W. Crawford
Frederick H. Gramling

To be lieutenants

Carl N. Davis
Edward E. Jones
John E. Dropp
Joseph W. Dropp
Walter F. Forster II
Delwyn C. Webster
Joseph T. Smith
Peter M. Schidrich
Robert C. Westphall
Billy G. Morrison
William R. Klesse
Gerald M. Ward
Woodrow E. Bliss, Jr.
Phillip C. Johnson
Rodger K. Woodruff
James M. Wintermyre
Karl W. Kieninger, Jr.
Karl S. Karinch

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

James P. Brown, Jr.
Richard M. Petryczanko
Leonard T. Lynch, Jr.
William S. Plank
Richard V. O'Connell
Philip L. Richardson
Ralph H. Rhudy
Walter S. Simmons
Frederick G. Paulsen
Jeffrey L. Gammon
Peter K. Reichert
Ellis G. Campbell III
Gary E. Rorvig
Bobby D. Edwards
Donald R. Rich
Marshall A. Levitan
A. David Schuldt
George M. Ensign
George C. Chappell
John P. Vandermeulen

To be ensigns

Fidel E. Smith
Charles H. McClure
Christopher C. Mathewson
Otto F. Steffin
Carl W. Fisher
Arthur P. Sibold III
John O. Rolland
Phillip F. Dean
Steven M. Erickson
Joseph L. Scott
Lance W. Pape
Glen R. Schaefer
Harold D. Nilsson
Duane D. Helton
Lionel Greve
James L. Murphy
William M. Goodhue, Jr.
William S. Richardson
A. Conrad Weymann III
David L. Sweetland
Gordon P. Dodge
George R. Knecht
Jack L. Wallace
Henry M. Coghlan II
Michael W. Chalfant
Roy K. Matsushige
Richard T. LeRoy
Larry K. Nelson
Arthur D. Ross
Colin L. Campbell
Richard F. Coons
Arthur J. Kuhn
John K. Callahan, Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of January 26), 1966:

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and sections 8373 and 8376, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

*Brig. Gen. Howard W. Cannon, FV383170, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. J. Clarence Davies, Jr., FV-904230, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Donald S. Dawson, FV582705, Air Force Reserve.

*Brig. Gen. Benjamin W. Fridge, FV365107, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Richard C. Hagan, FV307796, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr., FV944440, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William D. Price, FV286176, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

*Col. Earl O. Anderson, FV705280, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph W. Barron, FV423421, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Richard T. Cella, FV378228, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Stanley J. Czyzak, FV364077, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Dan B. Dyer, FV2212700, Air Force Reserve.

Col. William R. Harpster, FV662780, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Herman L. Harris, FV344153, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. John W. Hoff, FV828596, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Joseph S. Hoover, FV907184, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joe M. Kilgore, FV437412, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Tom E. Marchbanks, Jr., FV669752, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Maurice I. Marks, FV367334, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James L. Murray, FV386624, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Gwynn H. Robinson, FV791240, Air Force Reserve.

*Col. Martin H. Scharlemann, FV402684, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John H. Stembler, FV342806, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Evelle J. Younger, FV391177, Air Force Reserve.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph P. Gentile, FG384460, Massachusetts Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Raymond A. Fortin, FG420587, Maine Air National Guard.

Col. Roy A. Jacobson, FG2054045, Arizona Air National Guard.

Col. Raymond J. Kopecky, FG740462, California Air National Guard.

Col. Michael C. Maione, FG1849428, New York Air National Guard.

Col. William D. Prescott, FG484947, Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

Col. Valentine A. Siefermann, FG794707, Hawaii Air National Guard.

Col. Walter E. Williams, Jr., FG766815, Colorado Air National Guard.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates selection by 1963 selection board and submission provided for in section 8373(d), title 10, United States Code.)

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Jack N. Donohew, FR1319 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas B. Whitehouse, FR1677 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Milton B. Adams, FR1712 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., FR1937 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Horace A. Hanes, FR2060 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, FR3809 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Fred J. Ascani, FR4036 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert W. Burns, FR4142 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James C. Sherrill, FR4910 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Abe J. Beck, FR5831 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Gordon M. Graham, FR7761 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Harry E. Goldsworthy, FR1631 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William B. Campbell, FR2000 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John D. Lavelle, FR4359 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald W. Graham, FR4361 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Otto J. Glasser, FR4368 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Duward L. Crow, FR18061 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William J. Crumm, FR8663 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Vogt, Jr., FR8709 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., FR8956 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys, Jr., FR19928 (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Manson, FR1800 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert L. Delashaw, FR1913 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvan N. Moore, FR2062 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ernest A. Pinson, FR3117 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William L. Mitchell, Jr., FR4063 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Paulson, FR3871 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig Gen. John L. Locke, FR4042 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Evans, Jr., FR4072 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig Gen. Harrison R. Thyng, FR4414 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard A. Yudkin, FR4480 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth C. Dempster, FR4633 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Albert W. Schinz, FR4646 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frank B. Elliott, FR4681 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon F. Blood, FR4766 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Sam J. Byerley, FR4875 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward H. Nigro, FR4889 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worley, FR4906 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William Burke, FR4950 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Lindley, Jr., FR5006 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen John M. McNabb, FR5037 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William B. Kyes, FR5064 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert L. Petit, FR5213 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Glen J. McClernon, FR5217 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas N. Wilson, FR5255 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John L. Martin, Jr., FR7556 (colonel, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Ralph G. Taylor, Jr., FR8660 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee V. Gossick, FR3679 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James T. Stewart, FR8692 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William H. Reddell, FR8874 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew S. Low, Jr., FR8890 (colonel, U.S. Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Reinbold, FR8927 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William C. Garland, FR8934 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Howard E. Kreidler, FR9177 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George B. Simler, FR9236 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Norman S. Orwat, FR9489 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. Baer, FR9820 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. David C. Jones, FR9887 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, FR9961 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Russell E. Dougherty, FR9985 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard F. Schaefer, FR10096 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Roadman, FR3379 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Archie A. Hoffman, FR19222 (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

Lt. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel III, O18655, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711, to be senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Autry Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Charles Haneka, O20263, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Charles Fremont Tillson III, O21196, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Irvin Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Hightower, O23531, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Jaroslav Thayer Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Richard George Ciccolella, 034117, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. James Joseph Gibbons, O25355, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016, U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Hugh McGovern, O36851, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Burbank Webster, Jr., O23425, U.S. Army.

Col. William John Durrenberger, O25099, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Orwin Clark Talbott, O24617, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, O36285, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Warren Kennedy Bennett, O35691, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474, U.S. Army.

Col. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., O24893, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Haywood Young, Jr., O36242, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Thomas Bradley, O21768, U.S. Army.

Col. John Reiley Guthrie, O36240, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.)

Col. Salve Hugo Matheson, O36253, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin I. Donley, O34887, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harris Whitton Hollis, O53724, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James McMenamin Shepherd, O21068, U.S. Army.

Col. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, O24715, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army.)

Col. John Joseph Kenney, Jr., O23114, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Murphy Williams, O22206, U.S. Army.

Col. C. Craig Cannon, O39008, U.S. Army.

Col. Allan Langdon Leonard, Jr., O32898, U.S. Army.

Col. Wallace Leo Clement, O23167, U.S. Army.

Col. Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196, U.S. Army.

Col. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., O24681, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905, U.S. Army.

Col. Daniel Arthur Raymond, O24670, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Leo Bond Jones, O24255, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Alden Burke, O46646, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Francis Paul Koisch, O24669, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Leon Baldwin, O36864, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Davis Terry, O24739, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Albert Becker, O24267, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Bautz, Jr., O34750, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William McKinney Mantz, O33403, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Howard Keller, O21871, U.S. Army.

Col. Morgan Garrott Roseborough, O22681, U.S. Army.

Col. Karl William Gustafson, O45560, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles George Fredericks, O22092, U.S. Army.

Col. James Kyle Terry, O33375, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel (U.S. Army).

Col. Henry Alfred Rasmussen, O40502, U.S. Army.

Col. Glen Carl Long, O24170, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Robertson Desobry, O24262, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Felix John Gerace, O23954, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Harwell Barfield, O35425, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Edgar Shedd III, O24971, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Ivey Oscar Drewry, Jr., O33224, U.S. Army.

Col. John Pershing Traylor, O25060, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Samuel Blanchard, O26737, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Louis Klingenhagen, O39223, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Earl Franklin Cole, O64999, Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3806:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be brigadier generals

Maj. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., O20405, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

DENTAL CORPS

Col. Clare Thomas Budge, O21050, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Estes Blount, O19612, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Harold Gingles, O20920, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert Lee Rhea, Jr., O29285, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. James Arista Wier, O26416, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Ashton Herbert Manhart, O18773, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier general

Chaplain (Col.) Francis Leon Sampson, O30951, U.S. Army.

U.S. NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated, in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Frank T. Norris.

SUPPLY CORPS

George E. Moore.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Robert R. Wooding.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade indicated, in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Norvell G. Ward	Frederick J. Harlfinger II
Constantine A. Karaberis	Dennis C. Lyndon
William S. Guest	Fred G. Bennett
Edward C. Outlaw	David C. Richardson
Russell Kefauver	Richard R. Pratt
Allan F. Fleming	Norman C. Gillette, Jr.
John M. Alford	William P. Mack
James W. O'Grady	Paul E. Hartmann
William F. Bringle	Donald Gay, Jr.
Edward E. Grimm	Charles S. Minter, Jr.
John D. Bulkeley	John P. Sager
Ben W. Sarver	Emery A. Grantham
Don W. Wulzen	Nathan Sonenshein

MEDICAL CORPS

Edward P. Irons.
John W. Albrittain.
George M. Davis, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Harry J. P. Foley, Jr.
Jack J. Appleby.
Winston H. Schleef.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

William M. Heaman.
Walter M. Enger.

To be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years

Rear Adm. Edward J. Fahy, U.S. Navy, for appointment as indicated.

The following-named officers, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admirals

*Vice Adm. John L. Chew, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. John J. Hyland, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Frederick L. Ashworth, U.S. Navy.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates an interim appointment.)

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade indicated, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

To be vice admirals

Vice Adm. Charles L. Melson, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Lisle C. Carter, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Robert G. Taylor, to be a permanent professor, U.S. Air Force Academy, and ending Donald L. Rouland, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 17, 1966; and

The nominations beginning Alvin D. Aaronson, to be major, and ending Edward R. Ward, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31, 1966.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Nellie J. Zalesney, to be major, and ending Richard H. Zeiler, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31, 1966.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Michael Monroney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to join the Postmaster General, Lawrence O'Brien, in expressing my deep regret over the resignation of his Executive Assistant, Mr. Michael Monroney.

I am sure that I speak for my colleagues in saying that Mike Monroney's vast experience in Government affairs will be missed. He has made great contributions to the Post Office Department which will long be remembered by the citizens of the Nation.

Mike has served his country well under President Kennedy and President Johnson. Mike Monroney began his present assignment in early 1961 under former Postmaster General J. Edward Day, assisting him during the transition of the Post Office Department to the Kennedy administration.

Monroney brought to his postal job considerable and varied experience in journalism and in local and Federal Government affairs.

Moving into nearby Silver Spring, Md., following his graduation from Dartmouth College in 1951, he covered suburban affairs as a staff reporter for the Washington, D.C., Post and Times-Herald during most of his 5 years with the newspaper.

In 1957 and 1958, he served as a top aid to the county manager of Montgomery County, Md., adjacent to the District of Columbia. In 1956 he served on the presidential campaign staff of Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson.

The 38-year-old Monroney served for 2 years as administrative assistant to Congressman JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, during which he worked on a variety of legislative problems, including aid to distressed areas, Federal aid to education, the Federal airport construction program and labor-management reform legislation.

He left Congressman BRADEMAS' staff in January of 1961 to assume his present position. As executive assistant to the Postmaster General, Monroney is in charge of congressional liaison for the Post Office Department in addition to other assignments at the direction of the Postmaster General.

Named Maryland Young Democrat of the Year in 1961, Monroney was also nominated that same year for one of the 10 outstanding young men of the year awards sponsored annually by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A Navy veteran, he is the son of U.S. Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

I would like to wish him the best of success in whatever field of endeavor he chooses to enter. Past experience shows that Mike is a man who has a deep understanding and sympathy for his fellowman and is dedicated to serving his country.

NBC Honors Chicago's Len O'Connor on His 25th Year of Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night the National Broadcasting Co. honored one of Chicago's most highly respected journalists, Len O'Connor, who is observing his 25th year of reporting.

Len O'Connor is one of Chicago's most popular television journalists and commentators. NBC is to be congratulated for honoring him on his 25th anniversary.

He is frequently called the "Guardian of Chicago's Conscience." Because of his thorough understanding of the problems of a large city like Chicago; his deep insight into problems of America and his thorough knowledge of international affairs, he today has several million people in the Midwest following his daily commentary both on radio and television.

Len O'Connor is a newspaperman's journalist. He is penetrating, perceptive, understanding and often pungent, but never unfair. He has earned the respect not only of those he reports about, but also those he reports for.

Mr. Speaker it was a privilege to be invited yesterday to see the top management people from the National Broadcasting Co.'s Midwest facilities present Len O'Connor with a wristwatch in grateful recognition of his 25 years of outstanding journalism.

May time be kind to him so he can observe his golden jubilee of enterprising and dedicated contributions to the highest standards of American journalism.

Padded Agricultural Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the progress of agricultural exports and, judging by official reports, they have been performing admirably in recent years.

The following table will show the progress during the past 12 years, through 1964:

U.S. exports of agricultural products, 1953–64

Year	Exports (millions)	Share of total exports (percent)
1953	$2,847	18.0
1954	3,054	20.0
1955	3,199	21.0
1956	4,170	22.0
1957	4,506	22.0
1959	3,955	23.0
1960	4,832	24.0
1962	5,034	24.0
1963	5,585	24.0
1964	6,347	25.6

Source: U.S. Foreign Agricultural Trade by Commodities, calendar year 1963, June 1964, ERS, U.S. Department of Agriculture; also October 1965.

By looking at these statistics we are struck not only by the doubling of dollar exports since 1954, but also by the increase in the share of total exports enjoyed by agricultural exports. This share rose from 18 percent in 1953 and 20 percent in 1954 to 25.6 percent in 1964.

This fact would seem to call for congratulations to the Department of Agriculture.

However, let us not forget that Public Law 480 was passed in 1954. In 1956 agricultural exports jumped to $4,170 million or by a billion over 1955. Since 1959 there has been a steady growth in exports of farm products, rising to $6,347 million in 1964, a record high. The 1965

total is not yet available but the indications are that there was a slight decline to $6.2 billion in that year, from the 1964 high.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in a statement in the November 1965 issue of "Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture." It said, to quote:

> The major factor behind such a rapid export expansion was the high rate of industrial growth in Western Europe and Japan.

However, if we look at page 7 of the same publication, table 1, we find that the share of Europe in our total agricultural exports dropped from 48 percent in 1959 to 43 percent in 1964. Asia's share went in the opposite direction, or from 25 percent of the total in 1959 to 31 percent in 1964. However, Japan's share dropped from 39.5 percent of our total agricultural exports to Asia in the 1955–59 period to 36.9 percent in 1964. India's share, on the other hand, rose sharply from $153 million in the 1955–59 period to $480 million in 1964 or from 15.6 percent of our total agricultural exports to Asia in the 1955–59 period to 24.6 cents in 1964. There was also a sharp rise in such exports to Iran—a sixfold increase—and a threefold increase to Pakistan—see table 14, same publication, pages 17–18. The upshot is that of the billion-dollar increase in our agricultural exports to Asia during this period only a third went to Japan while two-thirds of the increase went to other Asiatic countries, mostly to India, Pakistan, Iran, and Iraq.

It is therefore difficult to follow the statement quoted above, to the effect that the major factor behind the rapid rise in our agricultural exports has been the high rate of industrial growth in Europe and Japan.

When Europe's share of our total agricultural exports dropped from 48 to 43 percent between 1959 and 1964 and Japan's share of our exports to Asia dropped from 39.5 percent in the 1955–59 period to 36.9 percent in 1964, it must be apparent that some other factor was at work; and of course it was the increase in shipments to such countries as India, Pakistan, and so forth. These were, as we know, heavily dependent on Public Law 480 shipments.

Mr. Speaker, we are very much in need of clear statistics in this field, particularly if we are to unravel unsubsidized and unassisted exports of farm products from exports that move in private channels on a competitive basis.

For the latest fiscal year the Department of Agriculture reports total agricultural exports of $6.09 billion. This was for the year ended June 20, 1965. Of this total $1.669 billion were indeed reported in the Agriculture Department's publication as exports under Government-financed programs, leaving a total of $4.426 billion which were classified as "commercial" exports.

The trouble with this classification so far as reflecting the competitive position of this country is concerned, is that it does not go far enough. My reason for saying this is that we export "commercially" about a billion dollars worth of wheat, wheat flour, raw cotton, rice, and so forth, outside of the Public Law 480 or AID program. These sales are made because of a considerable Federal subsidy of these products and not because we are competitive.

If we add such exports to those that we shipped under titles I–IV of Public Law 480, and so forth; that is, those classified by the Department of Agriculture as Government-financed programs, the $1.669 billion rises to $2.605 billion. This will leave $3.599 billion as truly commercial competitive exports of agricultural products in the 1964–65 fiscal year instead of $4.426 billion—see table 3, page 15, of the above cited Department of Agriculture publication.

This leaves a considerably less brilliant accomplishment. No doubt we could export well above $6 billion in agricultural products if we first, sold more for foreign currencies under title I, Public Law 480; second, moved more exports under famine and emergency relief under title II of Public Law 480; third, increased foreign donations under section 416, Agriculture Act of 1949 and section 302, Public Law 480; and fourth, and offered more shipments under barter programs—CCC Charter Act; section 303, Public Law 480; and so forth.

But if we did so we would not advance by one iota the competitive capacity of this country in foreign markets. This is a matter of production costs, and giving away agricultural products does not reduce costs of production. It tends to raise them because of the higher tax burden created.

Mr. Speaker, the false impression created by the inclusion of subsidized farm products in our exports and shipments under Public Law 480, and so forth, is matched by another statistical practice that is equally pernicious in its effects. I refer to what has been called the f.o.b.-c.i.f. distortion. All the other leading trading nations report their imports on the c.i.f. basis. This merely means that they record the true cost of the goods imported by adding to the foreign price, the cost of shipping and insurance incident to bringing the goods to their ports of entry.

What is our practice? We leave off these charges and record the value of our imports at their foreign price, point of export. If anyone believes this to be a minor matter he should compare the price of an automobile at its f.o.b. Detroit level and what the cost would be if he took delivery several thousand miles away.

From calculations made on the basis of actual import and export statistics of this country in its trade with England and Japan, it seems safe to say that our imports from these countries are undervalued from 20 to 25 percent for the reason just set forth. This represents a serious distortion, and we should review all our import statistics with this distortion in mind.

Surely we cannot base our trade policies on unreliable statistics. Yet that is what we have been doing.

It has been estimated that in place of a $5.2 billion surplus in our exports over imports for 1965 as reported recently by the Department of Commerce we actually ran a deficit of about $2 billion, when the figures are corrected by the guides I have set forth above.

I am very anxious to see this statistical practice corrected as soon as possible and am introducing appropriate legislation to that end. I urge all who are concerned about a sound foreign trade policy to take an interest in this matter and to support the legislation.

Community Antenna Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks my office has received literally hundreds of letters and telegrams from residents of my State who are subscribers to Community Antenna Television. These people are deeply concerned about reports that the Federal Communications Commission is planning to impose restrictions upon the CATV industry which will impair the service which they presently receive. After some study of the problem, I can only conclude that their fears are not unjustified.

It is not my purpose to maintain that the FCC is without authority to regulate CATV. Nor is it my contention that no regulation is needed. However, the authority of the FCC to regulate and actual regulation are not the same thing. Moreover, judging from the substance of staff recommendations at the FCC and the basic assumptions underlying these recommendations, I seriously question the correctness of what I anticipate the regulations will be.

I do not intend at this time to delve too deeply into the technical aspects of the problem. I will, however, cite the possible effects that regulation will have upon CATV subscribers in my district, specifically in Laconia, N.H., which presently has the sole CATV system in my district. It is my impression that the situation in Laconia is not dissimilar to other situations throughout the country.

Laconia is a small city in central New Hampshire. It has no local television station of its own. As a matter of fact, the only TV broadcaster in New Hampshire is located in Manchester about 45 miles from Laconia. By present FCC standards, Laconia is located within the grade B contour of three Maine broadcasters who represent all three major networks. A grade B contour is one in which the broadcaster delivers an acceptable signal to 70 percent of the locations 50 percent of the time. The plain and simple fact is, however, that for those who live within the city of Laconia, normal off-the-air reception is inadequate and unreliable. Therefore, many people desirous of better reception have made the financial outlay to subscribe to Community Antenna Service. The very fact that people subscribe to

the system is evidence of the inadequacy of off-the-air reception.

The Community Antenna Service also furnishes, by way of microwave relay, a major New York independent station. This service is particularly attractive since this station carries the New York Yankees baseball games.

If the FCC staff recommendations are incorporated into regulations much of the service now provided will be severely curtailed. For example, the nonduplication requirement of the recommendations would require the CATV to black out any show which is being carried by any other stations in a grade B contour. The practical effect would be to require the viewer to watch the weak signals transmitted by the Maine broadcasters, or watch nothing at all. Such a regulation would be totally unrealistic. It would effectively deprive a large segment of the subscribers of decent television reception.

The FCC has indicated that one of the reasons it wants to restrict CATV is to encourage the development of local television stations. There is undeniably merit in this purpose. However, to the best of my knowledge, no one has ever evinced an interest in establishing a local station in or near Laconia.

A further justification for restricting CATV has been its "economic impact." This can be and often is a valid justification. The underlying assumption involved is that CATV has a negative effect on local advertising. But when the community involved lies on the outer fringe of a station's B contour, this justification is less persuasive. A Maine television station is not the logical medium for Laconia, N.H., advertising. I would, therefore, seriously doubt that CATV in Laconia has adversely affected the advertising revenues of the Maine broadcasters.

I have not attempted to discuss all the effects that unwise and unduly restrictive regulation would have upon CATV. I have attempted to briefly outline the most harmful effect that such regulation would have upon one community. Undoubtedly, there are countless other communities in the same position. I want to make it perfectly clear that my primary concern is for those subscribers who without CATV would not receive adequate television service. I will vigorously oppose any regulation which will impair this service.

Failure To Remove Snow at District of Columbia Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I commented on the failure of the District of Columbia to deal effectively with the snow situation which paralyzed the city. Since then I have had many reports and examples of dangerous situations which were permitted to exist. For instance, I am told that a week after the snow fell, along the school grounds at 13th Street NW., at Military Road, little tots still had to choose whether to defy the deady rush-hour traffic on 13th Street or brave the chin-deep snow, still untrampled on the school walk.

In front of Wilson High School on Nebraska Avenue, the snow, higher than a tall man stands, remained untouched for days after the children returned to school. The report which came to me indicated that similar conditions were found at most other District of Columbia schools. It seems that the only thing brought to bear on the snow surrounding our public schools here were the cold, damp feet of courageous children beating a path to classes that were declared reopened, with a dare to get there if you can.

In times of such emergency, why cannot we recruit from among the ranks of those men who are drawing upon the various Federal sustaining programs, at least to perform the public service of clearing a path to our school buildings—before we order the children to return? Perhaps the Job Corps could help in such instances—or those who, under better weather circumstances, would be working on the beautification program.

Clifford R. Shaw Award Presented to Elliott Donnelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr Speaker a very distinguished citizen, Elliott Donnelley, of Chicago, was honored on Sunday, January 30, 1966, by the Chicago Federation of Community Committees.

Mr. Donnelley, vice chairman of R. R. Donnelley & Co., located in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois and one of the largest printing firms in the country, was presented the Clifford R. Shaw Memorial Award in recognition of outstanding contributions in human relations, youth welfare, and delinquency prevention.

Attended by 500 persons at Luigi's Restaurant, 2550 West North Avenue, the award was presented in behalf of the federation by Anthony Sorrentino, delinquency prevention supervisor for the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission.

In making the presentation Mr. Sorrentino remarked:

I greatly appreciate the privilege and honor accorded me by the Chicago Federation of Community Committees to present its special award, the Clifford R. Shaw Memorial Award—bearing the name of a distinguished social scientist and humanitarian—for presentation to an eminent industrialist, philanthropist and humanitarian, our good friend Elliott Donnelley.

I know that Clifford R. Shaw, the sociologist, founder and director of the Chicago area project, would have been pleased and proud to know that this first award bearing his name is being presented to the man we are honoring this evening. For the man we are honoring is an extraordinary man.

Our honored guest has an illustrious record in the field of human relations and youth welfare. Last year, for example, he was given special recognition and an award by the United Negroes Fund for his outstanding contribution in promoting the education and welfare of our Negro citizens.

Mr. Donnelley is especially noted in our city as the founder, organizer, and major supporter of the Chicago youth centers, one of the most valuable resources for thousands of disadvantaged, culturally deprived children. Under his able leadership, and boundless generosity, the Chicago youth centers have grown during the past decade from a few boys' clubs to over six major institutions. In addition the centers carry on special community services and work with street gangs, performing vitally needed programs for youth welfare and delinquency control.

Another unique project started by Elliott Donnelley about 6 years ago was the establishment of the job-finding investigating committee. Financed almost singlehandedly by him, with staff services by the Illinois Youth Commission, this project was the very first in the city of Chicago to focus attention on the need for special services for our unemployed youth, and particularly for those who had been in trouble with the law. This project paved the way for other special projects in the field of youth employment which were later supported by foundations and by city and State government and more recently by the war on poverty by the Federal Government.

Those of us who are identified with the Chicago Federation of Community Committees and the Chicago area project which work with and through the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission, are especially grateful for Mr. Donnelley's interest and financial support to our community projects for the treatment of delinquents and the prevention of delinquency. Under Mr. Donnelley's leadership a plan was initiated last year to give financial assistance to self-help community committees and to assist them in the further development of their programs, and hopefully to prepare them for participation in the Community Fund of Chicago.

These are just a few highlights of Mr. Donnelley's activities and contributions. In addition he is a generous supporter of numerous other charitable, welfare, and educational programs, too numerous to mention.

In conclusion, I should like to mention just a few of Mr. Donnelley's affiliations. He is a former mayor of Lake Forest. At the present time he is vice chairman of the board of R. R. Donnelley & Co. In 1961 he was appointed by Gov. Otto Kerner to the advisory board of the division of community services of the Illinois Youth Commission. A fishing enthusiast and world traveler, he is virtually a railroad engineer with an avid interest in all things pertaining to trains from model trains to locomotives on the narrow gage to the sleek, modern diesels.

Above all, our honored guest is a man who is endowed with great commonsense, who has deep insight in identifying a problem and great capacity for making intelligent decisions and plans for an attack on the problem. In short, he is a down-to-earth man of action and a great humanitarian in the best sense of the word.

Neighborhood volunteers and professional workers in youth welfare were also honored. Walter S. Klimek, Illinois

Youth Commission member, also presented awards to 31 volunteers who support the work of community committees affiliated with the Chicago area project.

Dr. James E. McKeown, chairman of the Sociology Department of De Paul University, also presented awards of merit to four professional youth workers for unusual dedication to their work. The four are: Mrs. Lural Evans, an attendance officer for the Chicago Board of Education; John F. McGuire, probation officer for the Family Court of Cook County; Donald E. Thomas, of the Chicago Police Department Youth Bureau; and Edward Miller, a parole officer for the Illinois Youth Commission.

During the meeting, the Honorable John Troike, chairman of the Illinois Youth Commission, spoke on the value of volunteers in delinquency prevention.

The main speaker was Arthur H. Kruse, executive director of the Community Fund of Chicago, who stressed first that we need to join leadership and money of the total community with the leadership and money of the local neighborhood. Second, we need to join together the motivations and inspirations of volunteers and professional people. Third, we should strive to mobilize and coordinate all resources in the community.

Currently, with our Government's emphasis on the war on poverty and in the prevention of juvenile delinquency, this approach by the Chicago area project and the Illinois Youth Commission, is especially worthy of our attention. It was Clifford R. Shaw who first stressed the indispensability of involving the local residents in any attempts to deal with community problems, and especially the problem of delinquency. Shaw was truly a pioneer in this field and it is heartening to see our Government and many private agencies now employing these self-help ideas.

Since the Chicago area project is so little known, yet so significant, a brief account of the story of this enterprise by Anthony Sorrentino is herewith included for the RECORD.

Excise Taxes To Eliminate Junkyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, prior to his confirmation as Director of the Bureau of Mines last week, Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., noted that very promising progress is being made on the Bureau's research project for the use of automobile scrap in modern steelmaking. In view of the numerous steps that are in the making to contend with the auto junkyard problem, I feel that every Member of Congress should familiarize himself with all facets of the subject.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provides that the establishment and use and maintenance of junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty. Among the provisions are Federal participation in junkyard removal, landscaping and screening, as well as a reduction in federal highway funds to states which fail to provide effective controls.

Also during the last session of Congress, I proposed that 1 percent of the auto excise tax be used by the Federal Government to dispose of auto junkyards, with as much as half of the income to be put into research to determine whether the junked cars have further economic use. Numerous recommendations have come from the general public as well as from interested businesses in response to this suggestion, and meanwhile considerable development toward economic disposal of scrapped cars has taken place. I have received correspondence from representatives of the scrap industry who are convinced that research thus far clearly indicates that the time is near when through proper crushing and incineration old cars can be dismantled and the steel salvaged profitably. Meanwhile Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has invited universities, nonprofit organizations, business firms, and individual citizens to submit constructive recommendations and proposals to the Bureau of Mines for expanded research on disposal of scrap autos and other solid mineral wastes.

The Bureau's own scrap-auto research is described as follows:

> Bureau research on the scrap-auto problem is directed toward overcoming presently known economic and technological barriers—such as changes in steelmaking and automobile manufacturing practices—that have caused once-sizable markets for these discarded cars to shrink. Out of the Bureau's research have come two promising metallurgical processes, both of which are scheduled for early testing in large-scale demonstration plants.
>
> One process involves the conversion of all the iron and steel in auto body scrap to a high-grade iron ore for which there is a ready market. With this process the scrap can be used as a reductant for low-grade, nonmagnetic taconite that is abundant in the United States. This is done by carefully controlled roasting of the scrap and the taconite in a rotating kiln, which converts both the iron in the taconite and the iron and steel in the scrap to magnetic iron oxide. After roasting, any unconverted scrap is screened for recycling, and the iron oxides are concentrated by magnetic separation into a high-grade form of iron oxide. All nonferrous materials in the scrap, as well as the gangue in the taconite, are rejected in the process. By changing the roasting conditions, the process can be made to operate without taconite. In this variation iron in the scrap is obtained as an oxide, which can be separated magnetically from nonferrous contaminating elements in the scrap.
>
> In the other process being developed by the Bureau, cylindrical shaped bales made from cannibalized automobiles, less engines and transmissions, will be run through a rotary kiln at a temperature high enough to burn the combustible materials and melt the nonferrous metal parts. The kiln gases will be cleaned to prevent air pollution. Resulting clean scrap, upon discharge from the kiln, will be compacted to any desired density for steelmaking charges. After the technique for burning and separating nonferrous metals from baled automobile hulls is developed in a pilot plant, a larger demonstration plant including a modern electric steelmaking furnace with necessary accessories will be built for demonstrating the economic feasibility of the thermal treatment technique. The objective is to show that many types of steel can be produced from thermally treated automobile scrap only, and that almost any type of steel can be economically produced from thermally treated scrap and directly reduced iron ore.

Mr. Speaker, as these efforts continue, the number of junked cars to blight suburbs and countryside rises annually. More than 5 million were dumped onto the heaps last year. The president of General Motors predicted on January 17 that the average annual demand for cars and trucks in the United States could exceed 11 million by 1970, thus blazing the way for bigger and bigger junkyards.

While the unsightly cars are piled higher, adjacent land tracts—whether they are business, residential, or farm areas—suffer correspondingly. Regardless of how attractive your own plot of ground may be, its beauty is quickly marred if a neighbor is unconcerned about the trash in his yard. In our particular region of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Electric Co., has long practiced beautifying to the fullest possible extent the properties on which its facilities are located, including the rights-of-way for power lines. Trees are planted and carefully nurtured, and the company takes pride in helping to keep our State beautiful.

Responsible mining companies needed no laws to insist upon reclamation of stripped properties. For years they have been turning earth from which coal has been extracted through surface operations into attractive forest, farm, and recreational areas.

These operations by the utilities and coal companies have been carried out at their own expense, without cost to Federal or State government. By the same token, it would seem reasonable for auto manufacturers and consumers to provide the means for proper disposal of cars that are no longer usable, and the use of a portion of the excise tax would appear to be the least injurious or objectionable means of absorbing the cost.

The Bureau of Mines projects are commendable and should receive high priority, but once a satisfactory method of economic disposal of auto bodies is developed, the Federal Government should retire from this activity and permit commercial growth of the industry. I am hopeful that such plans will be achieved prior to July 1, 1970, in order that it will not be necessary for Federal and State governments to finance removal and screening of auto junkyards, as provided in the Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Newspaper Columnist Joe Crump has observed:

Making junked automobiles commercially profitable is a sure way to remove them from the scene.

With a portion of the excise tax available in support of the junked car disposal program, there is all the more reason to assume that research can and will make it a profitable undertaking.

While some development engineers are confident that small disposal plants—even portable facilities—can dispose of junked cars economically, the consensus would appear to favor—at least in the early stages—large centers to which the steel shells would be hauled from points within a wide periphery. In the latter event, I would hope that automobile transportation firms will be ready to assume a role in the operation without delay. Stackback and piggyback railroad cars as well as the two-deck auto-carrying trucks that move from assembly centers with new vehicles snuggled closely together should quickly be converted for hauling remnants from scattered junkyards to points where giant incinerators have been established.

We are obviously making headway in our battle to eliminate the ghastly auto junkyard. Let us give it a boost by applying 1 percent of the excise tax to this crusade.

About Raised Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the recent raising of the interest rates by the Federal Reserve Board has caused quite a furor. Those of us from the Midwest feel especially unhappy about these developments.

The farm economy of our area has never progressed under a tight money policy. Because we must borrow funds for most of our farm operations, the raise in interest rates is costing the farmers of the Seventh Iowa District considerably more than previously. This is neither wise nor fair.

One of the editors of our district, F. S. Nelson of Shenandoah, commented on this is his paper the Weekly Times. His recent article along with a news story quoting two of my colleagues, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, and Congressman WILLIAM BARRETT, fairly well expresses my personal feeling on this matter.

[From the Red Oak (Iowa) Weekly Times, Jan. 12, 1966]

ABOUT RAISED INTEREST RATES

(EDITOR'S NOTE: the noted financial columnist J. A. Livingston recently tried to explain why the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates. His widely read column, usually very succinct and profound, caused a furor across the Nation, President Johnson openly opposed McChesney Martin, Federal Reserve chairman, in the move. The following letter by veteran Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, sums up the administration views on the matter quite clearly, and we publish it for your enlightenment. F.S.N.)

To the EDITOR:

Columnist J. A. Livingston has now given us the Christmas bedtime version of the continuing and constantly shifting story of "Why the Federal Reserve Board raised interest rates."

Mr. Livingston assures his readers that the action was all part of a Christmas Eve urge by the Federal Reserve Board to benefit the little savers of the Nation. Yes, Mr. Livingston, there is still a Santa Claus.

But for the average consumer who does not subscribe to the Santa Claus theory of economics, Mr. Livingston's column has a cold, hard ring. For they are the ones who will be reaching down deep to pay an added $25 billion in interest charges in 1966, up 25 percent from the interest rate bill of $100 billion in 1965.

Mr. Livingston's theory is based on the fact that there are millions of savings accounts in various financial institutions. Therefore, according to the Livingston theory, millions benefit when interest rates are increased. The columnist attempts to imply that among these savers are millions of low-income Americans.

What Mr. Livingston leaves out of this Santa Claus image of the Federal Reserve Board's action is astounding.

First, Mr. Livingston ignores the income distribution figures. The fact is that more than half of the population has annual income of less than $4,600. Surely the columnist does not suggest that this group has amassed huge fortunes in savings accounts.

About one-fourth of the Nation's families and single individuals have no liquid assets—that is, no savings. On the other hand, virtually all of this group must borrow to survive. Higher interest rates take more dollars out of the already inadequate incomes of this segment of the population.

Another 28 percent have liquid assets or savings of under $500 and another 12 percent, liquid assets of between $500 and $999. In other words, 64 percent of the Nation's families and single individuals have savings of less than $1,000.

But the big question is how much debt is on the backs of this group of nonsavers and small savers which make up the great majority of the population. The interest on this debt is staggering and does not begin to be offset by the minimal interest gained on small savings accounts.

Millions of Americans have home mortgages ranging between $10,000 and $20,000. Millions of the same Americans also owe $1,000 to $1,500 on an automobile. Millions of small businessmen and farmers are deeply in debt for capital. All of this group must pay the 25-percent increase in interest imposed by the Federal Reserve Board. It is nothing less than a tax on this group.

I hope Mr. Livingston is not suggesting that the small saver who may draw interest on a $300 or $400 savings account is benefited when he must pay 25 percent more for interest on a $20,000 home. For example, a 1-percent increase in interest rates adds $4,734 in interest costs to a $20,000 loan over a 30-year schedule of maturity. This is roughly equivalent to the annual income for more than half the population.

Mr. Livingston's upside-down economics notwithstanding, the truth is that interest income goes primarily to a handful of high-income groups, large corporations, and financial institutions. It takes money from the pockets of the average- and low-income citizen.

Mr. Livingston cannot escape the fact that it takes money to make money with money.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. House of Representatives.

Two veteran congressional leaders today charged that the increase in interest rates on FHA mortgages was the direct result of the Federal Reserve Board's defiant action in increasing the discount rate on December 6.

"Now William McChesney Martin has succeeded in jeopardizing President Johnson's housing programs to the detriment of millions of American homeowners," Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat of Texas, and Representative WILLIAM BARRETT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said in a joint statement released following the announcement of the FHA interest rate increase. Mr. PATMAN is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and Mr. BARRETT is chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Housing.

The two Congressmen described the FHA action as "highly regrettable."

"This one-fourth of 1 percent increase in the FHA rate will add millions of dollars to the cost of homes purchased in 1966," they said. "For example, a home buyer who purchases a $20,000 house will pay $1,122 in additional interest charges over the life of a 30-year loan."

Mr. PATMAN and Mr. BARRETT said that although the FHA increase was held to one-fourth of 1 percent, there is "grave danger that this rate hike will lead to even larger increases in the cost of conventional home mortgages." This has been the traditional pattern in previous interest rate increases, they noted.

"Much of the effect of the 1965 Housing and Urban Development Act will undoubtedly be wiped out by increased interest costs," they said. "These increases will hamstring and slow the building industry throughout the country, placing decent housing out of the reach of many Americans."

The two Congressmen said that the increase of the interest rate on housing added another "substantial reason" for forcing the Federal Reserve Board to rescind its December order raising interest rates.

"The Congress cannot sit idly by while the housing and other vital programs are threatened by a one-vote majority of the Federal Reserve Board," they said.

The Congressmen said that interest already represents too high a proportion of the total cost of housing. With the new increase in FHA rates, they noted, homeowners will pay a total of $20,881 in interest on a 30-year, $20,000 mortgage—more than the cost of the home itself.

"These are costs that should be brought down and not raised," they said.

Bringing the Ohio River Valley to Its Finest Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just had an opportunity to read the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], who was principal speaker at the christening of the first seagoing vessel built on the Ohio River since World War II. His salient observations point up the importance of this great river to the general economy of the entire valley and, indeed, its value to our Nation. Like the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], I foresee the

Ohio River's vital role in our future progress and economic prosperity.

I commend his remarks to the attention of all the Members and, under unanimous consent, I insert them in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. LEE H. HAMILTON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM INDIANA, AT CHRISTENING OF M/V "PHAEDRA," JEFFBOAT, INC., BOATYARDS, JEFFERSONVILLE, IND., DECEMBER 18, 1965

You may not be aware of it, but today you are witnessing a historic occasion in the life of the Ohio River Valley. You may not be aware of it from my speech because I'm not that good at conveying thoughts, but in spite of my speech, and not because of it, this is a historic occasion.

In Shakespeare's "Henry V," the king is about to lead his men into battle; he gives them a stirring oration urging them to arms. In part, he says: "And gentlemen in England now abed shall think themselves accursed they were not here." Well, I don't know if your friends and neighbors who are not here today will think themselves accursed 5 or 10 or 20 years hence, but I do think they might regret it because this is a significant day in the history of the Ohio River Valley.

It is significant because Jeffboat has reached a milestone by producing a seagoing vessel, the first since World War II. And it is because a milestone has been reached that our thoughts naturally turn today to our inland waterways, their importance to the Nation, to the Ohio River Valley, and to Louisville, Jeffersonville, and Jeffboat.

This is a day to remember because we see today the evidence that the Ohio River Valley is on the move in meeting one of its and the Nation's greatest needs—good transportation. The evidence is all about you.

IMPORTANCE TO THE NATION

The milestone reached today reminds us of the importance of the inland waterways to this Nation.

Water carriers today move 431 million tons of freight annually—14½ percent of all of the Nation's domestic freight. And they do it at an average cost to the shipper of 3 mills per ton-mile. This compares with an average cost to the shipper by rail that is five times that of the water freight cost or 15 mills per ton-mile. Truck freight service costs the shipper an average of 6½ cents per ton-mile—and average aircargo rates are in the range of 22 cents per ton-mile.

The savings realized on our waterway transportation are diffused widely throughout the Nation's economy. Coal is an excellent example of that and very important to us because almost 47 million tons moved on the Ohio River in 1964. The savings in transportation costs of coal is reflected, for example, in the price of electricity in home and factory.

The inland waterways are the workhorse of our transportation system. They have set the floor under transportation pricing in this country for many years and will continue to do so as long as water transportation is an effective competitor for business.

Our inland waterways have had a substantial effect on water resource development. Navigation requires that a stable supply of water be maintained in a channel in order to provide a standard operating depth for commercial vessels. In most water resource development projects, this is done by building a series of dams which create relatively deep stillwater pools. But in order to feed that system, dams are built on headwaters and tributary streams to conserve water supplies which feed into the main channel. The water supplies created in these navigation projects are among the most precious and most valuable assets which this Nation has.

Our inland waterways are big business in America. The United States has 25,260 miles of usable, navigable inland channels exclusive of the Great Lakes; the Ohio River alone is 981 miles. In all, there are some 1,700 companies operating on the waterways, some 2,600 tank barges, more than 14,000 dry cargo barges and scows and approximately 4,000 towboats and tugs, representing a total investment of over $1.6 billion.

The inland waterway business is booming. It stands in stark contrast to our oceangoing merchant marine which required a total Government subsidy during the calendar year 1964 of $319 million for construction and operational differentials.

The inland waterway system is a recognized instrument of national defense.

IMPORTANCE TO OHIO RIVER VALLEY

This milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel since World War II reminds us of the importance of inland waterways to Jeffersonville, Louisville, and southern Indiana.

In my congressional district, we talk a great deal about industrial development. And the history of recent years shows that off-river plants constitute the industrial base of much of southern Indiana: the powerplant in Madison, the distilleries in Lawrenceburg, Jeffboat, and the detergent and soap business in Jeffersonville. In the last decade a high proportion of industry's capital investment dollars have been spent in adding new facilities or expanding existing facilities along the navigable inland channels—or very close to these channels.

These waterways become vital to the communities. Traffic on the Ohio River doubles on an average of once every 11 years. It is now pushing 90 million tons annually. In 1963 there was an average of 64 tons for every household in Louisville. It is easy to see what an impact on income and prosperity the waterways have in the Louisville metropolitan area. And for each 100 water-based jobs, it is estimated there are 100 to 135 additional jobs created by the waterways.

In my congressional district, I have said repeatedly that we have no greater concern than the development of our water resources. I usually say this in the context of reservoirs, watersheds, flood control, and water supply, which are very important to my district. But the same concern applies to the development of waterways which abut the Ninth Congressional District in Dearborn, Ohio, Switzerland, Jefferson, and Clark Counties. A sound use of our waterways creates a firm industrial base, helps create jobs, produces income, and brings economic vitality and prosperity to the region.

So I share your concern that the Nation's future is vitally dependent on full development of water resources, vigorous prosecution of a dynamic policy of water resource development. American national policy, from the writing at least of the Federalist papers and the famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787, has been for the free use of the Nation's rivers, harbors, lakes, and water courses.

The Northwest Ordinance said "Navigable waterways shall be common highways, and forever free—without any tax, impost or duty."

This policy is based on the sound recognition that the waterways have served and will continue to serve a variety of basic public purposes. Among them are unification of the country, furtherance of western expansion, defeat of sectionalism, low-cost transportation and lower prices to the consumer, water resource development, water supply, power, recreation and conservation.

So I join you in opposing special charges and user taxes on America's historically free waterways. Such taxes would retard essential development, upset competitive balance, bring economic hardship to businesses which depend on water commerce (and many do), raise prices of transporting goods and materials, and it would be an economic hardship to inland cities like Louisville and Jeffersonville.

JEFFBOAT

And the milestone reached today of producing the first seagoing vessel by Jeffboat since World War II symbolizes the contribution of Jeffboat and its parent company, American Commercial Lines, Inc.

Jeffboat is a producer. In 1965 it completes its greatest peacetime operation in its history—with 233 barges, 2 towboats, 1 deepwater vessel. In 1966 things look even better—250 barges, 7 towboats, and another deepwater vessel. A barge a day.

Jeffboat is a wealth creator. In 1965 its revenue will exceed $20 million and in 1966 this figure is expected to exceed $25 million. It is now the Nation's biggest manufacturer, tonnagewise, of barges, towboats, and related marine equipment. And it meets a staggering production schedule.

Jeffboat is an employer, too—920 people approximately were employed in 1965 and this figure will probably exceed 1,000 next year. Its present annual payroll is approximately $6.3 million.

And, of course, it's a consumer, too, using, for instance, about 9,000 tons of steel a month.

Jeffboat and the American Commercial Lines have had a distinguished history reaching back into World War II when it produced 125 LST's. It was honored five times by the U.S. Navy. The best is ahead.

So I am exceedingly pleased to be here, because this is a happy occasion. All of us want to build and grow and create. And you have done this in a remarkable way. You are helping the Ohio River Valley and southern Indiana and the Louisville metropolitan area take a giant stride forward in meeting the needs of its citizens. You are conserving, improving, and making use of our natural environment—the waterways—to the benefit of all of us. And many of us here today draw strength and encouragement from what you do—do for yourselves and for the Ohio River Valley and for the Nation.

I look forward to a great future for the Ohio River Valley—a future in which we will match our performance with our potential, our wealth with our resources, our power with our purpose.

I look forward to an Ohio River Valley—
Developing its natural environment.
Harvesting its rich crops.
Achieving in the arts and sciences.
Using its waterways to make the economy vital and vibrant.

And I salute you in the major part you are playing to bring the Ohio River Valley to its finest hour.

Medicare and Your Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, because of the many inquiries my office has received from constituents who expect to participate in the medicare program but want to know what they will need in the way of supplementary private insurance or financial assistance in the event of sickness, I have developed

a fact sheet which I hope will be of some help to them.

The Social Security Administration, of course, has made complete material on the program available but has approached the task with information as to the coverage medicare will provide. The fact sheet developed in my office shows exactly what the program does not cover.

This information, which has been checked for accuracy by the Social Security Administration, should be helpful to those persons who want to provide, through private insurance, for those expenses not covered by medicare. Many people, I find do not realize that medicare will not pay all the bills.

My concern about the eventual cost of this program and the philosophy behind it is a matter of record, but my purpose in setting forth the limitations of medicare is not to find fault with it but to make sure my constituents know exactly what it will provide. With this knowledge, they should be better prepared to participate in the program.

Because of the great interest that has been shown in this approach to the problem, I am pleased to insert the fact sheet at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of any Member who might find it useful:

THE LIMITATIONS OF MEDICARE

This fact sheet has been prepared to acquaint you with the limitations of the Government's new medical care program for people 65 and over and, hopefully, to assist you in the selection of private health insurance to supplement the Government plan. Actually, there are two Government insurance programs, both starting next July 1. One helps you pay your hospital bills, the other helps you pay your doctors' bills. In either case will the Government program cover all of your expenses. Listed below, for your use as a participant in the program, is a brief description of the limitations.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

(Eligibility is automatic if you are 65 or over and now get social security or railroad retirement benefits. If you are not getting these benefits—whatever the reason—you are probably eligible. If so you must fill out a routine application to establish coverage. There are no monthly premiums.)

Hospital bills: Limited to 90 days each illness. You must pay the first $40 in each spell of illness. After 60 days in any one spell, you must pay $10 a day for the additional 30 days of hospital care to which you are limited.

Outpatient diagnostic services: Limited to 20 days. You must pay first $20 in costs and 20 percent of remaining cost during the 20-day period.

Posthospital nursing home care: You must have been in the hospital at least 3 days before you qualify for this convalescent care in a nursing home or specially designated extended-care section of a hospital. After 20 days of this care, you must pay $5 a day for each of the remaining 80 days provided in a single spell of illness.

Home health care: Does not pay for doctors' bills. Program will pay for 100 visits to your home (by nurses, etc.) in any 365-day period following your hospitalization.

MEDICAL INSURANCE

(You must enroll and pay $3 a month for this plan, which will help you pay your doctors' bills. The Government also pays another $3 a month for you. If you were 65 by last year, you must enroll on or before March 31, if you want to be covered under this plan when it starts in July 1966. Those who are 65 or over and are getting social security, civil service or railroad retirement benefits will, upon enrolling, have the $3 deducted each month from benefit checks. Those not getting monthly benefits will be told later how and where to pay.)

Doctors' bills: You must pay the first $50 of medical expenses, including doctors' bills and other medical services (see "other medical services" below), in any calendar year and 20 percent of the remaining "reasonable" charges in that year.

Home health visits: You are entitled to up to 100 home health visits per year (in addition to the home health visits under hospital insurance) subject, of course, to a plan having been approved by the attending doctor for the same.

Other medical services: Other medical services, such as X-rays, surgical dressings, splints, casts, etc., are also covered.

SERVICES NOT COVERED AT ALL

You must pay for routine physical checkups, eyeglasses, hearing aids, dental expenses (except in certain surgical cases), private duty nurses, custodial care in a nursing home, and such personal services as a telephone and television in your room. Doctors' bills are not covered unless you sign up for the medical insurance plan.

DRUGS

Under hospital insurance, drugs are covered only when furnished in a hospital or extended care facility.

Under medical insurance, drugs are covered only when actually administered by a physician; not when self-administered, even if at a doctor's direction.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE OTHER HEALTH INSURANCE?

Although medicare doesn't cover all your hospital and medical expenses, it does offer some benefits (home health care, and nursing home convalescent care, for example) not normally covered by private health insurance policies. In fact, many insurance companies have indicated that to the covered individual, medicare is a bargain and have advised people over 65 to sign up for the medical insurance feature before the March 31 deadline. There are indications that many companies are now in the process of changing their policies so that after July they can offer to persons over 65 covered by medicare new policies to cover those things for which medicare does not pay. There is nothing in the act to prohibit private coverage and it is suggested that you consult your insurance agent concerning additional coverage.

Remember, though, that medicare doesn't start until July 1, 1966, so if you sign up for it, don't cancel any health insurance you now have, at least until then. If you have any questions about how your present insurance will be affected by medicare, get in touch with your insurance agent.

SHOULD YOU SIGN UP FOR MEDICARE'S DOCTOR BILL INSURANCE?

That decision is entirely your own. Coverage is not automatic. However, as your Representative in Congress, I would urge you to sign up without delay. If you sign up by March 31, you will protect your rights to all medicare benefits, and you can also carry one of the new supplementary private insurance policies if you wish. However, if you miss the March 31 deadline, you won't have another chance to sign up until the end of 1967, when the premiums will be higher.

In order to sign up for medical insurance one need not visit the local office in person but may do so by mail. All inquiries should be addressed to your district office of the Social Security Administration.

Appointment of Jack Hood Vaughn To Head the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the other body yesterday and to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn, to be the Director of the Peace Corps.

While my primary purpose in testifying was to urge the committee to approve Mr. Vaughn's nomination, I also discussed the role of the Peace Corps in our oversea assistance efforts.

Because of the great respect I have for Mr. Vaughn and the importance I attach to the position to which he has been nominated, I thought my testimony would be of interest to our colleagues and offer it herewith for insertion into the RECORD.

TESTIMONY OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, RELATIVE TO THE NOMINATION OF JACK H. VAUGHN, AS DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS, FEBRUARY 9, 1966

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful and delighted at the opportunity you have afforded me to testify in behalf of the nomination of Jack Hood Vaughn for Director of the Peace Corps. I warmly endorse his nomination.

While I know it is usual to speak primarily of a nominee's qualifications at these hearings, I should like to concentrate first on the importance of the position, for I think it has been underrated both in Congress and by the public.

The Peace Corps too often still today is viewed as a mere idealistic outlet to absorb the energies of the starry-eyed do-gooders of our society. While under the brilliant leadership of Sargent Shriver it has earned universal praise from the complete spectrum of our society—from its most conservative to its most liberal elements—its weight and importance is still not generally recognized. One has but to ponder that one of the President's highest aids, Bill Moyers, aspired to this post as the "Everest" of his ambitions, to come to second thoughts about its significance.

In my view, the Peace Corps demonstrates an approach to success in our endeavors with the developing countries, where all other approaches have to a greater or lesser degree failed. I think I will meet little argument that the future of the world and of our role in the world lies largely with these developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Peace Corps has proved the validity of working from the bottom up rather than from the top down in these countries. It has demonstrated the success potential of community development techniques of having our people live with the people they are assisting in the slums that surround all of the major cities of these countries and in the countryside in the rural peasant villages. It has demonstrated the importance and practicality of stimulated self-help—and the economy of such programs. It has shown that work in primitive societies does not necessarily require top technical background—that the average citizen of this country can play a meaningful role in the

development of a country where infant mortality is over 50 percent and the people don't know the significance of feces disposal, water impurities, or sound diet. It has proved the feasibility and efficacy of intensive language and cultural preparation of our foreign cadres, of having them live within the communities they serve rather than in isolated American ghettos, of having them receive compensation comparable to their host counterparts and play roles not as superior advisers but as coequals.

The future expansion of our foreign assistance endeavors should be along lines demonstrated successful by the Peace Corps—and no more appropriate person could be found than Jack Hood Vaughn to preside over this extension.

Indeed, by standards of experience, knowledge, ability, personality, character, and temperament, no equal could be conjured.

Jack Vaughn is a close personal friend and became so when he was my boss at the Peace Corps. He was Regional Director for Latin America and I, Director of Programs for the west coast of South America under him, virtually from the start of the Peace Corps.

I, therefore, am able to speak of him from a vantage point of an associate as well as a friend, and as a person intimately familiar with the Peace Corps operation he is to head, for I was the second staff member brought on board by Mr. Shriver to formulate the concept of a Peace Corps early in 1961. I can also speak of him from a personal familiarity with his knowledge of Latin America and the respect Latins hold for him.

What an unusual combination of experience. Jack Vaughn has served in virtually all of our overseas agencies—the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America and before that as Ambassador to Panama; our foreign aid agency as mission director in Senegal; he started his Government career in the early days of USIA in Bolivia and Costa Rica; and, of course, he served as a Regional Director of the Peace Corps itself.

The geographic diversity of his foreign experience has been broad, bringing him in direct contact with two of the three continents of the world with which the Peace Corps deals—Africa and Latin America—and with incomparable breadth and depth where the greatest Peace Corps concentration of activity lies, in Latin America.

Jack Vaughn's rise to responsibility has been meteoric and hard won. He came up the hard way, by his bootstraps. It's a real American success story worthy of Horatio Alger—how a golden gloves fighter from Columbus, Mont., going under the inauspicious pseudonym of "Johnny Hood" made good. He graduated from the University of Michigan in 1943 and volunteered for the Marine Corps where his talents earned him promotion from private to captain in just 3 years. He got a master's degree from Michigan when he got out and taught there and at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1949 he offered his services to USIA and from there had the spectacular span of Government service and rise of personal success previously recounted.

In the Peace Corps, Jack Vaughn built the Latin American program from insignificance to the dominant program. He was a man who was universally respected in a highly competitive organization and whose advice and counsel were sought by all. As a boss, he encouraged his associates to innovate and inspired from them an indescribable devotion which led to uncanny productivity. This human quality no doubt played an important part in his continuing series of successes and his warm following among his associates and the foreign peoples with whom he worked. He was immensely popular and respected both as Ambassador to Panama and previously as ICA mission chief in Senegal as well as at his other posts. The universal acclaim he received from all Latin capitals during his recent trip as Assistant Secretary of State is well known and recognized as a major contribution to our Latin American relations.

It gives me great pleasure to give this nomination my unqualified praise and to urge upon you and the committee the confirmation of a most unusually well qualified man for this job of great national and international importance.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under its previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday noon next.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 16 seconds a.m.), the Senate adjourned under the order of Thursday, February 10, 1966, until Wednesday, February 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ralph B. Winders, director, department of student work, Mississippi Baptist Convention, Jackson, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Mark 6: 34: *And Jesus, when He came out, saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and He began to teach them many things.*

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for Thy great mercy and compassion as revealed by Jesus.

This day we recognize ourselves as individuals needing guidance and wisdom even as the shepherdless sheep in His day.

Look upon us with love and mercy and grant unto us that we may know Thy will for us, and having known it, give us the courage to act accordingly.

Make Thy presence known in a special way to this assembled body as they deliberate this day.

Forgive us our sins and lead us in ways of righteousness.

We pray in the name of Christ and for His sake and in His presence. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6845. An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition to be held at Tulsa, Okla., May 12 through 21, 1966; and

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the chartering by act of Congress of the Boy Scouts of America.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1407. An act for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

THE WASHINGTON POST HAS NOT PRINTED THE TRUTH

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is an open season on Congressmen at all times, and that newspapers feel privileged to take potshots at us at any time they so desire. But I do think there are certain ethics