newly inducted GI a copy of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 11, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God to Thee, author of liberty, our thought of Thee is glad with hope, dear country of our love and prayer. Thy way is down no fatal slope, but up to freer sun and air.

Tried as by furnace fires, and yet by God's grace only stronger made; in future tasks before Thee set Thou shalt not lack the oldtime aid.

Great, without seeking to be great by fraud or conquest; rich in gold, but richer in the large estate of virtue which Thy children hold.

With peace that comes of purity, and strength to simple justice due, so runs our loyal dream of Thee, God of our fathers. Make it true.

"O Land of lands. To Thee we give
Our prayer, our hopes, our service free;
For Thee, thy sons shall nobly live,
And at thy need shall die for Thee."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 30, 1966, was dispensed with.

ORIGINAL BILLS REPORTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of June 30, 1966,

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on July 7, 1966, reported the following original bills; and submitted reports thereon, which reports were printed:

S. 3583. A bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward internal and external security (Rept. No. 1358); and

S. 3584. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1359).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of June 30, 1966,

The following reports of committees were submitted on July 7, 1966:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 3467. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children (Rept. No. 1360).

By Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 3112. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1361).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3035. A bill to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1363).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2287. A bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula (Rept. No. 1362).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 2574. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (Rept. No. 1366).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 8337. An act to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1364).

By Mr. McINTYRE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H.R. 15860. An act to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1365).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On June 30, 1966:

S. 693. An act to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 3368. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

On July 4, 1966:

S. 1160. An act to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 324, of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238), to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to establish the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

On July 5, 1966:

S. 1611. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the injunction of secrecy from Executive O, 89th Congress, 2d session, the International Telecommunication Convention with annexes, and the final protocol to the convention, and that the convention and protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith first, the International Telecommunication Convention, with annexes, and second, the final protocol to the convention, which were signed at Montreux on November 12, 1965, by delegates of the United States of America and delegates of other countries represented at the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, Montreux, September 14–November 12, 1965.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention and final protocol.

The International Telecommunication Convention and final protocol signed at Geneva on December 21, 1959, is presently in force between the United States and other countries.

Because of rapid technological and related developments in the telecommunication field, a plenipotentiary conference is held periodically under the auspices of the International Telecommunication Union to consider the revision of the convention. Separate administrative conferences are held from time to time with a view to modifying the radio regulations, the telegraph regulations, and other technical documents.

The new Montreux Convention follows closely the pattern and provisions of the 1959 Geneva Convention, which it will replace, but with a considerable number of minor improvements and a few major modifications. The principal modifications are those which would affect the functioning of the Union and its several organs.

The Administrative Council would be increased in membership from 25 to 29 seats, with the understanding that 3 of the extra seats are reserved for the African region and 1 for the region of Asia/Australasia.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The membership of the International Frequency Registration Board would be reduced from 11 to 5, or 1 for each of the 5 regions established for the election of the Administrative Council; namely, the Americas, Western Europe, Eastern Europe and Northern Asia, Africa, and Asia/Australasia.

Although the existing structure of the General Secretariat of the Union would be left unchanged, certain modifications would be effected to increase the operating efficiency.

The term of office of the Director of each of the two International Consultative Committees would be set at an initial 6 years, with continuing eligibility for reelection for each succeeding 3-year period.

The Coordination Committee over which the Secretary-General presides would be given greater responsibilities of an advisory character.

As under the existing Geneva Convention, each member government would contribute to the Union on the basis of the class of contribution freely chosen by that government. The United States, including its separately assessed territories—which have a separate vote in the Union—would continue to contribute 55 of the total of 556 units contributed by all members.

The Montreux Conference did not undertake to resolve many of the long-range problems which were the subject of discussion at the Conference, but referred some of them to the Administrative Council for study and recommendation. As stated in the report of the U.S. delegation to the Conference:

> Such important questions as the efficient organization of the Union, technical cooperation development, the streamlining of the IFRB Secretariat, and the investigation of the desirability of establishing regional offices throughout the world are examples of the type of tasks delegated to the Council.

At the time of signing the convention, the U.S. delegation made a declaration to the effect that signature of the convention for the United States did not constitute U.S. acceptance of the telephone regulations or the additional radio regulations which, under article 15 of the convention, are among the regulations related to the convention.

The convention and final protocol have the approval of the Department of State and the Federal Communications Commission. I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the convention and final protocol.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Enclosures:

1. Report of the Secretary of State.
2. Volume containing certified English texts of (a) telecommunication convention with annexes; (b) final protocol; (c) additional protocols; and (d) resolutions, recommendation, and opinions.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 11, 1966.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13651) to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for the collection of claims of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO SIMPLIFY LAWS RELATING TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to simplify laws relating to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, reporting, for the information of the Senate, that, as of July 1, 1966, 11 of the 13 parties to the Convention on the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 had ratified or adhered to the protocol; to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chairman, The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, Storrs, Connecticut, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign students in the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on management of donated food programs for Mexico under title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on violation of statutes by use of management and investigations of resources funds for general administrative expenses, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, dated June, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for effective guidance of Navajo Tribe of Indians in management of tribal funds, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, dated June, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for further improvement in accounting and financial reporting system, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated June, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

A letter from the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on equality of educational opportunity (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS RELATING TO THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Office, for the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 18—RELATIVE TO A HARBOR OF REFUGE AT SAN SIMEON

"Whereas an investigation was authorized by Act of Congress, Public Law 14, Seventy-ninth Congress, which investigation was to include the preliminary examination report of a harbor for light-draft vessels at San Simeon; and

"Whereas this preliminary examination report recommended that a survey report be made for a harbor for light-draft vessels at San Simeon; and

"Whereas light-draft vessels navigating between Morro Bay and Monterey are without a protected harbor along a 130-mile rugged and unprotected shore; and

"Whereas an improved harbor at San Simeon would considerably reduce the distance between safe harbors of refuge and contribute to the safety of life and property; and

"Whereas an improved harbor would enhance the economic stimulus provided by those who go to sea in light-draft vessels; and

"Whereas it is necessary that a federal government report of survey be made before a harbor for light-draft vessels can be established at San Simeon; and

"Whereas the California Navigation Conference has recommended to the House and Senate Subcommittees on Civil Works Appropriations that such a report be made; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California supports the recommendation of the California Navigation Conference and respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds for the report of survey to determine the feasibility of establishing a harbor for light-draft vessels at San Simeon; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution, adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for an equitable return of Government funds on an annual basis; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of the Tribal Indian Land Rights Association of Oregon, Inc., Portland, Oreg., remonstrating against the derogation of Indian rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A petition, signed by Sarah I. Bradley, and sundry other citizens of Covington, La., praying for permission for voluntary participation by students or others in prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 2947. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such act (Rept. No. 1367).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3034. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals (Rept. No. 1368).

By Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

H.R. 139. An act to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the one thousandth anniversary of the founding of Poland (Rept. No. 1369).

PRINTING OF BEACH EROSION CONTROL STUDY OF ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLA. (S. DOC. NO. 97)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting an unfavorable report dated May 12, 1966, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion control study of St. Johns County, Fla., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate, and the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 3585. A bill to amend the U.S. Grain Standards Act, as amended, to permit the inspection of certain grain thereunder upon the basis of submitted samples; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. METCALF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3586. A bill to make certain expenditures by the city of Portsmouth, Va., for a civic center eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3587. A bill to provide for settlement of labor disputes in the transportation and other essential industries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3588. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Chapman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (by request):

S. 3589. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3590. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eduardo Sixto Dieguez-Santiesteban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3591. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes; 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. MONTOYA:

S. 3592. A bill for the relief of Johann Klassen, his wife, Katharina Klassen, and their seven children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3593. A bill for the relief of George Zaharias; and

S. 3594. A bill for the relief of Angelo Picinic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3595. A bill for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 3596. A bill providing for appointment of postmasters and rural carriers from civil service registers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3597. A bill to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3599. A bill to establish a joint congressional committee to make a continuing study of the programs and operations of the Federal Government relating to science and technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3600. A bill for the relief of R. Carl Britt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Judicial Improvements of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, after consulting with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], we do not anticipate that a vote on the pending bill, the Federal Employees Pay Act, will occur before 4:30 or 5 o'clock. Although discussion of the pending legislation may be concluded before then, the distinguished minority leader and I have decided to ask the Senate to concur in our mutual wish, because some Senators have been unable to return to Washington because of the airline strike. We believe that because of the unusual circumstances, Senators should be given that consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Is the Senator making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I just desire to make that fact known.

U.S. GRAIN STANDARDS ACT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which I am introducing on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. The bill would amend section 4 of the U.S. Grain Standards Act, as found in 39 Stat. 483, 7 U.S.C. 76.

This is a very short bill, the stated purpose of which is "to permit the inspection of certain grain, upon the basis of submitted samples."

What we seek in the proposed legislation, Mr. President, is permission to apply to the handling of shipments of grain a little of the modern technology about which we hear so much. We simply desire to make possible the use of mechanical grain sampling devices in carrying out grain inspection procedures required by law.

In this way, we hope to expedite considerable the shipment of grain. Present inspection methods, in our view, cause a loss of time and aggravate the boxcar shortages which periodically plague the great grain-producing areas of our Nation.

Although it might seem that a move to use a mechanical device in the inspection of grain could be accomplished without action by Congress, we have been advised by the Department of Agriculture that this is prohibited under the present construction of the Grain Standards Act as reflected in regulations issued pursuant to its provisions. These regulations have been in effect with only minor change since 1920.

If the bill which is introduced today becomes law, it will be possible for automatic grain sampling devices to be installed in grain elevators along with rail lines. These devices would take samples of the grain as it is loaded into boxcars. The samples would be taken to the nearest licensed inspection agency, to be graded. This procedure could replace the present old-fashioned probe test.

A recent survey by a private firm interested in this matter traced the movement of nearly 10,000 railroad cars through 8 grain inspection terminals. Cars stopped or held for official inspection at these terminals underwent a delay that varied from about 2 days in one terminal to more than 10 days in others.

Given the 2 million carloads of grain that are shipped in this country each year, these inspection delays represent a waste of some 10 million car-days. In sum, modernizing grain inspection methods will have the same effect as building thousands of new boxcars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table until July 12 for the addition of names of other sponsors, and that the bill 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, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 3585) to amend the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, to permit the inspection of certain grain thereunder upon the basis of submitted samples, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. CURTIS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3585

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (39 Stat. 483, 7 U.S.C. 76) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, inspection and grading under this Act of grain shipped or to be shipped in interstate commerce may be based upon a sample or samples obtained (by probe or other mechanical device), and submitted, by or on behalf of the shipper of the grain."

PORTSMOUTH, VA., URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Presdent, I have today introduced a bill to authorize Portsmouth to get credit for money it spends on its proposed new civic center as local grants-in-aid for the proposed Crawford urban renewal project of which the civic center is an integral and essential part.

I have introduced this bill, as I introduced 3 others, S. 3146, relating to Roanoke, S. 3367, relating to Richmond, and S. 3458, relating to Hampton, because I think that these cities, like Norfolk and 14 others last year, are entitled to count their expenditures for major civic projects in downtown areas as contributions toward related urban renewal projects, even if these civic projects are used by or serve parts of the city outside the limits of the urban renewal project.

I trust that the Housing Subcommittee and the full committee will give due consideration to these bills and the 19 other similar bills which have been introduced and referred to the Housing Subcommittee for consideration in connection with the housing program for the year.

However, the fact that I, myself, have introduced 4 such bills and other Senators have introduced 19 is to me a clear indication that a general amendment should be adopted to authorize all cities to have the same treatment. It makes no sense for Senator after Senator to have to introduce individual bills to give fair and equal treatment to individual cities one by one. Instead, we should have a general amendment applicable to all cities conducting major civic projects in downtown areas, permitting the cities to count the cost of such projects as grants-in-aid for the project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3586) to make certain expenditures by the city of Portsmouth, Va., for a civic center eligible as local grants-in-aid for purposes of title I of the Housing Act of 1949; introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES IN TRANSPORTATION AND OTHER ESSENTIAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the settlement of labor disputes in the transportation industry and other essential industries.

The purpose of the bill is to provide legal machinery, after efforts have been made to bring disputant employers and employees into an agreement without success, for the appointment of a board vested with authority to make a final ruling in the matter.

We have had a number of stoppages in the transportation industry in the last decade. The one that provoked the greatest fury of protest was the New York stoppage in the metropolitan transportation industry. At that time statements were made, columns were written, and expressions made even on the floor of the Senate about the injustice and the calamity that came to the citizens of New York when the strike against metropolitan transportation business was put into effect. There was no effective method of bringing that dispute to an end.

The bill which I send to the desk provides that whenever a labor dispute has occurred in the vital transportation industry—and after the mediation board and conciliation service has exercised unsuccessfully its powers to bring about a settlement of the dispute—the President shall create a presidential board to investigate and decide the dispute.

The President shall appoint five members. Three members shall be representatives of the public, and two representatives, respectively, one for the industry and one for the labor union. This board shall have the power to conduct investigations and to take testimony at any place within the United States in relationship to the dispute. Moneys would be appropriated for the financing of the services of the board.

Upon the appointment by the President the board shall promptly hold a public hearing of the parties with reference to the dispute and shall make public a report in writing with respect to the dispute which shall state findings, conclusions, and decisions of the board.

Section 6 of the bill states:

> The decision of the Board shall be by a majority of the whole Board. The rates of pay, rules, or working conditions prescribed or approved by the Board in its report shall be just and reasonable and, unless set aside in judicial proceedings shall be final.

Mr. President, I recognize that the proposals of the bill will not be highly acceptable to many people. However, I am definitely of the opinion that our country cannot suffer any longer the stoppage of the transportation industry which is so vital to the economy of our Nation.

We now have the airline strike. We know what it has done. We know what happened in New York. In my judgment, a law of the type which I propose is needed on our statute books.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed and referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3587) to provide for settlement of labor disputes in the transportation and other essential industries, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, TO AUTHORIZE AIRCRAFT NOISE ABATEMENT REGULATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Federal Aviation Agency Administrator, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Administrator be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3591) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft bill "To amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize aircraft noise abatement regulation, and for other purposes."

This bill is part of the FAA legislative program and is needed to assist us in alleviating a most serious problem.

The introduction of jet aircraft into civil use has provided a faster and more economical method of air transportation which has proved a great benefit to the nation's, and the world's, air commerce. But while advancing jet aircraft technology has provided that benefit, and promises even greater benefits for the future, one increasingly serious disadvantage has accompanied the benefit: jet noise.

Several communities, particularly those located in the vicinity of large jet airports, have experienced the annoyance of jet noise. Heavier jet aircraft are now being introduced into service and the volume of traffic by jet aircraft of all types is rapidly increasing. Thus we can expect that more people will suffer the annoyance of aircraft noise in immediate future years.

Numerous bills have been introduced in this and other recent Congresses proposing various approaches to the solution of the aircraft noise problem. These bills reflect the legitimate concern that many members of Congress feel regarding the impact of aircraft noise on persons and property on the ground.

We in the executive branch are also concerned. The President has designated his Special Assistant for Science and Technology to direct the activities of an interagency task group charged with the responsibility for studying the noise problem and recommending what legislative or administrative actions are needed to alleviate it. That group has recommended that the enclosed legislation be transmitted to the Congress with a request for early enactment.

The proposed bill adds a new section 611 to the Federal Aviation Act to authorize the Administrator to prescribe and apply noise control standards under the provisions of Title VI of the Act, which are presently limited to the promotion of safety.

The existing authority of the Administrator to act in the aircraft noise area is confined to Title III of the Act, section 307(c) of which authorizes and directs the Administrator "to prescribe air traffic rules and regulations governing the flight of aircraft . . . for the protection of persons and property on the ground. . . ." The New Title VI authority is designed to complement the existing noise abatement authority conferred by section 307(c).

The proposed bill authorizes the Administrator to prescribe aircraft noise standards, rules and regulations in the same manner now authorized with respect to minimum standards, rules and regulations as may be required in the interest of safety. The bill also authorizes the application of such noise standards, rules and regulations in the certification of aircraft, airmen, air navigation facilities and air agencies. Under Title VI of the Act, the Administrator is already empowered to issue, amend, modify, suspend or revoke such certificates, but for safety considerations only. This bill would authorize the enforcement of the noise standards in the same manner as we now promulgate and enforce safety standards.

The proposed bill is a part of the Federal Government's overall program to alleviate the problems of aircraft noise by (1) reducing aircraft noise at the source, (2) developing noise abatement flight techniques and (3) fostering the compatible use of land adjacent to airports. Under the proposed bill, noise output must, as a Federal requirement, be taken into account not only in the operation of aircraft but also at the appropriate stage of the development and manufacture of new aircraft. Without such a Federal requirement, there is no authority to insist that the manufacturers and operators take the necessary preventive action within the existing state of the art of noise reduction. Accordingly, we ask early enactment of this legislation to permit us to proceed immediately to develop whatever reasonable standards are appropriate to be applied in the certification of air navigation facilities, air agencies, aircraft, and airmen.

If the Department of Transportation legislation now pending before the Congress (H.R. 13200 and S. 3010) is enacted, the authority vested by the proposed bill in the Administrator and the Civil Aeronautics Board will become vested in the Secretary of Transportation and the National Transportation Safety Board, respectively.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that submission of this proposed legislation is consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKEE,
Administrator.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS AND RURAL CARRIERS FROM CIVIL SERVICE REGISTERS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers on a nonpolitical basis. My bill provides for the filling of these vacancies through the competitive procedures of the Civil Service Commission and insures that the most qualified individuals will be selected and appointed by the Postmaster General. All Senators, as well as the people of our country, are aware of the present inequitable system, the lengthy delay inherent in the nomination and confirmation process, and the too frequent resulting inefficiency in the Post Office Department. The number of postmaster nominations sent to the Senate by the President is overwhelming. So far this year we have received 1,037. Figures for the past 5 years indicate not only the volume of work these represent for an already overburdened Senate, but also the opportunity present for widespread abuse in such a system. These are: 1965, 1,456; 1964, 1,303; 1963, 1,918; 1962, 1,644; 1961, 1,949.

I urge Senators to face up to this challenge for better service for the public and greater return from their tax dollar.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill 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. 3596) providing for appointment of postmasters and rural carriers from civil service registers, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3311 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3311. METHOD OF APPOINTMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Postmaster General shall appoint postmasters in accordance with the Civil Service Act and rules except that in each case he shall appoint the person who is certified to him by the Civil Service Commission as the eligible applicant who has the highest earned rating among the applicants examined."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 3315 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "(4) Appoint an Acting Postmaster,", and inserting in lieu thereof "(4) Appoint the Senior Officer or Clerk in the Office as Acting Postmaster."

SEC. 2. (a) Title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately following section 3339 the following new section 3340:

"SEC. 3340. APPOINTMENT OF RURAL CARRIERS.—In filling a vacancy in the rural carrier service the Postmaster General shall appoint the person certified to him by the Civil Service Commission as the eligible applicant who has the highest earned rating among the applicants examined."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 43 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto the following:

"3340. Appointment of rural carriers."

BILL FOR RELIEF OF INEQUITIES ON CIVILIAN INSTRUCTORS (USMA)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to

amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code. A companion measure was introduced in the House by Congressman ALEXANDER PIRNIE who is a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The purpose of this bill is to allow those civilian instructors who were hired by the U.S. Military Academy on the explicit understanding that there was to be no charge for their housing to continue their services under the terms of the original contract. If this bill is not enacted, they will retroactively be subject to a 1963 reinterpretation and ruling by the Comptroller General which imposed a $1,500 per year charge for housing.

While the bill provides relief for those 14 instructors injured by the GAO ruling, those hired after the announced change would be required to abide by the new ruling; thus the legislation provides for an eventual termination of the privilege through personnel turnover. The bill has the support of the Superintendent of the Military Academy and the Department of the Army. For the above reasons, I strongly urge passage of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3597) to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TAX TREATMENT OF EXPENDITURES FOR FACILITIES TO ABATE AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides an incentive tax credit for the taxpayer who undertakes a construction program for air and water pollution treatment facilities in cooperating with the Federal and State Governments on pollution programs.

The 20-percent incentive tax credit is applied to all costs of the facility—buildings, improvements, machinery, equipment, and includes total costs of land. Under this legislation the investment tax credit would not be allowed in respect of these facilities.

In addition, the taxpayer is permitted at his election, to deduct these expenses or to amortize these expenditures during the tax year or over the next 4 years after the year in which the expenditures were made.

For the taxpayer to qualify for the benefits of the incentive tax credit and the rapid tax amortization provisions of this proposal, he must obtain approval from the appropriate State agency that the facility is to be constructed in accordance with the State's program for abatement of air or water pollution.

The provisions of the legislation are relatively simple, but they are essential to accelerate construction on the part of business and industry and to achieve the tremendous task involved. American business and industry must have these incentives to undertake programs of the scope necessary to solve the Nation's pollution problems promptly.

The money expended for these projects would be put into nonproductive facilities, primarily in the interest of the public in health, welfare, recreation, and esthetics. These are costly facilities to construct and will require high nonproductive operating costs, which will be continuing charges against future earnings. A modest incentive tax credit and rapid tax amortization of the tremendous costs involved in the construction of pollution abatement facilities will enable the Nation's leaders of business and industry to take prompt action to cooperate with State and Federal Governments in helping to solve the pollution facing our Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3598) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, of such expenditures, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as we all know, pollution and contamination of our air and water resources is an increasingly important problem facing the United States.

The distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has today introduced a most important piece of legislation designed to help us cope with this growing problem, and I am proud to associate myself with this bill as a cosponsor. I hope it will receive prompt congressional attention.

Many American leaders in business and industry are voluntarily making large-scale plans and expect to commit heavy expenditures in an attempt to combat and solve the serious pollution problem. Many cities in my State—particularly Houston—are seeking ways to clear up air and water pollution.

This legislation provides an incentive tax credit to private firms for all expenditures made for certified pollution abatement facilities. In addition these taxpayers would be able to take these antipollution expenditures as a deduction or to elect to amortize these costs over a period of from 1 to 5 years.

I believe this is an effective and appropriate method of indicating Federal concern in this field and of making it possible for private firms to retain funds with which to make attacks on air and water pollution. Working with State and local authorities, they should—with the assistance provided by this legislation—be able to make major strides toward the goal of preserving clean air and clean water for all Americans to use and enjoy.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOVERNMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a joint committee to make a continuing study of the programs and operations of the Federal Government relating to science and technology, and for other purposes, and request that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

I have long felt that despite the proliferation of offices in the executive branch of the Government dealing with science and technology, there is a definite lack of coordination of Government policies and plans, and certainly little or no coordination between Government plans and those of the nongovernmental sector. Further, there is insufficient coordination in the congressional oversight of Government efforts in science and technology. This is not to say there are not individuals and organizations concerned with science, and even with the coordination. But too much of the effort in this direction is fragmented, and I feel that the Senate in particular needs better information along these lines. Even within the Appropriations Committee, where I believe we would be most likely to find some sort of comprehensive overview of such activity, there is no real coordination due to the organization into subcommittees and the consequent piecemeal approach to the budget. As a matter of fact, I have recently had the rather frustrating experience of trying to reconcile figures in the budget of the Department of Defense for research and development. The Defense Department gave me a total dollar figure they say they spend on research and development, and when I noted that this figure differed considerably from the amount the Bureau of the Budget said Defense would spend on research and development, I was told that the two offices simply use different bases for computing the proper figure—and so the two could not be reconciled.

The budget contains, it seems, more money each year for scientific research. The "Special Analyses of the Budget," prepared for the fiscal year 1967 budget, contains a 20-page analysis of Federal research, development and related programs. It is, of necessity, a superficial treatment of the Federal involvement in scientific endeavor, and contains none of the substantive information which I would like to see presented to Congress in the annual report my bill would require.

It does show, though, that 11 executive departments and independent agencies either support or are engaged directly in the conduct of research and development to a substantial degree. It shows obligations for research up $200 million in the 1967 budget, from $5.4 billion in fiscal year 1966 to $5.6 billion in the 1967 budget. The comparable figure for fiscal year 1965 was $4.8 billion, an increase of $800 million in 2 years.

It shows also 4 Government-wide programs of scientific research spread among 14 different departments or agencies. Atmospheric science, for example, is budgeted for $234.6 million in fiscal year 1967, spread among five executive

departments and four independent agencies. Part of this will be in-house research, part will be by contract or grant to nongovernmental institutions.

Table I–15 in the analysis shows budget expenditures for research and development 1954–66 and also the budget requested for fiscal year 1967. It shows the growth of our R. & D. expenditures in that period of time from $3 billion in 1954 to a requested $16 billion in fiscal year 1967.

In conjunction with this tremendous growth in Government spending for research, we have seen what has been called the "information explosion." Our scientific and technological information has been expanding at such a rate as to be almost incomprehensible. We appropriate funds for the NSF each year now just to index the new information, in an attempt to at least keep scientists in the various fields abreast of developments within their own areas of interest.

And as Senators know, in the Congress we are required to pass judgment on budget requests for science and technology. We are expected to, and should, have some degree of familiarity with at least the general outlines of what is going on in the various disciplines of science, and within the various departments of the Government in the way of science and technology, if we are to fulfill our legislative duties in responsible fashion.

I have strongly supported the various Government programs in science through the years, and I feel that I have been in a uniquely favorable position to do so especially through my work on the Committee on Appropriations. I am privileged to serve on the Subcommittee on Defense Department Appropriations, where the largest amount of funds for science and technology is handled; on the Subcommittee on HEW Appropriations, which includes funds for the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health; and as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, which handles funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Science Foundation, among others. I also serve as a member of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, which makes recommendations to the full Committee on Appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, among others, although I am not as closely connected with that particular appropriation as with the others I have named. The Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, NASA and NSF together account for $13.6 billion of our $15.9 billion R. & D. budget proposed for fiscal year 1967. AEC has another $1.5 billion in R. & D. funds, and the other $816 million in the budget is spread among several departments and agencies.

I do not suggest by the introduction of this bill that the Federal effort in science and technology should be cut back. I believe that the great bulk of funds we have appropriated for this work have been well invested. There is not the tendency today which I believe I saw 3 or 4 years ago to grant funds without question if they were labeled "R. & D." But I feel we should have more information, and in particular a broader view of the information available, to arrive at the decisions we must make. What I am concerned about is putting into the hands of Congress sufficient information for us to discharge our responsibilities intelligently, and to allow us to make an informed, independent judgment on whether we are satisfied with the overall direction being given to our support of science and technology.

The bill I introduce would require that the President prepare a comprehensive report each year setting forth the major policies, plans, goals, and programs of science and technology in the Government and, so far as they are known, in nongovernmental organizations, and changes proposed therein; the status of and steps to be taken in coordinating such work both within the Government and between the governmental and private sectors; impact of major developments in science and technology; and an assessment of the spending on science and technology anticipated by the Government and nongovernment institutions during that year. The bill would also establish a Joint Committee on Science and Technology which would be without legislative jurisdiction or authority, but would review by way of hearings and issuance of a committee report, the report submitted by the President.

The functional model for the proposal I make is the method now employed by Congress to keep itself informed on the Nation's economic situation and plans. I believe that the President's Economic Report and the review of it by the Joint Economic Committee have been helpful to the Congress and the Nation, and feel that a similar sort of review in the fields of science and technology would also be of great benefit.

While the committee would be without legislative authority, as are the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Joint Economic Committee, it could make recommendations to the appropriate committees with jurisdiction or to the Congress as a whole; and at the very least, I would expect this committee to point out some of the areas where the Government could improve its handling of this great and rapidly expanding field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3599) to establish a Joint Congressional Committee to make a continuing study of the programs and operations of the Federal Government relating to science and technology, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 637

Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, and Mr. RANDOLPH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended to strengthen and expand food service programs for children, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of June 15, 1966:

S. 3506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction of certain additional moving expenses of employees: Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HART, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of June 21, 1966:

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the 30th day of September in 1966 as "Bible Translation Day": Mr. ERVIN.

Authority of June 23, 1966:

S. 3550. A bill to provide for the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of a 25-cent-per-bushel export marketing certificate on wheat for the 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of wheat: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MONDALE.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senators TOWER, MORSE, and YARBOROUGH be added as cosponsors of S. 3097, a bill to provide financial and other aid, under the Housing Act of 1949 and related Federal programs, to encourage and assist in the preservation and maintenance of historic structures, at the next printing of this bill.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts be added as a cosponsor of S. 3521, a bill to foster high standards of architectural excellence in the design and decoration of Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and to provide a program for the acquisition and preservation of works of art for such buildings, and for other purposes, at the next printing of this bill.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 3561, to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, to express the sense of Congress that the United Nations provide for the self-determination of the Baltic States, the name of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] be added as a cosponsor.

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

NOTICE OF CONTINUATION OF HEARING ON STATE PROCEDURES FOR THE REMOVAL, RETIREMENT, AND DISCIPLINING OF UNFIT JUDGES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce that the hearing on State procedures for the removal, retirement, and disciplining of unfit judges to be held Thursday, July 14, will be continued on Friday, July 15, in room 6226, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 9:30 a.m.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON VARIOUS BILLS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce hearings on the following measures:

S. 1356, a bill to permit Indian tribes to bring civil action in Federal district courts without regard to the $10,000 limitation;

H.R. 2653, a bill to permit the District Court for the District of Connecticut to sit also at New London;

S. 3404, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to transfer inmates at the District of Columbia jail to any other institution under the control of the Director of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections nothwithstanding the pendency of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus with respect to such inmate;

S. 3576, a bill to amend section 2241 of title 28 of the United States Code, with respect to jurisdiction and venue of applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody under judgments and sentences of State courts.

The hearing will be held on July 15, 1966, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room 6226 of the New Senate Office Building. Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD NATO

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that the Honorable George Ball, Under Secretary of State, will appear before the committee as a witness on U.S. policy toward NATO and related matters on Wednesday, July 13, 1966. The hearing will be open to the public. It will begin at 10 a.m. in room 318, the Caucus Room, Old Senate Office Building.

Mr. Ball last appeared before the committee on June 30. The hearing on that day was supposed to be devoted to European matters, but because of the interest in events in southeast Asia, particularly the initial bombing of oil installations near Hanoi and Haiphong, the June 30 hearing was devoted almost exclusively to the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Ball's appearance on July 13 continues the committee's educational hearings on Europe which began on June 20. Previous witnesses have been McGeorge Bundy, Douglas Dillon, Gen. Lauris Norstad, Prof. Henry Kissinger, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, and Mr. Adrian Fisher.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on constitutional implications raised by the Supreme Court decision of Miranda against Arizona. These hearings will be held on July 20, 21, and 22, 1966, at 10 a.m. in room G-308 of the New Senate Office Building.

Any persons or organizations interested in presenting their views to the subcommittee should contact the subcommittee staff in room 419 of the Old Senate Office Building, Extension 3018.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lloyd P. LaFountain, of Maine, to be U.S. attorney, district of Maine, term of 4 years, vice Alton A. Lessard, resigned.

Vance W. Collins, of Kansas, to be U.S. marshal, district of Kansas, term of 4 years (reappointment).

Leo A. Mault, of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal, district of New Jersey, term of 4 years (reappointment).

Jackie V. Robertson, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Oklahoma, term of 4 years, vice William M. Broadrick, resigned.

Jesse L. Dobbs, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Texas, term of 4 years (reappointment).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday July 18, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Robert R. Bowie, of Massachusetts, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on July 7, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2266. An act to authorize the Attorney General to transfer to the Smithsonian Institution title to certain objects of art; and

S. 2999. An act to amend section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965; 79 Stat. 1068).

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the Nation grows, and the programs passed by Congress increase in scope and complexity, the need to exercise effective control over the Federal Establishment and to coordinate Federal cooperation with State and local governments takes on added urgency. This is particularly true in view of the outpouring of new legislation in recent years, especially by the 89th Congress.

It is reassuring to note that many Members of Congress and committee chairmen are giving serious thought to these matters since a responsibility in the development of administration for this legislation vests in the Congress. A leader in the search for effective coordination and control is Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, whose whose Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has spent 3 years studying these problems. His recommendations are embodied in legislation to establish a National Intergovernmental Affairs Council, which he described in some length on June 15 on the Senate floor.

More recently, an article entitled "The Challenge of Creative Federalism," written by Senator MUSKIE, appeared in the Saturday Review. I ask unanimous consent that that article, along with an editorial by the Wall Street Journal of July 8, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Saturday Review, June 25, 1966]

THE CHALLENGE OF CREATIVE FEDERALISM

(By EDMUND S. MUSKIE, U.S. Senator from Maine)

Federalism is everyone's concern—from the President, who is ultimately responsible for making our system work, to the individual citizen, whose way of life depends upon good government. There is nothing dull or abstract about the subject of federal-state-local relations, since they directly involve people: their health, their homes, their jobs, their rights as citizens, and their security as free men. And when our governments at each level do not apply their laws or allocate their resources effectively—when they do not cooperate to bring the full force of their

programs to bear on social and economic problems—it is the people who suffer, and the nation that loses.

During the past five sessions Congress has developed the most impressive package of federal legislation since the Depression to attack poverty, ignorance, urban blight, discrimination, and other human problems. It cuts across departmental and agency lines both in the federal sector and at state and local levels; it requires special skills and technology for effective administration. Thus, this legislation is only as good as the machinery which administers it.

Today this machinery, molded and tempered by a century and three quarters of evolutionary development, is under its greatest stress. While in the past we have concentrated primarily on the policies of government, the spotlight now must be turned on the procedures of government. Here is where the Great Society will succeed or fail.

What are some of the problems?

First, there is the emergence of big government—at all levels. The scope of government today has become enormous and complex, and it involves far more than federal activities.

In 1946, state and local governments spent a total of $11 billion to meet public needs, and they had a combined debt of $16 billion. This year they will spend approximately $84 billion, and their total debt will rise to $100 billion. This represents a 528 per cent increase in state and local outlays in the past twenty years.

By contrast, the federal government in 1946 spent $894 million to help the states and localities augment their public programs. This year that expenditure will rise to more than $14 billion and will involve more than 170 separate aid programs administered by some twenty-one federal departments and agencies. Projected ahead to 1971, state and local annual expenditures are expected to escalate to $120 billion, while total federal expenditures—barring a war or depression—will reach $110 to $115 billion.

The accelerated growth of public employment parallels this dramatic expansion of budgets and programs. Here, it is getting increasingly difficult to tell the players by the numbers, let alone keep track of the score. State and local public employment has risen from 3,300,000 in 1946 to 8,000,000 in 1965. The federal government—despite the popular myth that its rolls, too, are expanding—has reduced its employment by 100,000 during the twenty-year period, but it still accounts for 2,600,000 workers.

These statistics tell us a great deal about the pressures on our federal system. They highlight the strenuous effort that state and local governments have exerted and must continue to exert to meet the demand for more and better public services. They certainly dispel the notion that expanding federal power has undermined the capacity of these jurisdictions to govern themselves. And they show clearly how complicated the task ahead will be of coordinating our joint economic and social action programs.

A second major intergovernmental problem area is the "management muddle"—the overall quality and efficiency of administration of public programs. The Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, which I am privileged to chair, recently completed a three-year survey of federal, state, and local administrators to learn their views and attitudes about our federal system.

We found substantial competing and overlapping of programs at all three levels—sometimes as a direct result of legislation and sometimes as a result of "empire-building." We learned that too many federal officials, particularly at the middle management level, were not interested in, and, in fact, were hostile to, coordinating programs within and between their departments, and were reluctant to encourage coordination and planning among their state and local counterparts.

At the same time, federal aid officials complained that state and local administration was understaffed, lacking in quality and experience, unimaginative, and too subject to negative political and bureaucratic pressures. They found a variety of archaic state constitutional and legal restrictions that continue to block effective application of federal aid programs, and hamstring state and local administrators in developing their own programs.

Perhaps the most serious indictment coming of the survey concerns the caliber of state and local administrators responsible for building the Great Society. Confronted with urban congestion, slums, water pollution, air pollution, juvenile delinquency, social tension, and chronic unemployment, public administrators today must be professionals in every sense of that word. Yet we found that too often they are not, mainly because of the antiquated, patronage-oriented personnel systems which hinder the hiring and keeping of good people.

We found that unfavorable working conditions, low pay, and excessively bureaucratic rules and procedures discouraged both prospective employees and careerists. Personnel development programs, including opportunities for job mobility, in-service training, and educational leave, appeared to be minimal, except in some of the larger jurisdictions. We found a noticeable lack of effective merit systems, which results in the loading of some agencies with unprofessional, uninspiring, and ofter unfit personnel. Finally, responsible administrators complained that inflexible rules and regulations—dictating whom, when, and how they could hire, pronote, or fire—frustrated their efforts to develop effective staff support.

In short, there is a serious manpower crisis in state and local governments which, if not confronted, may contribute more than anything else to a weakening of the states, their localities, and the federal system as a whole.

What can be done? Where do we begin?

First, we must start by putting the federal house in better order. We can hardly expect state and local jurisdictions to coordinate their services and plan their communities if Congress continues to pass inflexible programs and if federal administrators maintain their traditional aversion to program coordination and comprehensive planning. What we need is a new policy of coordinating federal aid programs and new machinery in Washington and in the field to see that such a policy is carried out.

This is why I have recently proposed that permanent machinery be established in the Executive Office of the President to produce specific new guidelines for coordinating and planning federal programs, and for working directly with state and local leaders to encourage them to coordinate and plan their programs. This is not being done today—not by the Bureau of the Budget, not by the Council of Economic Advisers, and not by the more than 100 inadequately staffed interagency committees, boards, and councils which have been set up in the federal establishment to solve specific problems and which, for lack of authority, have ended up doing virtually nothing.

What the President needs in his impossibly busy and exhausting job is a personal ombudsman, a watchdog for crisis, a central domestic information agency, and an inspector general for program effectiveness. This can be achieved by creating a new and broadly based interdepartmental council with a "working secretariat" of top-level generalists not wedded to any department; or it can be achieved by strengthening the authority of the Bureau of the Budget in this area.

Secondly, we must find a more flexible way to grant federal assistance to the states and the communities that would encourage their joint programing and longer-range, comprehensive planning. Four recent bills are steps in this direction:

The Economic Development Act, passed last session, provides in part for establishment of regional economic planning commissions—composed of federal representatives and Governors of states that have related growth problems to recommend regional plans for coordinating programs, establishing priorities, and allocating expenditures.

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, which unanimously passed the Senate last summer and is now pending before the House, would establish a coordinated intergovernmental urban assistance policy and significantly strengthen the basis of regional and local planning.

The Demonstration Cities Act, recently advanced, would provide incentive funds to cities to come up with their own coordinated programs for renewing blighted areas on a multifunction basis—welfare, schools, antipoverty, housing—as well as supplemental assistance for federal programs included in the demonstration program.

The Urban Development Act would give special supplementary funds for projects that are part of a metropolitan-wide development program being coordinated by a public, area-wide planning agency.

The emphasis in all four of these bills is on marshaling federal, state, and local resources, in coordination, to achieve a meaningful impact, rather than on the traditional program-by-program, jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction approach—which too often has led to confusion, waste, and delay in overall urban development.

Some of my colleagues would abandon—wholly or in part—the federal grant-in-aid approach, and seek to stimulate overall development at state and local levels by sharing federal revenues with the states or by making block grants on an unrestricted basis. This is becoming a popular cause; its advocates include a curious coalition of conservatives, moderates and liberals.

The pitfalls of unrestricted revenue allocation are many and are sufficiently complicated to warrant extensive examination by a top-flight panel such as the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. In general, however, states vary so extensively in their attitudes and machinery for providing their own revenues, planning for their needs, administering their programs, and ensuring the civil and ecionomic rights of their citizens, that any kind of federal revenue sharing that ignores the uneven pace of efforts to modernize state and local tax, finance, planning, and administrative policies would provide windfalls to some states and inequities to others.

Third, we must develop a new federal program for helping state and local governments improve the competency and efficiency of administrative personnel. These people carry the bulk of the responsibility for making the Great Society work, and it is Congress' responsibility to help them.

I recently introduced legislation, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1966, which helps to discharge this responsibility. The measure extends the merit system requirement to more grant-in-aid programs (only nine at present are covered); it makes matching grants and technical services available to state and local governments for the improvement of their overall personnel administration; it encourages cooperative efforts in recruitment and training, on an interlevel and interstate basis; and it makes available federal training facilities and also provides

grants and technical assistance for training. Modest as these changes are, they at least would be a start in the necessary direction.

Encouraging the states and local governments to plan for expanding needs and make effective use of their own resources and of federal programs is admittedly a difficult task. Some observers feel that the traditional anti-federal biases and apprehensions of these jurisdictions make this task impossible. I disagree. Governors, county commissioners, mayors, and other public officials are serious about wanting to provide better services to their constituents. Politicians know the political mileage that can be gained by bringing effective, modern programs to their communities. And most citizens want to see their tax money spent wisely.

Encouraging federal administrators to visualize the long-term implications of their programs and to recognize the necessity for greater inter-level coordination and cooperation is also difficult. For some, the functional, professional, stand-pat bias of middle-management executives who administer grant programs makes this task impossible. President Johnson, however, and the top management of this Administration, do not despair of the task.

In his Budget message the President said:

". . . Many of our critical new programs involve the federal government in joint ventures with state and local governments in thousands of communities throughout the nation. The success or failure of those programs depends largely on timely and effective communications and on readiness for action on the part of both federal agencies in the field and state and local governmental units. We must strengthen the coordination of federal programs in the field. We must open channels of responsibility. We must give more freedom of action and judgment to the people on the firing line. We must help state and local governments to deal more effectively with federal agencies."

The President's concern with improved intergovernmental relations is critically important to the task ahead. The concern of governors, state legislators, county executives, mayors, and other public officials is no less significant. Cooperative federalism, after all, accepts the expanding role of state and local governments to take on greater political and administrative responsibilities as the nation grows, while relying on an effective federal role to provide incentives and resources to these jurisdictions to promote common goals.

The pattern of sharing that is so characteristic of contemporary intergovernmental relations is not new. It came into being during the three decades following the adoption of the Constitution—largely under the successive, masterful leadership of three Cabinet officers, Hamilton, Gallatin, and the younger Calhoun. The program of reform that I have described here merely updates this traditional approach, as must be done if we are to meet the challenges of the last half of the twentieth century.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 8, 1966]

COORDINATING A COLOSSUS

After three years of studying the interworkings of Federal, state and local governments, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE has concluded that things are in pretty much of a mess. His appraisal—confirmed by this week's Governors Conference—is indisputable but the Maine Democrat's proposed remedies do raise a few questions.

At all three levels of government, the Maine Democrat said in a Senate speech, his Intergovernmental Relations subcommittee "found substantial competing and overlapping of programs . . . sometimes as a direct result of legislation and sometimes as a result of bureaucratic 'empire building.' We learned that many Federal officials . . . were just not interested in—in fact, were hostile to—coordinating programs within and between their departments." The committee found similar deficiencies in the states and localities.

A number of Senator MUSKIE's suggestions have merit; among them are ideas for improving the quality of state and local government and for easing communications between various administrative levels. He also is wise enough to see that any attack on the problem should start in Washington.

"We can hardly expect state and local jurisdictions to coordinate their programs and improve their services," he comments, "if the Federal house is not in better order." Unfortunately, however, his proposals at the Federal level mainly involve new methods for managing the house; actually, the structure itself is in need of some basic alterations.

In the first place, there should be a realistic realignment of Federal responsibilities. To cite only one of the more glaring examples, transportation activities are scattered among the Department of Commerce, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Defense, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of the Interior and the General Services Administration.

The proposal for a new transportation agency could be a first step toward simplification, though the plan—as it now stands, anyway—would leave too many related activities outside. If the new agency is ever to serve its proclaimed purpose fully, its jurisdiction will have to be clear and complete.

Morever, if a new transportation agency is to operate efficiently it must be more than a rickety new framework placed atop a number of existing and still largely independent units. The folly of that approach should have been adequately exposed by the early misadventures of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

If these difficulties can somehow be surmounted, not only in transportation but in other areas, the way will be cleared for improved management and planning. Here Senator MUSKIE offers some ideas that are provocative.

At the moment, the Senator notes, there are at least 100 interagency committees charged with coordinating domestic programs that in one way or another affect the states and localities. Obviously enough, many if not most of these groups are ineffective and should be eliminated.

As a replacement for the interagency committees, Senator MUSKIE proposes a National Intergovernmental Affairs Council, chaired by the President and composed of the Vice President and the agency heads whose programs impinge on state and local governments. With a strong staff and the use of Presidential power, the NIAC could compel coordination at the Federal level and strongly encourage it elsewhere, keep tabs on existing domestic programs and serve as a forum on the need—or lack of same—for new ones.

While the NIAC plan has much to commend it, there's at least one major argument against it: The Council would do what the Budget Bureau already does or, if adequately staffed, surely could do. And we're afraid we don't share the Senator's feeling that the Bureau's usual emphasis on "budgeting, economy and functional performance" would be a handicap.

Furthermore, a beefed-up Budget Bureau would have an advantage in its breadth of approach. It could set up reasonable priorities not only in programs that touch states and localities but throughout the whole wide and expanding range of Washington's activities.

If there's ever enough will to coordinate the Federal colossus, in sum, a way can be found. Senator MUSKIE's analysis of intergovernmental confusion is further evidence that, unless the will is found soon, the alternative could be complete chaos.

COST REDUCTIONS REPORTED BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is indeed encouraging to read in the New York Times this morning about the tremendous savings being effected by the Department of Defense. The Department has, according to the Secretary of Defense, saved $14 billion in the first 4 years of its cost reduction program. During this same 4 years the actual expenditures of the Department have risen, not quite 50 percent on an annual basis, so that in fiscal 1967 the Department will absorb just about $60 billion. Since World War II our Defense Establishment has spent approximately $850 billion and today we have more bombs and other machines of destruction than the Nation has ever had.

It is indeed fortunate that we have such an efficient and cost-conscious administration in the Pentagon. It is all the more important as our defense expenditures creep up from the $60 billion to the $70 billion or even $100 billion mark. We shall need all the savings we can get in order to survive at all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, the article from the New York Times of July 11 by Mr. Benjamin Welles.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 11, 1966]

MCNAMARA SAYS COST REDUCTIONS SAVED $14 BILLION IN 4 YEARS

(By Benjamin Welles)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—The Defense Department has saved more than $14 billion in the first four years of its cost reduction program, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has informed President Johnson.

The program, which went into effect in July, 1962, has "far" exceeded its original goals each year, the Secretary said in a report relased for publication today.

As an example of the accomplishments, Mr. McNamara said that in the fiscal year 1966, which ended June 30, $4.5 billion was saved. He said this saving was $400 million more than had been estimated.

Mr. McNamara said it was expected that annual savings would increase to $6.1 billion for 1969 and each year thereafter.

This cost-cutting program, Mr. McNamara said in his annual progress report to the President, has not only produced "very substantial savings" but has also improved the efficiency of the nation's military logistics system.

NOTES MILITARY BUILD-UP

The $4.5 billion savings in 1966, the Secretary said, were achieved "at the same time we were building up a military force of about 350,000 men in Southeast Asia, some 10,000 miles from our shores" and were providing them weapons, ammunition and huge quantities of other needed combat supplies.

Mr. McNamara advised the President that the United States military effort in Southeast Asia had been increased in the last 12 months

by 240 per cent in the number of military personnel deployed and 480 per cent in the number of combat maneuver battalions.

He said that other increases had amounted to 235 per cent in the number of helicopters, 110 per cent in the number of land-based attack aircraft, 70 per cent in the number of naval vessels in offshore waters, 145 per cent in air ordnance expended, 310 per cent in the capacity of the ports, 240 per cent in the volume of dry cargo delivered by ship and 170 per cent in tonnage delivered by aircraft.

Further, he said, during the 1966 fiscal year the United States expanded production of fixed wing aircraft by 15 per cent, of helicopters by 60 per cent, of aluminum air field matting by 2,100 per cent, of air-delivered munitions by 1,300 per cent, of ground-delivered munitions by 160 per cent and of tropical uniforms by 6,700 per cent.

All this, Mr. McNamara noted, was accomplished without imposing wartime controls on wages, prices, or on civilian production and consumption.

The Secretary stressed that the Reserves had not been mobilized. And he said the Defense Department had held defense expenditures at a level lower than that of four of the past five years.

The level of spending was based on a percentage of the gross national product, which is the dollar measure of the nation's output of goods and services in a year.

Defense Department sources said that the spending percentage between 1961 and 1965 had been 8.5, 8.6. 8.4, 8.3, and 7.1 As far as can be estimated for the fiscal year 1966, they said, the figure yas 7.6.

Mr. McNamara conceded that the Defense Department's "Primary" responsibility was to be ready for combat rather than to cut costs. However he said that without an "incentive" toward the economy the pervasive tendency in the Pentagon would be to overstate requirements, hoard stocks and manpower and "pyramid" supplies at each echelon of management.

The United States emerged from the Korean War with $12-billion worth of surplus stocks, Mr. McNamara said.

"The over-funding during the Korean War was startling," he said, adding:

"In June, 1953, the Defense Department reported a total of $12.7 billion programmed for air force spare parts for fiscal years 1951–54 compared with actual and projected consumption in those years of only 1.7-billion; and an inventory requirement of only $1.5-billion.

"This is the kind of pitfall we are seeking to avoid in the current military build-up."

Under the present cost reduction program, Mr. McNamara said, the Defense Department stocks only enough to meet "normal peacetime needs plus the amount required to tide us over in wartime until production can catch up with consumption."

Even with hindsight, the Secretary asserted, "We could not have significantly improved" on the over-all performance of the cost reduction program during the last five years.

Some mistakes were made, he conceded, and "there is room for improvement in the mechanics of the program" as was pointed out by Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart, an independent public accounting concern hired by the Pentagon to review the program.

Citing the opinion of military commanders whom he did not identify, Mr. McNamara said:

"No military force in this century has been moved so far so fast, has been as well supplied and has sought as effectively as the force of 350,000 men, 1,800 fixed wing aircraft, and 1,700 helicopters which we currently have deployed in Southeast Asia."

"This has been achieved after realizing, during the past five years, $14-billion in savings from the cost reduction program and after eliminating, during the same period, almost $60-billion from the budget requests of the military services."

The cost reduction program is built on three basic principles, the Secretary said. These involve buying only what we need to achieve combat readiness, buying at the lowest sound price, and reducing operating costs by ending unnecessary operations, by standardization and by consolidation.

During the last year, Mr. McNamara said the Defense Department saved $1.6 billion by refining calculations of requirements, by increasing the use of excess inventories, by eliminating costly items and by cutting inventories.

For example, he said, the number of items in the Pentagon inventory, which rose from 3.3 million in 1958 to 4 million in 1962, has been cut to 3.8-million at a major savings. It is estimated that each item costs $100 to handle each year, he said.

The Secretary said that a deliberate shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement had also helped to save about $1.3-billion in the last year.

CREDIT UNION COOPERATIVES IN ARGENTINA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, an interesting article appears in the New York Times this morning. It describes the taking of control of the credit union cooperatives in Argentina by the Central Bank.

The article says this is the first dividend paid by the new military junta to its big business backers. If I understand the story correctly it is also a major blow to the development of a middle class in Argentina and eventually a democratic system. In view of this development I hope our Government will go very slowly in extending financial assistance to this new dictatorship.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BACKERS OF ONGANIA JUNTA PROFIT FROM CURB ON ARGENTINA'S CREDIT UNIONS

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

BUENOS AIRES, July 10.—The business backers of Argentina's new military regime received their first dividend Friday when the Central Bank took control of the widespread credit-union cooperatives.

Banking interests had been particularly opposed to the growing competition of the credit cooperatives and had long urged their liquidation. Other business sectors have been equally outspoken against marketing and other cooperative groups financed by these funds.

If the credit unions are dissolved as many believe they will be, the impact on Argentina's small-business men and consumers will be tremendous. Not only do the credit unions finance the corner grocer; they provide low-cost loans without collateral to tens of thousands of individuals.

Unable or unwilling to make small loans of this kind, commercial banks have seen these funds expand rapidly, particularly during the 32-month government of President Arturo U. Illia, which was overthrown June 28.

Although comparative figures are not available, a glance at the balance sheet of one of the typical unions of the 583 credit unions in the greater Buenos Aires district illustrates their recent growth.

The Villa Sahores Credit Cooperative had 750 members in 1962. By last June 30 the membership had grown to 2,667. The Villa Sahores Credit Cooperative's loans rose from the equivalent of $72,000 for all of 1962 to $900,000 in the first half of this year.

News of President Juan Carlos Ongania's decree placing the credit co-ops under Central Bank control and direction has thus far been overshadowed by the sesquicentennial events yesterday marking Argentina's independence. The full impact is expected to be felt this week.

However, the new Government's intentions were foreseen. A few days after the coup, overzealous Government aides ordered the arrest of 18 top officials of the Institute of Credit Cooperatives, which was formed in 1958 to act as spokesman for the autonomous units. President Ongania ordered the officials' release last Tuesday.

The credit unions were formed about 75 years ago by Jewish farmers and cattlemen in northern provinces. When the bulk of later Jewish immigration settled in the cities, the credit unions provided financing for small merchants and manufacturers that was usually not available to them.

Some foreign bankers conceded that these funds made possible the relatively high standards of living in Buenos Aires.

During the early decades of the credit unions they were often subject to harassment and despite the growing number of non-Jews in them they were the target of any anti-Semitic groups.

The broadening of the membership began during the 11-year rule of the former dictator, Juan D. Perón, whose strange economic theories hurt many in the banking community.

The greatest impetus occurred when President Illia's Government took office on October 11, 1963. His efforts to curb inflation pinched the banks.

Officially, the new Government has taken the position that the Central Bank, which is similar to the Federal Reserve System in the United States, could not regulate the nation's monetary policy with about a fifth of the country's banking business outside its control.

Officials of the Institute of Credit Cooperatives contend that they are already subject to banking regulations.

The first test of the Government's order is expected Tuesday when several credit unions plan to hold mass rallies. If held, they will be the first mass demonstrations against a ruling by the military regime.

DIPLOMATIC SANCTIONS ASKED

The Johnson administration was urged by New York's two Senators yesterday to continue withholding diplomatic recognition and economic aid from the new military regime in Argentina until it receives evidence that democratic processes will be restored.

In separate statements, ROBERT F. KENNEDY, a Democrat, and JACOB K. JAVITS, a Republican, called on Washington to show in practice its dismay over the overthrow of Argentina's constitutional regime.

The continued suspension of diplomatic and economic ties, they contended, would discourage other military uprisings and prevent the Argentine junta from becoming a dictatorship.

The Senators expressed concern about the developments after President Ongania indicated Saturday that he had no plan to call for elections or to lift the ban on political parties.

At the same time reports from Buenos Aires quoted diplomatic officials as confident that the United States would soon resume diplomatic relations which Washington suspended June 28.

VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently Mr. Stuart Chase wrote a very perceptive letter to the editor of the Washington Post, which appeared in the issue of June 24, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

VIETNAM BALANCE SHEET

The war in Vietnam has been escalating for almost a year and a half now, long enough to produce some accredited facts and much debate. Communiques from the front, reports by impartial journalists, editorials at home, teach-ins, full page advertisements, statements by the Pope, U Thant, de Gaulle and other world leaders, and most recently the Fulbright hearings—these are sufficient, I believe, to warrant a balance sheet. What do we stand to gain from this war, and what do we stand to lose?

The gains:

Our Government has carried on a policy inaugurated by former Administrations, and can thus claim a certain consistency in maintaining national policy and interest. (The fact that the national interest and honor have acquired a new and different complexion in the nuclear age is disregarded in evaluating this asset.) Vietnam provides a laboratory for testing new varieties of military hardware, chemicals and tactics. (Not all Americans, however, consider this a gain.) The rate of unemployment has been somewhat reduced by war spending.

The losses:

The detente with Russia, which promised so much for disarmament and ultimate world peace, has been disastrously weakened. To my mind this is the most serious loss of all, both for our country and for mankind. Vietnam, with the firepower now deployed or anticipated, will be battered to a pulp—its people, villages, rice fields. This is the major human cost. The American dead and wounded are also a grievous human cost. We are losing, if we have not already lost, the support of our allies around the world. Some governments may give uneasy assent, but not their people, if foreign reports are to be trusted. The Pope is critical and alarmed.

The United Nations has been materially weakened. U Thant is critical and alarmed.

Communist countries have been presented with a new arsenal of propaganda weapons, revolving around the charge of "imperialist aggression." Vietnam has seriously divided U.S. opinion, hurt President Johnson's consensus, and lined up many intellectuals and large church groups against the Administration. Most wars unify the home front; this war has sundered it. The credibility of official statements about the war is widely questioned. Many if not most citizens are confused and uneasy. Who is the enemy? Head counts of Vietcong dead do not seem to quiet the uneasiness. There is danger, in the steady march of escalation, that Russia and China may forget their ideological differences. If so, World War III looms.

A final loss, hard to measure, is the sheer momentum of war. Powerful people, in and out of the Pentagon, are now so fiercely concentrated on military victory ("there is no substitute for victory") that one wonders if the process can be stopped. De Gaulle, to his credit, stopped the war in Algeria, but it takes great leadership, once the tanks begin to roll. How long will it be before this war goes out of all human control?

It does not take a CPA to certify that the liabilities exceed the assets on this balance sheet, and that the deficit is mounting.

STUART CHASE.

GEORGETOWN, CONN.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter by one of my valued constituents, Mr. Lee McEwen, to the editor of the distinguished newspaper in my State, the Texarkana Gazette, of May 27, 1966.

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

[From the Texarkana Gazette, May 27, 1966]

EDITOR'S MAILBOX

EDITOR, TEXARKANA GAZETTE:

I take exceptions to Thurman Sensing's article in the May 15th, 1966 Sunday Gazette captioned "The Ugly Senator," because of Sensing's unfounded and unfair implications as to Senator Fulbright's views on foreign affairs, alleged Fulbright quotes taken out of context and the general structure of the article being based upon much innuendo. From newspaper accounts and having watched on TV much of the Senate Foreign Relations committee hearings about the Viet Nam situation, I had the feeling that it was conducted in such a manner as to find our real purpose and to give the American people answers to questions that we are entitled to know.

Senator Fulbright has frankly admitted he could have been and was perhaps wrong in the past in supporting some of the various phases of our role in Southeast Asia. This is not the mark of a man that would have his every opinion taken verbatim without review. I get the impression that Senator Fulbright tempers his statements with a "let's examine and see before we act" attitude rather than that of making rash statements in concrete form.

He has stated in the course of the hearings that indeed, since we have committed ourselves in Viet Nam, we have a "face saving" responsibility as a great nation with great power and we hope great respect in all the world. The Senator has never advocated that we tuck our tails and run, only that we examine the possibilities of an honorable settlement or withdrawal from an extremely unstable situation in a country in which we are not even sure that the majority of the people want our assistance.

I think it unfair for Mr. Sensing to accuse the senator of being bent on "convincing the American people that they are "ugly ducklings." The senator is not responsible for the number of unpleasant facts these hearings have laid bare to the public. The fact that we have used our influence to prevent elections in Viet Nam that were supposed to have been held long ago, is not the senator's sole responsibility.

It is a fact that these people in that area have been constantly engaged in warfare for the past 25 years and this is not the senator's fault. Do they think like we do? Do they want a system of government like ours? And in fact, do the majority want peace? These are questions we should have answered.

Is it a proven fact that many millions of dollars that was intended to help the masses of South Viet Nam people has in fact made rich people out of a few profiteers over there? Who is to blame for this? We furnished the aid and should be responsible for its intended distribution.

Is it being an "Ugly Senator" to head a senate committee that seeks to find answers as to why we are expending American lives, and tax money, (the latter the least important) in a country where there is no clear cut leadership and where one after another regime has fallen? Are we not a people capable of knowing these answers? If in fact we have erred to any degree in our policy in Viet Nam, are we not big enough to make corrections?

Certainly, any good American will fight to hell and back in the cause of freedom. And I sincerely hope our role in Viet Nam will serve this purpose. However, I find it comforting to know that we have in our nation such men of influence and leadership as Senator FULBRIGHT, who have the courage he has shown in attempting to reveal important facts to the people which they are entitled to know about such actions.

Our system of government is such that we have always had "checks and balances" in the form of various leaders in moments of national crisis down through our history. Let us pray that this will always be so and that it will insure sufficient tolerance and patience where and when needed.

Criticize if you will, such dedicated men as FULBRIGHT if they have different views, but don't condemn them as demagogues. Had it not been for such men, our Republic would have never been founded. Certainly our Declaration of Independence was prompted by voices that dared speak out against the leadership of the time and against the financial interests of many of the citizens.

Speaking as one American, I found the public hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee informative and enlightening. It has given me cause to wonder if our interpretation of "freedom" can be effectively applied in Viet Nam.

The leaders in power, when we committed ourselves, are shot and dead now—there have been a number of different assumed leaders since. We have never known the true desire of the people. Recent demonstrations and other developments have indicated we have good cause to wonder if our help or presence is wanted.

In fact, we are involved in a civil war in another country whether we want to admit it or not. And it may well become a civil war within a civil war.

If the majority of those people choose to have a communist type government, can we legally and in good faith impose our will by force to prevent it. Though we may detest the system and the evil it breeds, we cannot without being hypocritical, put a common brand on everyone and everything communist. If this is so, why are we aiding Yugoslavia?

It is right that the American people be alerted to potential hazards involved by our action so close to the Chinese mainland. It is careless to assume that China won't become directly involved.

Any nation of people that will spend 1500 years to build a defense wall to keep out invaders (1500 mile great wall of China began around 228–210 B.C.—completed the latter half of the 14th century) is by tradition and heritage bound to have a common fear of having their border exposed to foreigners. Whether they be ruled by clans of war lords or under the common direction of a Communist dictator, fear can cause a person or a nation to commit a suicidal act. I don't believe for a minute our leaders intend to arouse China, but we should not condemn those leaders who point out such possible dangers.

Sensing in his article suggests throwing things in FULBRIGHT's face—using our fighting back in Pearl Harbor and our action with the Berlin Air Lift as justification. It is absurd to even attempt to make comparisons between our situation in Viet Nam and that of Pearl Harbor and West Berlin.

In one, our people and our security were directly attacked with tools and men of war without any room for equivocation as to the intent for such attack. In the other, in Berlin, a right was being denied us which the world knew we had and were entitled to by virtue of Americans already having fought and died to help bring about. It is absurd to try to show equal comparisons and irresponsible journalism to try and appeal to a reader's same degree of patriotism was felt because of the Pearl Harbor attack.

The difference is: on the one hand our liberty was in jeopardy by direct intervening forces—on the other, as in Viet Nam, we are intervening and many Americans are wondering if the latter is justified even though we want it to be in the cause of freedom.

There is one thing for certain—Never before in the history of man, until recent years, did he have the ability to completely destroy himself. This ability exists today and whether we like to think about it or not we should, perhaps, sometimes need to be reminded of this in no uncertain terms.

Because of this grave fact, the American people are entitled to know all the facts pertaining to such commitments as we have made in Viet Nam. The American people should be allowed to decide whether or not we feel we have sufficient national resources, man power and wealth to commit them all anywhere in the world, especially when it is done in the cause of an assumed "fight for freedom," where there is insufficient evidence to know the majority of the people want our help. If there is clear cut danger to our freedom, by all means let's fight back and leave no reason to doubt that we won't, but let's have a lot of public committee hearings by our leaders on situations like Viet Nam before we become too involved.

Can we support many Viet Nam operations without eventually resorting to our great nuclear power? Is it not conceivable that we will be exposed to more than one such Viet Nam commitment and possibly all at one time if we don't examine our present policy? Aside from a few Australians and a substantial number of South Koreans, where are our allies in this action? Even the committed member nations of SEATO? (Many are hauling supplies that help our enemy.)

We are involved in a sticky mess unparalleled in the history of our republic, and a nation of people that has built what we have certainly are intelligent enough to review the situation from all aspects without condemning those that seek to help present facts to help us focus on the overall picture.

The simple facts are: we are in constant danger of war with China because of getting involved in something which has not been sufficiently proven that the justification matches the potential hazards and the degree of their consequence.

We do not want to be an aggressive nation, nor ever have to use our vast nuclear power, yet simple arithmetic should reveal to all of us that a nation of 200 million would have little chance of defeating one of over 600 million in a conventional war, where our supply lines would have to reach and be maintained half way round the world. We would almost certainly have to use our nuclear weapons, and once we "push the button" deterrent forces might very well, out of fear or for whatever reason, push theirs.

Though it might be unthinkable, this is a real possibility and should it ever occur, the "point of no return" may well have been past for all mankind. There may be a few moments left to reflect upon the mistakes of man, but no recourse left to correct them.

I believe that people are and need to be better informed than ever before—it is right and proper that we examine and review each step we now take.

There is one absolute certainty upon which we all can be sure of—if we can not correct any mistakes that might have been or will be made and the "button is ever pushed" we will be a long time dead.

Respectfully yours,

LEE R. MCEWEN.

TEXARKANA, ARK.

LOYALTY NOT THE ISSUE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Loyalty Not the Issue," published in a recent issue of the Northwest Arkansas Times.

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

LOYALTY NOT THE ISSUE

It has not been a question of "whether," but of "when" the administration would charge those in the United States who do not support escalation of the war in Viet Nam are less patriotic than the people who go along with an all-out effort to defeat militarily the powers in North Viet Nam.

The "when" was answered yesterday by Vice President HUMPHREY in an address to the nation's governors in Los Angeles.

Mr. HUMPHREY is quoted as proclaiming "The time has come for some of us to stand up for our country," implying that those who do not see the wisdom of spreading the war are close to being disloyal to the United States.

In the same address, the vice president remarked that it would be "immoral" for this country to "pull out of Viet Nam."

As everybody who has studied the situation knows, few if any of those who are not supporters of the ever-mounting war policy of the administration have counseled withdrawal from Viet Nam. The two stands are not synonymous, regardless of the interpretation of the vice president. And because some do not feel that broadening the war through extension of bombings is a wise course does not mean these people are not "standing up" for their country.

One of the dangers inherent in the Viet Nam situation is that the American people will be led to adopt the attitude that anything goes which will lead to a military victory—even dropping of "the" bomb. Those who have opposed escalation of the war effort have said repeatedly that the United States, the greatest military power in the world, can desolate enemy territory at will in the small and backward nation where fighting is raging. The advisability of demolishing North Viet Nam is questioned, not the ability of the United States to achieve this aim.

And there is no real question of patriotism involved in a difference of opinion as to whether continued stepping up of the war effort is wise or foolish. The vice president's intimations that "halfway" support of the expanding war effort, or direct opposition to such moves, are somehow disloyal are unfair and regrettable.

HOW FIAT CORP. SOLD MOSCOW

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the May 14 issue of Business Week magazine contained an interesting article about arrangements under which an Italian automobile manufacturer will provide goods and services to the Soviet Union for construction of an $800 million auto factory. I congratulate the enterprise of these Italian businessmen. It is estimated that as much as $320 million of the cost of the project will be spent in Italy. This is a very healthy development in international trade.

I regret that our businessmen are not at least sharing in these enterprises and contributing to greater trade and more normal relations.

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

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

HOW FIAT SOLD MOSCOW

The Italian auto maker's deal to help make cars in Russia will give $320-million boost to Italian industry. Now France's Renault and Japan's Toyota may follow its lead.

It was about quitting time for factory workers in Turin, Italy, last Wednesday when a peppery little Italian industrialist and a rotund Russian bureaucrat decided to sign their contract and do business together. Then, Fiat's honorary president, Vittorio Valletta, and Soviet Automotive Industry Minister Aleksander Tarasov toasted each other with champagne.

Each had reason to grin. With a stroke of his pen, Tarasov thrust the Soviet Union further into the automotive age than it has ever been. For his part, Valletta plunked Fiat right in the middle of the biggest industrial deal the Russians have ever made with Western companies. It could lead to more of them in Eastern Europe.

Fiat contracted to help engineer and set up a plant in Russia capable of producing 2,000 cars daily, or about 600,000 a year. The cars will be a version of Fiat 124s, reportedly modified with a larger engine (1,400 to 1,500 cc.), more rugged frame, less glass area and better battery shielding as protection against Russia's primitive motoring conditions and harsh climate.

IMPRESSIVE

While the secretive Russians didn't want to talk publicly about money, the deal by any standard is a whopper. Estimates of total cost run as high as $800-million, although slightly more than half of this may be local expenditures.

Certainly, the Italians came up with attractive financing: Istituto Mobiliare Italiano, the Italian state financing organization, agreed to finance $320-million of the deal, the part to be spent in Italy. The loan is repayable in 8½ years after delivery of goods at about 6½% interest. About 65% to 75% of the $320-million will be spent to buy machine tools and other equipment from Italian companies besides Fiat (Tarasov visited the Innocenti machine tool plants and the headquarters of Pirelli, Italy's biggest tire maker). Other orders may be placed with other European and perhaps even some American companies for supply of additional machinery.

Construction of the plant probably will begin next year, with the first cars rolling off the line by 1969 and full-capacity output probably several years later. No announcement of the plant's location was given, but Moscow sources mentioned as possible sites the Moscow area, Gorki, and Zaporozhe. All three are currently centers of vehicle production; Zaporozhe, the Ukraine, also has a steel mill. An estimated 2,000 Italian technicians will be sent to Russia to oversee engineering and construction of the plant.

NEW OUTLOOK

The Fiat deal reflects a changed Soviet attitude toward the passenger car in recent years. Both Stalin and Khrushchev were against private passenger cars on principle on the grounds that they tended to promote a private-enterprise mentality and that they

wasted resources. Premier Aleksei Kosygin, however, has said it is wasteful for Soviet officials to ride around in trucks and commerical vehicles. In any case, he ordered Soviet passenger car production increased from about 200,000 a year currently to about 800,000 by 1970. Some of the new cars will become taxis and a few will go to private use, but there is no indication yet that the Kremlin will devote sizable resources to mass construction of roads, service stations, and repair facilities typical of motorized societies in the West.

Since the Fiat plant won't go into quick production, it is expected that the Russians also will expand existing plants—and possibly contract to buy others in the West to reach an output of 800,000 cars by 1970. They have been dickering with France's Renault for a plant with the approximate capacity of the Fiat plant; a Renault mission is to leave Paris for Moscow later this month. Japan's Toyota Motor Co. has had preliminary talks with the Russians on a plan capable of producing 300,000 to 400,000 units a year, and the company is drawing up plans to submit to the Russians this summer. Renault may at least get some of the equipment for the Fiat plant.

THE ORIGIN

Fiat clinched the Soviet deal after four years of trying. In 1962, Valletta flew to Moscow to open a large Fiat exhibit at an Italian trade exhibit there. Valletta met Khrushchev, and the two talked about possibilites for plants to manufacture cars, tractors, or both.

Subsequently, Valletta hosted delegations of Soviet technicians visiting Fiat factories in Turin. Last July, Valletta and Khrushchev's successors signed a protocol for the joint study of scientific and technical problems. While the language was obscure, it was widely believed that Fiat and the Russians were working on a deal for building plants to make autos and tractors.

Nothing more was said about the deal until mid-April when Tarasov went to Italy at the head of a big technical delegation. Almost immediately, Italian sources hinted the deal was close to completion and that the Russians were mainly concerned about technical aspects of the car model and financing. Fiat, according to Italian sources, offered the Russians the 124 model, a new five-passenger four-door sedan with an engine in the 1,200 cc range.

But the Russians wanted a bigger engine. They also didn't like the large expanse of glass, possibly because it would be harder to seal out the Russian cold, and in general they wanted the car to be more rugged. They eventually got what they wanted. Says an Italian auto executive: "The result will only be a second cousin to the 124 model that we know."

BUILT ON EXPERIENCE

Fiat has had considerable success dealing with Communists. Its smallest car is made under license in Yugoslavia, and it has had other experience selling in Eastern Europe. But there may have been other factors in Fiat's success: Italians buy about 20% of Russian oil exports annually, and they are known to have been talking with Moscow for some time about the possibility of importing natural gas from the Ukraine. In any case, the Russians are in a good position to service credits because of their mounting trade surplus with Italy (nearly $100-million last year).

The deal stirred a flurry of interest in the U.S., although none of the Big Three auto companies—General Motors, Ford, or Chrysler—showed any immediate desire to inquire about the possibilities for following in Fiat's tracks. For one thing, present U.S. policy is to limit credits to Eastern European Communist countries to five years. U.S. trade with Russia is too small to make a Fiat-sized business deal plausible now. Beyond this, the Russians have made no bones of their reluctance to improve relations with the U.S. in any field as long as the Vietnam war goes on. For the same reason, U.S. companies would be wary of making deals with the Soviet Union which could be used against them by their competitors.

Still, U.S. participation in the Soviet automotive industry has a precedent; in the 1920s, Ford sold thousands of trucks and tractors to Russia and later cooperated with the Russians in setting up a large automotive factory at Gorki as well as a smaller assembly plant in Moscow. Many Ford engineers visited the Soviet Union and Russians visited Dearborn, Mich., in those days.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Flight Fast, But, Oh, Those Delays," written by Art Buchwald, which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post. The article is informative, and it should be preserved in the RECORD. The article discusses the tremendous importance of the supersonic airplane which this Government is sponsoring.

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

FLIGHT FAST, OH, THESE DELAYS!

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—"Good day, ladies and gentlemen, this is your captain speaking, and I'm happy to announce that this is the first supersonic flight from New York to Paris. We will be flying at an altitude of 60,000 feet and a speed of 1,800 miles an hour. Our flying time to New York to Paris will be two hours and 45 minutes. Now please fasten your safety belts and we will be ready to take off. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, I know you're wondering what the delay is, as we have been on the ground waiting to take off for the past two hours. Unfortunately, air traffic conditions are very heavy at this hour and we have been asked to hold here on the runway. We are now the 20th in line for take-off. . . .

"Well, folks, we've been moving up as you might have noticed and we are now second in line. I'm sorry these last four have been so difficult, but the tower has assured us we will get clearance to take off in the next hour or so. . . .

"May I have your attention, please. It appears that there are more planes in the pattern than was expected, and we've been asked to hold further. Why don't you all relax? I've turned the 'No Smoking' light off . . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, we've finally been cleared for take-off. Would you all please relax? I apologize for the six-hour delay at the runway, but this is something we have no control over . . .

"Well, folks, we seem to have broken some sort of record. Our flying time to Paris was two hours and 31 minutes. Unfortunately, there are many planes circling the Orly airport and we've been asked to fly over to Copenhagen and hold there at 55,000 feet. Paris assures us that as soon as it is feasibly possible they will permit us to make an approach. . . .

"Ladies and gentlemen, this is your pilot speaking. Since I last spoke to you 90 minutes ago I regret we have not been encouraged by Paris to come in and they have asked us to maintain altitude and fly in a pattern over Sicily. The stewardess tells me there seems to be a shortage of drinks and water, so we are putting everyone on rations of one glass of water each.

"Also, I'm sorry to say we have run out of food.

"Some of you have complained about seeing the movie four times, so for the next two hours we'll play stereophonic music instead.

"You'll be kept informed as to our progress. . . .

Folks, this is the captain again. I know you're all very tired and hungry and thirsty and so am I, but trying to knock down my door is not going to help anybody. We should be getting the green light from Paris any time now . . .

"We've just heard from Paris and we are now in the pattern and will be permitted to land within the next hour. Please fasten your safety belts . . .

"This is your captain again. As you can gather we are on the ground at Orly, France. Unfortunately there doesn't seem to be any room at the ramp and we've been asked to wait out here until someone leaves. It should not be more than 40 or 50 minutes. . . .

"Well, here we are at the terminal and I hope you've enjoyed your first supersonic flight. I'm happy to announce we beat the Queen Mary's record by four hours and 12 minutes."

STRUGGLE FOR UNITY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 11, 1966, I had the honor to speak at the commencement ceremonies of California State College, at Long Beach.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks at that time appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

STRUGGLE FOR UNITY

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL at commencement ceremonies of California State College at Long Beach, June 11, 1966)

I am highly honored that you should ask me to participate in these commencement exercises of California State College at Long Beach. I share the pride of the people of California, and particularly of the people of this great metropolitan and cosmopolitan community of Long Beach, in all that has been accomplished here, on this campus, in the indispensable cause of higher education, and, beyond that, for what has been accomplished generally for education, and for higher education by our entire state.

Here, students may study and learn, regardless of creed or race. Here all have an equal opportunity to use the brains God put in their heads to think with, and, under the guidance and instruction of a dedicated faculty, to educate themselves, and to develop their own skills and talents.

I am a neighbor of this institution. My home, Anaheim, is less than half an hour from this campus. And it is to this area that my immigrant grandfather came from across the sea, well over a century ago, to be an American, to live out his life, and to raise his family, in freedom.

I give to those who graduate today my earnest and warmest congratulations. You are the products of an educational system successfully created by our society, fashioned by our own unique political institutions, through legislation adopted by democratic processes, and you represent the best hope of the Republic and of our Golden State that this kind of free society, which you know and I know, will endure.

We have made great progress in the production of material things in this country. American industry, led by our men of science and of technical skills, has produced all manner of new contrivances for creature comfort. People will, it appears, live longer, travel to more places, and do it faster, with more leisure time than ever before. The dimensions of energy available to us are vastly altered from what they used to be, and are of such an order as to defy comprehension. We are led to believe that the discovery of the secrets of the atom constitutes simply one more quickly passing milestone in the accelerating pace of scientific discovery.

Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott, the President of George Washington University, has said that "the brink of the unknown is the true playground of the scholar." I have no doubt at all that in your lifetime, graduating students, many of the barriers which now insulate us from the unknown will be broken down, as scholars from all the fields of science continue their relentless probing. And who are we to dare to stop them?

It was King Solomon who said "knowledge is a wonderful thing: therefore get knowledge; but with all thy getting, get understanding."

What we need, in the process of making material advances, is achieving some progress in becoming better people. While our standard of living may be going up, our standards for life ought also to be improving. I think that is what Solomon had in mind: with knowledge, get understanding.

Not very far from here is the area which, just last summer, suffered violence and tragedy as flames erupted, and death occurred, over a fairly wide area of this county. What good is all our progress through technology and science if we still have the most terrible and unbelievable civil strife by some of our neighbors in this state? All of us bear some of the burden of the tragedy of Watts. We need to follow the guidance of the best possible human wisdom in trying to improve our people, to unite them, in making all of us better, in lessening—and, then, in overcoming the causes of social unrest and racial tensions which continue to be present in parts of our state and nation. We need to learn to live together in unity and harmony. That is part of the struggle for unity which you and I need to wage.

This quest for improvement in ourselves includes an improvement in the machinery of our society, the apparatus by which we govern ourselves.

I beg of you, graduating seniors, to take an active interest in government, at all levels, and, also, in politics. I think you have a duty to do so. And politics, I hasten to say, is not a dirty word. It is a decent word. It represents an honorable calling, and it certainly represents an indispensable part of the American way of life. It is the means by which our people go forward or backward, or to the right or left.

Part of the genius of the American system was the extra-constitutional establishment of two political parties a century or so ago. Over ensuing generations, their positions on some public issues would overlap; and within each, there has always been a considerable divergence of view on some elements of basic public philosophy. But, with all their faults, the two parties, and the system which produced them, have well served our nation and have kept us together in an orderly process of government. Certainly our two-party system is far better than what I saw in France in the time of the Fourth Republic: a multiplicity of parties. Under the old French parliamentary system, coalition government was all that was then available, and at a fairly high rate of political mortality. Certainly, too, our system is far better than the Communist system where one-party rule remains in rigid control of all facets of life.

Students, for the future of your country and yourselves, interest yourselves in a political party, and do what you can, throughout your life, to make it responsive to the best needs of the people as you may see the light. That is the only reason for their existence. That is the sole purpose for a political party in our kind of society. There are, I fear, some dangers to this good system. The relative sizes of our two parties today are, it seems to me, a little out of kilter, and that means the loss of an important check in our governmental machinery.

Our problems, however, are not confined to our neighborhood nor to our nation. This world has shrunken now to the point where it, itself, is a neighborhood. This is the era of instant global communications and of almost instant travel and transportation.

What we—the people of the globe—are greatly in need of today are new devices and new techniques to bring people and nations together for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for an ever-widening exchange of culture and ideas as well as goods, and for a ceaseless search for means to achieve a just peace. The world stands in need of new institutions and new instruments of international communication capable of leaping over the traditional barriers of language and diverse customs.

There is no such thing as isolation anymore, though there are still some among us who yearn to live in the past and want nothing to do with their neighbors. But that kind of early planet is gone. And where neighbors in the world community are concerned, our problem is how best to promote unity among the free, and those who wish to be free.

Perhaps nowhere else in the world community today is the urge for unity more evident than on the continent of Europe. The United States of Europe, alas, remains but a dream. But the Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, the Common Market and the Western European Union have given European unity new meaning and new hope. In the East, the peoples of Rumania, Poland, and Yugoslavia show increasing courage in trying to overcome the barrier of Communist domination. Rumania criticizes the Soviet Union for interfering with the internal affairs of her neighbors, including Rumania, and the Rumanians applaud. Poland seeks admission to GATT. The Yugoslavs want more ties with the West.

Europe's leaders now foresee new struggles for unity. General de Gaulle would have a united Europe excluding Britain, hoping that the new union, whatever its form, would look to France for leadership. Other nations would prefer a more equitable arrangement. The Soviet Union presumably would oppose any arrangement for added unity in the West, especially an equitable one.

But time is on the side of those who would be free. The Churches of Germany and Poland have moved far ahead of their national governments in consulting on steps for unity of their peoples. The next generation in Europe is growing up in a new atmosphere. By international agreement, the children of France and Germany are now reading the same accounts of the bitter wars fought between their countries in the last 100 years. Their teachers are striving at objectivity in order to do away with historically false propaganda and the breeding of hate.

With an end to suspicion the peoples of Europe will be able, in the pursuit of peaceful purposes, to reach over their borders.

As we near the end of the 20th Century, the acceleration of history is increasing. Our yesterdays are receding further from us. The memories of past misfortune must not distract us from today's possibilities. Mistakes must not be duplicated but new opportunities must not be thrown away.

Ahead is the conquest of space, the exploitation of the seas, the research into the earth's interior, the battle to conserve resources and our natural beauty on every continent. These issues know no national borders. An atomic blast in China may subsequently contaminate milk in Detroit. Failure to vaccinate children in Central Asia may bring on cholera in Western Europe. An innocent poppy from Turkey may eventually bring crime to Los Angeles.

Harmony among nations will come when men learn to put aside the animosities of the past and to seek common ground in the realm of the future where national boundaries have yet to be posted. And here, our own United States has done some magnificent things. Our government led the way in urging peaceful exploration of outer space. It did it again in an offer to share the secrets of the moon. And under President Eisenhower, America pioneered in sharing the secrets of the atom.

The critical ingredients for success in the struggle for unity are:

(1) A desire to consult with one another frankly and openly.

(2) A recognition of a need to help one another in solving common problems.

(3) A willingness to look objectively at history, and

(4) A willingness to speak out on the issues of today and to seek to create opportunities for tomorrow.

Graduating students, our task, henceforth, is to seek widening agreement, at home and beyond, for the dignity of man and the independence of people. "In Union there is Strength." In disunion, there is weakness.

SECRETARY CONNOR—THE GROWING DANGER OF OUR CONTINUING UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a few weeks ago to his great credit, Secretary of Commerce Connor pointed out the growing danger incident to our continuing inability to handle the balance-of-payments problem, stating:

> As we pull the figures together in the Fall of this year . . . we will have to face up to some pretty difficult policy choices in deciding upon recommendations to the President.

He expressed apprehension about what happens when the program "sort of goes over the hill."

My only question would be, Why wait until fall?

The Secretary should be congratulated for his frankness, however. The situation is bad, and getting worse, and here are some facts presented to justify that observation.

In 1949 the United States had $24.6 billion in gold, and owed some $7.6 billion abroad, current liabilities redeemable in gold, owed primarily to the foreign central banks.

At the end of 1965, the United States had about $13.8 billion in gold, and owed some $29 billion abroad, again primarily to the foreign central banks.

In other words, between 1949 and January 1966, this country had lost almost 45 percent of its gold at the same time its gold obligations abroad increased nearly 400 percent.

But that is not the whole story.

In the first 4 months of 1966, the United States lost $138 million additional gold.

In the second month of the second quarter, May last, the United States lost another $86 million, the largest monthly loss in a year. Most of this loss, $78 million was to France.

And it would now appear there will be further heavy loss in June.

The record since 1958 is interesting. After an improvement in 1957—ascribed by most to purchases incident to the Suez crisis—the U.S. gold losses have been steady.

In 1958 we lost $2.275 billion.
In 1959 we lost $1.075 billion.
In 1960 we lost $1.702 billion.
In 1961 we lost $857 million.
In 1962 we lost $890 million.
In 1963 we lost $461 million.
In 1964 we lost $125 million.
In 1965 we lost $1.665 billion.

In the first 5 months of 1966 we have lost $224 million.

To the above should be added the increasing problems of British sterling; and also the fact that, during April, the favorable trade balance in the private sector dropped some $700 million from the 1965 annual level. This means a seasonally adjusted excess exports over imports of $4.1 billion instead of the first-of-the-year projection of $6 billion.

Is it any wonder that an administration official is quoted last month as saying that after adoption of a new monetary code, dollar-holding nations probably would refuse to negotiate for further reform until the United States settled its payments problem? This official stated, "I think these nations really mean business. You are going to see some real pressures put on us to get this thing settled once and for all."

In May, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler stated:

> The multiple costs of Vietnam have made the task more difficult and it may be that we will have to settle for an interim objective of equilibrium exclusive of the costs of Vietnam.

But how can there be any true balance, "exclusive of the costs of Vietnam"?

There is constant heavy discussion about various diplomatic and military problems resulting from our involvement in Europe, the Far East, and many other parts of the world; but very little discussion about the great and growing economic problems incident to those involvements.

Unless new policies are laid down in accordance with the thinking of Secretary Connor, however, many if not most of our diplomatic and military policies and programs will have to be decided in recognition of the fiscal and monetary problems these overseas commitments have created.

INTEREST RATES RISE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Great Society is constantly bragging about what it does for the American people, but sometimes it forgets to tell what it is doing to them.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of today, July 11, 1966. It states that interest rates rose to the highest levels in a generation in some segments of the money markets following signs last week that the Federal Reserve was tightening credit another notch.

This has a direct effect on every consumer and home buyer in America.

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

BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Interest rates rose to the highest levels in a generation in some segments of the money markets following signs last week that the Federal Reserve was tightening credit another notch. If the trend continues, pressures appeared to be building up for further increases in the basic lending rate of commercial banks, currently 5¾ percent, and in the 4½ percent "discount" rate charged by the Reserve System for loans to member banks. Some analysts believe, however, that if a discount-rate boost is in the offing, it may be put off at least until July 21. That's when commercial banks are to complete complying with a Reserve Board order to set aside 5 percent, instead of the current 4 percent as backing for certain time deposits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Great Society surely wants to get full credit for these high-interest rates.

U.S. WHEAT FOR REDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News which calls attention to the fact that U.S. wheat is going to two Communist countries.

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

U.S. WHEAT FOR THE REDS

A Senate sub-committee has uncovered an abuse of our "Food for Peace" program from which communist North Korea and Bulgaria benefit.

While U.S. wheat surpluses were being sold at cut-rate prices to Greece, the Greeks were exporting wheat on a hard-cash basis to the two communist countries.

This violated terms under which we provided wheat for Greece. Those terms provided for suspension of our shipments and penalties of up to $20 million. But the terms later were amended to permit Greek wheat exports, no penalty ever was assessed, and we resumed our surplus shipments, to Greece.

This is nonsensical. If Greece has such a surplus, why send our wheat there at all? And why permit one of our greatest cold-war resources—agricultural abundance—to aid the Red bloc at U.S. taxpayer expense?

The sub-committee, headed by Sen. ERNEST GRUENING (D., Alaska) turned up a similar situation in Egypt. Dictator Nasser used soft-currency purchases of U.S. wheat to feed his people while, over a four-year period, he increased sixfold Egyptian rice exports for hard cash to finance his military ventures.

The "Food for Peace" program designed to help hungry friends abroad, is a good one. But it seems to need some tighter policing.

SHRIVER ANSWERS POVERTY HIGH SALARY CRITICS ON CLARK-SCOTT SHOW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the best shows that originates from the Capitol is seen regularly by hundreds of thousands of Pennsylvania residents, but it is rarely, if ever, viewed in the rest of the country, and this is the country's loss.

I am referring, of course, to the Clark-Scott show, named after the two remarkable Senators from Pennsylvania who debate the problems of this country and the world on a widely viewed television and radio show every week.

Typical of the high quality of this program was a recent debate involving Sargent Shriver and the two Senators over the antipoverty program.

I recommend the text of the debate both to critics and supporters of the Office of Economic Opportunity. As one Pennsylvanian who saw the program told me, Shriver does a superb job of murdering that old chestnut about excessive salaries for the administrators of the antipoverty program.

Mr. President, because a lively and literate debate of this kind is so much more informative, so much more entertaining and readable, and because this issue is of such great importance to our Nation, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of that Clark-Scott debate be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

(Following is the text of "Your Senators' Report," a program done jointly by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK (D. Pa.) and Senator HUGH SCOTT (R. Pa.) for broadcast on television and radio stations in Pennsylvania. Guest: Sargent Shriver, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.)

Senator CLARK. Today we will be discussing one of the most controversial programs of the Johnson Administration—the War on Poverty. I think it will be sprightly, to put it mildly.

Senator SCOTT. And there will be quite some disagreement, although I am outnumbered two to one.

ANNOUNCER. "Your Senators' Report." From the Nation's Capital we present another report to the people of Pennsylvania. This unique, award winning series of programs done in the public service is brought to you by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, and Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican. Now, to open today's program, here is Senator CLARK:

Senator CLARK. We are honored to have as our guest on this program Mr. Sargent Shriver, the Director of the War on Poverty, more formally of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Mr. Shriver is a very unusual

and most distinguished American. As you can see, he is not an old man like HUGH SCOTT and me. He is a graduate of Yale and of the Yale Law School, a very successful businessman who ran the Merchandise Mart in Chicago for a good many years, has a very distinguished war record. He went into the Navy as a private—a seaman, and came out as a Lieutenant Commander; he was the first Administrator of the Peace Corps and for a while he rode two horses—the Peace Corps and the Office of Economic Opportunity—and now he is in the middle of a battle to prove that the concept of raising the standards of those many millions of Americans who live in poverty can be successful. Sarge, I am very happy to welcome you on this program. As you know, I am the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Poverty. We have recently completed, what I thought, was some very constructive testimony in that regard. We will be reporting—marking up a bill pretty soon. I hope we can get you most of what you want. We may even give you a little more than you can afford to say you want because of the budget restrictions. I know that HUGH will have some questions to ask you and he's particularly concerned about the problem of allegedly high salaries. And suppose you just tell us in a minute or two, I know you can't do it fully in that time, what your overall objective is in the war against poverty and then comment on this Republican disenchantment with the salary schedule.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, thank you very much Senator CLARK. I appreciate all the things you said about me and also about the program. Our objective in the war against poverty is to develop opportunities for poor people to help themselves to get out of poverty. We are not interested in giving somebody something for nothing. This is not a handout program. We say it is a "handup" program, not a "handout". And our objective is to create new mechanisms through which people can escape from poverty but they've got to make an effort themselves. Just as an illustration, the Head Start Program. The Head Start Program, which is for little children, does require the parents to come forward with the child; it does require the child to work; it does involve the parents themselves, the use of volunteers, as well as of educators in the regular public or parochial school system in the country. This is just one of about a dozen new programs which we have launched. It's true that we have been criticized, I think unfairly, for high salaries, the point you mentioned just a minute ago. The truth of the matter is that we have surveyed about three-quarters of all the local community action agencies in America, like the ones in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, or Scranton or wherever it might be. And, of all the people employed by those community action agencies nationwide, less than 175 of them get more than $15,000 a year.

Senator CLARK. How about the criticism that when they got to work for the Poverty Program they get a vast advance over what they were making before?

Mr. SHRIVER. In about 90 percent of the cases that's not true. We require each community action agency to indicate the salary the person was making before, what they propose to pay him and what people are paid in that community—that locality—for comparable work. For example, a great deal has been made of the allegation that we have paid such community action directors more than the mayor—full time mayor—of a city. I recently issued a statement that I would pay five dollars to anybody who could find a case of that kind anywhere in America. There just aren't any cases. So, the charge, to put it mildly, has been grossly exaggerated.

Senator SCOTT. Do I need an invitation to get in on this program? (Laughter)

Senator CLARK. Please feel free.

Mr. SHRIVER. That's why I turned to you then. I thought you must be . . .

Senator SCOTT. Thank you very much, Sarge. I am ready, a little more than ready, because I wondered about the salaries. I have stated several times that twenty-five of your people are so budgeted that they are getting more than General Westmoreland's base pay in Korea. Now that means that they are getting budgeted at $24,000 apiece. I've said this on other programs, so in fairness to you I should repeat it here, that I believe that by and large there is as high a rate or scale of salaries paid in the Poverty Program than there is in most government agencies. Now don't you pay about twenty-five people in the $24,000 bracket?

Mr. SHRIVER. I think that's correct, Senator. But the way you express it, if I may respectfully say so, I think does mislead the public. There is nobody in our program that gets as much money per annum as General Westmoreland. I get more money than anybody in it. I am paid $30,000 a year. General Westmoreland actually receives $30,000 plus. He receives about $32,000 per annum for his services and he deserves it.

Senator SCOTT. Sure.

Mr. SHRIVER. But the fact is that nobody in our program gets as much money per annum as General Westmoreland. Now it has been repeated and repeated and repeated that there are twenty-four people in our program who do get more money than he does.

Senator SCOTT. Well, that's just base pay.

Mr. SHRIVER. But people don't understand that, as you know. They think that means that he gets more money—that we get more money than he does. That's not true. He does justly get more money, he deserves more money. Second, on the basic issue about our level of pay as compared to other government agencies, we're exactly on the median. Our average salaries in the war against poverty are exactly at the middle of the general pay paid to the United States government employees. So we are not more highly paid.

Senator SCOTT. Well, let me put it another way, since you obviously don't like this General Westmoreland reference . . .

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, I just think its inaccurate and misleading.

Senator SCOTT. Isn't it a fact that those twenty-five people are paid more than a major general—let's take the average major general—is paid in this country. . . .

Mr. SHRIVER. No sir. . . .

Senator SCOTT. These lieutenants are paid more than major generals?

Mr. SHRIVER. No, sir, that's not true. Let's get one thing straight. Congress established these salaries. I don't set the salaries.

Senator SCOTT. Well, Congress does whatever the President wants.

Mr. SHRIVER. Not always.

Senator CLARK. I wish it did.

Senator SCOTT. Well, it does when it comes to spending and especially on high salaries.

Mr. SHRIVER. Let me give you an idea. There are more people who make more than $15,000 working in the Peace Corps than in the entire war against poverty.

Senator SCOTT. Well, the Peace Corps is bigger and it's in a lot more countries . . .

Mr. SHRIVER. Let me say the Peace Corps is about one-tenth as large. The Peace Corps is not even as big as the Job Corps.

Senator SCOTT. Now you are adding everybody who is involved in poverty including all of the . . .

Mr. SHRIVER. No, sir; I'm not . . .

Senator SCOTT. . . . individuals in private industry.

Mr. SHRIVER. No, sir; I'm not suggesting that at all. The war against poverty has an annual budget of $1,500,000,000. The Peace Corps, which I also ran, has a budget of $100,000,000. In other words its about one-fifteenth, in terms of dollars, the size of the war against poverty.

Senator SCOTT. Well, are there more than twenty-five people there who are getting more than $24,000?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, sir.

Senator SCOTT. I'm glad you put me on to that.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, I'm glad that I have been able to do that.

Senator CLARK. It's an easier job too, isn't it?

Mr. SHRIVER. I don't say it's easier. I just use it to illustrate the fact that the Peace Corps, which I ran also I am happy to say . . .

Senator SCOTT. And did very well and I never jumped you on the Peace Corps.

Mr. SHRIVER. I know. Perhaps you should.

Senator SCOTT. Well, maybe. But I am more concerned about getting back to the war and not the salaries.

Mr. SHRIVER. Do you know why one of the reasons the Peace Corps ran so well? It is because it did have good management. Now, the Peace Corps, for example, today has about seventy people who are what is known as super grades in the government. The war against poverty has fifty-four. So there are less super grades in the war against poverty than in the Peace Corps. Now, this is not to criticize the Peace Corps. You need good people to get a good result. The worst thing that you can do with General Motors, General Electric, the United States Government or the war against poverty is to put incompetent people in charge of large expenditures of the public money. The best investment you can make is good management. And I think the greatest mistake that the Congress can make or we can make would be to put poor managers in charge of this war against poverty.

Senator SCOTT. Now, let me summarize, Joe. And I appreciate your indulgence. Its rare that I can keep you quiet this long. But what I am trying to get at is I have supported the Poverty Program, as you know. I have supported a few amendments which would cut it. I have supported a number of amendments which would keep it as it is and I voted for the teachers phase and I think Head Start is a magnificent program. All I am trying to get at is that my role as critic is to get at the instances of ineptitude, waste or corruption and spending too much for a given objective. And in that line, I wonder if you could explain this which has appeared so often in the paper, that is the excessively high cost of some aspects of the Poverty Program, such as the Job Corps Center in St. Petersburg, Florida. My information is that it cost $7,000 per year per girl, and at the Center at Camp Kilmer, New Jersey, the cost is said to be $6,000 per boy. Now, isn't that a lot when you consider what it costs to educate a boy or a girl at a college or a university?

Mr. SHRIVER. It seems on the surface to be a lot. You are correct. But the difference is this, the St. Petersburg Center, which incidentally has been closed up, or the Camp Kilmer Center are Centers that run 24 hours a day, seven days a week, twelve months a year. Most people when they go, let's say to college, go there for let's say nine months and what they pay is for nine months of instruction. Second, they are the best people in the country, they require the least supervision, the least guidance, the least remedial attention. Youngsters in the Job Corps come from the most disadvantaged part of our society and they require the most remedial attention. So that it really isn't fair, in my judgment, to compare a 24-hour day, seven-day a week program in costs with another program which is merely an educational program which goes on a few hours a day. It is not a custodial program and only goes on nine months a year.

Senator SCOTT. Isn't twenty-four hours a day misleading? I assume that the Job Corps people don't put in more than eight or nine hours a day in work. Actually, they've got to sleep sometime.

Senator CLARK. But there has to be somebody there all the way around the clock. This is residential.

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, indeed. That's right.

Senator SCOTT. He's no more a twenty-four hour a day person than a student at college. He's at school twenty-four hours a day, too.

Senator CLARK. Three shifts, HUGH. And that costs the taxpayers.

Senator SCOTT. What I'm getting at is this point. If it costs $6,000 to $7,000 to take care of one boy or one girl, that should severely limit the number of people that you can reach, and yet the New York Times tells me that you have predicted that you will cut down the poverty rolls in this country from 20,000,000 to 12,000,000 in five years and virtually abolish poverty within ten years.

Mr. SHRIVER. Twenty. 1976, that's right.

Senator SCOTT. Twenty years?

Mr. SHRIVER. That's right.

Senator SCOTT. Now the Times quoted you as saying that "we virtually can eliminate it as a scourge of mankind." Now, for heaven's sake, I hope so.

Senator CLARK. If, and only if, you get the funding you require.

Mr. SHRIVER. That's correct. It is just like when President Kennedy said they could send a man to the moon. What he said was that it was technically possible, scientifically speaking and in terms of engineering, to get a man to the moon by 1970. Obviously, if Congress refused to appropriate any money, nobody could be sent to the moon. Now, the same thing is true of our problem or program. We can, as a matter of technical competence. There is the economic knowledge, there is the basic wealth in this nation, there is the mobility of people, there are the techniques to eliminate poverty in the United States, these fifty states, by 1976. But Congress will have to endorse it and appropriate the money.

Senator SCOTT. Well, Houston, Texas, for example, is growing at four times the rate of Philadelphia and eight times the rate of Pittsburgh, according to the Federal Reserve people I talked to today. And I suspect that a great deal of the wealth of Houston is in this multimillion space program. Senator CLARK and I both have said that we wished that the Space Program could be put on a more graduated basis and there would be more money to relieve the ills of mankind and the fundamental causes of disease and other matters. So that I am afraid that you may have trouble getting the amount of money it will take to eliminate poverty in ten years. How many billions of dollars would that take?

Mr. SHRIVER. Let me say one thing before I answer that. I am sure we will have trouble getting the amount of money that is necessary to eliminate poverty in ten years. My point was only that it can be done if our nation wants to direct to this field the resources that are required. Now, in answer to the last part of your question. We estimate that it could be done with less than one-half of the increase per annum in the annual productivity of our nation.

Senator CLARK. Gross national product.

Mr. SHRIVER. That's right. So what we are talking about is something approximating half the cost of the war in Vietnam.

Senator SCOTT. What is that in billions of dollars?

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, it might run somewhere around three or four billion dollars. Maybe a little bit more depending on——

Senator SCOTT. Well, that would mean thirty to forty billion dollars in ten years to do it.

Mr. SHRIVER. Let's say it were that much. I would be happy to say, right here before all the people of Pennsylvania, that I think that it would be one of the most successful and welcome expenditures in the history of our country.

Senator CLARK. I'd like to put this thing in a little bit of perspective for our listeners. We authorized—in seven minutes in the Senate the other day—a five billion dollar program authorization for the space program. We will authorize in somewhat more time—but not much—somewhere between 50 and 60 billion dollars for the military program. President Johnson has a great many of these Great Society programs which he would like to see not cut back, and so do I. One of the most important is the economic opportunity program. If you figure out that what you asked for this year, Sarge, is less than 40% of what Jim Webb is getting for NASA, the space, and considerably less than 5% of the military expenditure and a good deal less—I think—although it's closer with the total—education program, and in view of the enormous need and potential, it seems to me that your requests are quite modest if we have any sense of priorities at all. What I'd like to ask you in addition to commenting. . . .

Senator SCOTT. Would you state the amount that you're asking for?

Mr. SHRIVER. We're asking for $1,750,000,000 for next year—that's beginning July 1st. Last year, we had $1,500,000,000 and that constitutes about one cent, one cent out of every dollar of taxes paid by citizens in the United States to the Federal Government. So it isn't as if we were consuming a hugh proportion of the taxpayers' dollars . . . as I say, it's about one cent out of every dollar's worth of taxes.

Senator CLARK. Then in terms of our Gross National Product, it's really rather insignificant?

Mr. SHRIVER. I'm sorry to say you're right.

Sentaor SCOTT. May I point out one cent—now wait a minute—one and a half billion, one and three-quarter billion dollars, and the annual Budget is about one hundred billion dollars, so that it's $1.75 out of every hundred dollars paid, for your budget, isn't it. If you pay taxes to balance the Budget.

Mr. SHRIVER. If we got the money—which we haven't got—it would be that. It would be $1.75 out of every $100.

Senator SCOTT. That penny thing reminds me of the ads we see—you know, for one cent a day you can have another electric appliance. Now, it isn't as cheap as that.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, I'm glad that that reminded you of that. And it would be a greater thing. . . .

Senator SCOTT. It would be $1.75 out of every $100 if you balance the Budget.

Mr. SHRIVER. And that's the same thing as your electric light bill.

Senator SCOTT. In taxes. . . .

Mr. SHRIVER. Out of every $100 you pay it would cost you $1.00 not one cent. They say it's a cent out of every dollar. I say it's a cent out of the current expenditures.

Senator CLARK. Now let's stop playing games with each other on this. You can make this thing look pretty much any way you want depending on. . . .

Senator SCOTT. That's what I was just thinking of. . . .

Senator CLARK. But my view is entirely in accord with Mr. Shriver's and let's just leave it at that. Hugh disagrees. I wonder if you could give us, Sarge, a little bit of a bird's-eye view of the program in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, hitting the high spots so that we might perhaps spend the rest of the program talking about various aspects of the poverty program as it affects our listeners who are primarily citizens of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, Pennsylvania, Senators—I'm sure you know this, but maybe everybody in the audience doesn't—is about the 4th state in the Union in terms of the number of poor people in it—and it has received, from our office—approximately the same amount of money as compared with other states. It's about fourth among the states. We have, for example, put this year, into Pennsylvania, $63,000,000 in various programs. You mentioned Project Head Start which you endorse. . . .

Senator SCOTT. I endorsed the whole project.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, this year we will be reaching 18,000 youngsters in Pennsylvania in Project Head Start. In the Community Action program. . . .

Senator CLARK. Before you go on, some of our listeners I don't think are quite as familiar with Head Start as the three of us. That means the youngsters in what age groups?

Mr. SHRIVER. It's three, four and five years of age.

Senator CLARK. And this involves doing work with the whole family, doesn't it, and not just the kids?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, it does. Yes, many people think that Head Start is a pre-school program of the traditional type like a kindergarten program, but it's not.

Senator CLARK. Actually, you have a pediatrician at the head of it and not an educator, don't you?

Mr. SHRIVER. That's right. Actually, the Dean of the School of Medicine at Syracuse Upstate Medical Center—he's a pediatrician—he's the head of the program.

Senator CLARK. Nationally.

Mr. SHRIVER. Nationally. And the program itself would involve medical and dental care, social services to the family, the use of volunteers, psychological and other services to the child, and only as a fifth part does it involve what the educators call "school readiness." So it's a lot more than a kindergarten.

Senator SCOTT. It helps to give the children a chance to hold their heads high equally with the other kids. It teaches them dignity. It teaches them health care. It readies them for their early years.

Mr. SHRIVER. It readies them for life, not just for school—that's the basic distinction.

Senator CLARK. How about some of the other programs in Pennsylvania?

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, we have the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Pennsylvania. This year there will be about 14,000 youngsters in Pennsylvania participating in that. For the benefit of the audience that doesn't know, the Neighborhood Youth Corps is a job program for 16–21 year-old boys and girls who are out of school and out of work.

Senator CLARK. Living at home

Mr. SHRIVER. Living at home, and that's the distinction between it and the Job Corps, which is a residential program. There is a Job Corps center in Pennsylvania, it's called the Blue Jay Center. There are about 1100 young men and women in the Jobs Corps at centers around the country, from Pennsylvania.

Senator CLARK. And this is more or less, although not entirely, like the old Civilian Conservation Corps we used to have about 30 years ago, isn't it?

Mr. SHRIVER. That's right. Only in this program we have much more education than there was in the CCC program. The CCC, as you remember Senator SCOTT, was a work program for people—most of them finished High School or many of whom had finished college. Our clientele in the Job Corps, again, are all school dropouts. In addition to that we have a whole variety of programs working in Pennsylvania. We have adult education, literacy programs. We have the VISTA volunteers, the domestic Peace Corps. You were a great supporter of the Peace Corps overseas, Senator SCOTT, I hope you

will be an equal supporter of the Peace Corps here at home—known as VISTA. There are 95 volunteers, VISTA volunteers, working in the State of Pennsylvania right now.

Senator SCOTT. One of our girls just left to join the VISTA program from my office.

Mr. SHRIVER. In your office—I'm delighted to hear that.

Senator CLARK. I spoke at the first graduation. . . .

Senator SCOTT. Well, don't put her in the $24,000 a year program because she doesn't expect to make that much.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, I'll tell you, we'll put her to work in Pennsylvania. Maybe she can be a help right at home. She gets $50 a month, as you know.

Senator CLARK. I spoke at the first graduation of the VISTA class at Temple University, a year or so ago, and I was enormously impressed with the ability and dedication of those young people. Sarge, one of the parts of the program to come under increasing criticism—I think largely unjustly—are these various Community Action Programs. You've given HUGH SCOTT and me a big book showing what's going on in the Poverty Program in Pennsylvania. I don't recall how many counties, towns, and cities have Community Action Programs in our State, but I know there are a good many. Perhaps you'd say a word about the Community Action Program—why you think it's so important, and answer one or two of the criticisms which have been made against it.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, I'd like to do that, Senator. "Community Action" is a general abstract word which is hard for people to understand, but what it really is—it's pretty much like an old New England town meeting. It's like democracy was at the very beginning of our country, where everybody in the community or the representatives came together to discuss the community's problems and to take community action with respect to those problems.

We here in Washington supply the money to a local group which has to be representative of the community as a whole and that local group decides locally what needs to be done in that town or county to combat poverty. This is such a change from what has been going on recently that people in the United States find it hard to believe that they are actually going to get money from Washington over which they exercise jurisdiction and control. But that's exactly what it is. Now, Head Start, for example, is a part of Community Action. The other programs, such as the legal service program, or health programs. . . .

Senator CLARK. In which Philadelphia, incidentally, took the lead. Theodore Voorhees from Philadelphia has been the head of this effort to get some money for legal services and gave us some very good testimony the other day.

Senator SCOTT. The Community Action people in Philadelphia are very unhappy because you won't agree to give them a per diem, as I understand it. They had a meeting down here. Do you remember that JOE?

Senator CLARK. Yes, that's one of the very few subjects on which Mr. Shriver and I have been in disagreement; and I'm not anxious to air that disagreement on this program.

Senator SCOTT. Well, I'll let you off the hook and let me go into the next. . . .

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, let me just say, could I explain that we do pay poor people who serve on Community Action agencies their out-of-pocket expenses, but, in keeping with your desires for economy, Senator SCOTT, we have. . . .

Senator SCOTT. I appreciate the point.

Mr. SHRIVER. Thank you. We have resisted the efforts that some people make to pay them a regular salary for service on a Community Action agency. This is a—perhaps as Senator CLARK thinks, I guess, a mistaken judgment, but at least, it's on the side of economy.

Senator CLARK. I think this Community Action Program, while it has had some bugs in it—and it has, and you admit it—is an integral part and a vital part of the whole Poverty Program, don't you think?

Mr. SHRIVER. There's no question about it. Let me give you one illustration. Today, there came to my office a stack of papers that high which is the summer program for New York City.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt to say—for just a minute—that one of the most heartwarming bits of testimony I've ever heard, and one of the ablest, was made in support of the Community Action Program before our subcommittee, actually the end of last week, by Mayor John Lindsay of New York City. It was just terrific. And if I had any doubts about the Community Action Program, they were really set aside by Lindsay's testimony which I guess you saw.

Mr. SHRIVER. I saw it and, as a matter of fact, I thanked him for it. And I might say, on that point, since John Lindsay is a Republican, that the head of the United States Conference of Mayors, Mayor Blaisdell of Honolulu, is also. . . .

Senator SCOTT. Neal Blaisdell, I know him well.

Mr. SHRIVER. Neal Blaisdell is a staunch supporter of this program. So it's not a question of Republican or Democrat, it's a question of whether the community can mobilize itself, the leadership, the business leadership, the labor leadership, the religious, and philanthropic leadership, working together with the poor to create a program for Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton. . . .

Senator SCOTT. No, I don't think it's Republican vs. Democrat so much as it is Democrat vs. Democrat, as in Philadelphia where they are all fighting over the spoils and. . . .

Senator CLARK. That's because there aren't any Republicans left. . . .

Senator SCOTT. You'll be surprised this Fall on that. But, four or five different proposals were made on Community Action Programs in Philadelphia, and the poverty people, representing the poor, and the mayor of the city, and various groups, all fought over who was going to run it. Then, finally, the Community Action Program was set up and—you spoke about Operation Blue Jay—I want to tell you what happened, about a not so heartwarming experience involving some Jaybirds, and that was this: After they set the program up, the first sixteen group leaders hired under the Philadelphia poverty program to work with youngsters in the Neighborhood Youth Corps—out of sixteen, thirteen had arrest records which included larceny, assault and battery, and morals counts involving minors. So those are the kind of things I'm trying to get out of the program.

Senator CLARK. Is that a Republican sheet?

Senator SCOTT. No sir, it is not a Republican sheet. It is one of the statements that I put out myself and I don't know. . . .

Senator CLARK. Where was your basic data?

Senator SCOTT. The basic data, I believe, was the Philadelphia Inquirer, and the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and to be fair to everybody, the Philadelphia Daily News. But, isn't that a fact; weren't there thirteen involved with criminal records out of the first sixteen hired?

Mr. SHRIVER. I would doubt it very much. I don't happen to know that particular thing. Let me say that in the Neighborhood Youth Corps right now there are about 288,000 youngsters. I'm certain that in some place somebody got hired in the Neighborhood Youth Corps who had some sort of a record with the law.

Let me just explain about that, Senator. Most of the poor, a hugh proportion of the poor people, do have brushes with the law. They are much more easily picked up, they are frequently finger-printed more rapidly than more respectable people in the community.

Senator CLARK. They don't have any lawyers.

Mr. SHRIVER. They don't have any lawyers, until recently. . . .

Senator SCOTT. Sarge, the respectable poor people are the ones who are most hurt by rape, assault and battery, larceny, morals charges. I'm interested in what happens to the respectable poor people if a number of other poor people commit a crime, not because they are poor, but because they are disadvantaged—I agree to that—but that doesn't justify the crime. If a poor person mugs another poor person, the one who is mugged doesn't say he mugged me because I'm poor, or you mugged me because I'm poor—they say: "You mugged me."

Senator CLARK. You have 30 seconds to answer that before we are off the air.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, obviously we don't employ people that have criminal records.

Senator SCOTT. I know you try not to.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, the point is this—there's 285,000 kids in this today. Obviously some of them have had records. I'm not prepared to defend every case that's been employed. If we didn't have anybody who had a record of any kind we would not be reaching the most disadvantaged poor people. When we get those people into the program, it proves that we're reaching a substantial number of people that need to be reached.

Senator SCOTT. I wish there were more time. I meant to ask you about the restoration of the Governor's veto power, but you're against it and I'm for it.

Mr. SHRIVER. No, no, no, I'm not against it at all. The Governors are very pleased about it, don't you know, the way it's working right now—like Governor Romney and Governor Scranton.

Mr. SCOTT. We'll continue that in our next program and thank you very much for giving us an interesting time.

Senator CLARK. Thank you Sarge.

ANNOUNCER. Ladies and gentlemen, you've been listening to your Senators Report from the Nation's Capital, a report to the people of Pennsylvania, brought to you in the public service by Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat and Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican.

TRUTH IN LENDING MOVEMENT GROWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Congress has made far too little progress with the excellent truth-in-lending legislation championed by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

Recently Sylvia Porter reported on how truth in credit has been growing out in the country. She reported, for example, that in Massachusetts, the legislature passed what should be a model law for the country. That law will go into effect on November 1. It will require the total cost of credit, both in dollars and in the true annual rate. It will require them to spell out the buyers' rights on all credit contracts, such as the right to prepay the amount he owes. It regulates door-to-door salesmen and limits credit insurance.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sylvia Porter from the Milwaukee Sentinel be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, July 7, 1966]

TRUTH IN LENDING MOVEMENT GROWS

(By Sylvia Porter)

The New York State Bankers association in an extraordinary display of private initiative, has just called upon New York installment lenders to inform borrowers of the maximum interest rate they charge on any consumer loan.

This would relieve the borrower of the headache of calculating the difference between monthly and yearly interest rates, stated and true annual interest costs, discounts, add-ons, etc.

It would also relieve lenders of the task of figuring precise yearly interests rates on each individual loan—when those rates may change from month to month if the borrower fails to repay the loan exactly on schedule.

This month, the United States defense department, in another major effort to protect borrowers from hidden interest charges, is putting into effect a directive requiring all lenders to the nation's 3,000,000 military servicemen and their families to disclose the full financing charges on all loans and other credit arrangements both in dollars and simple annual interest rate.

Unless the lenders do this, they cannot expect military personnel to help them collect overdue debts.

Other federal agencies are now being urged to consider similar directives for millions of civilian employees.

PRESSURE MOUNTS

Across the nation there is mounting pressure on lenders of all types to inform consumers of the actual dollars and cents costs of borrowing money or buying on time in this era when interest rates are soaring to historic peaks.

Sen. PAUL DOUGLAS' controversial "Truth in lending" bill, which would require lenders to state total credit costs to borrowers in dollars and in simple annual interest rates, has been stuck in the senate banking and currency committee for six years. Despite repeated pleas from the White House and from consumer protection agencies, the bill still is given virtually no chance to pass this year.

But, from the six years of heated debate and hot publicity, a new truth in lending trend has emerged which is helping to accomplish what DOUGLAS has tried so hard to achieve.

Most significant is a tough new Massachusetts law which will go into effect on Nov. 1. It will require retailers in that state to disclose to installment buyers the total cost of installment credit on all sales, in dollars and in true annual interest.

It will require them to spell out the buyer's rights on all credit contracts—example, the right to prepay the amount he owes. It will require sellers to notify buyers of their intention to repossess at least two weeks in advance. It will require door to door salesmen to allow buyers a "cooling off" period of one business day in which to reconsider purchases.

And it will limit credit insurance charges to 50c per $100 and interest on revolving credit accounts to a maximum of 1½% a month.

MORE STATES JOIN

At least two other states are now also considering similar truth in lending laws and the Massachusetts legislature is debating another law to cover small loans as well.

This is a breakthrough. It is big news for the baffled borrower in this period of climbing credit costs, not to mention the undereducated victim of the unscrupulous loan shark.

From the national economic viewpoint it is also of tremendous importance because it will help impress on the borrower how much today's steep interest rates are adding to his cost of living.

By so doing, it will help encourage him to hold off on frivolous borrowing until the danger of inflation has passed and interest rates on loans go down again.

PROTESTS AGAINST WEST FRONT EXTENSION GROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during the past recess a series of excellent articles, columns, and editorials appeared opposing the extension of the west front of the Capitol.

I ask unanimous consent that a few of these eloquent expressions of concern for this beautiful Capitol be printed at this point in the RECORD. These protests include a report delivered by ABC Commentator Edward P. Morgan, an article by Joseph Alsop, entitled "Our Forefather's Glory," two editorials from the Washington Post, entitled "Focus on Preservation," and "Unauthorized Vandalism," an article by Fulton Lewis, Jr., entitled "Disfiguration of a Shrine," and an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Will the Capitol be Defaced?"

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

A CAPITOL ATTEMPT TO DEFACE HISTORY

(By Edward P. Morgan)

(*This report was delivered by Mr. Morgan over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network.*)

After the British redcoats burned the U.S. Capitol in 1814 in the War of 1812, Congress had to move to a tavern called Blodgett's Hotel. Presumably this could have served the legislators as a permanent meeting place since, as legend has it, politicians most comfortably gather in smoke-filled hotel rooms. Blodgett's had a cloakroom too. Lobbyists traditionally contact lawmakers in cloakrooms. So everything was fine and dandy.

But then some busybody insisted on restoring the Capitol building and there has been nothing but trouble ever since. Additions here, alterations there; all very unsettling. So I, for one, simply cannot see what the fuss is all about when an ex-Congressman from Delaware named J. George Stewart steps courageously forward and starts to bury all this history under a facade of freshly cut marble.

Nobody, of course, is more eminently qualified for this delicate but heroic task than Stewart. He is not now and never has been a card-carrying architect and, as far as I know, never intends to be one. He does operate with the title of Architect of the Capitol and it was under that cover that he executed—one might even say, murdered—his most famous work, the Rayburn Building, named in travestied memory of the late Speaker of the House. Into this crypto-Fascist-style mausoleum, jestingly referred to as a Congressional Office Building, Stewart poured all of this supervisory talents and by some reports, considerably more than $100 million.

The result, naturally, was a happy combination of superlatives—the ugliest and most expensive edifice of its kind ever erected on the face of the earth. Perhaps the happiest note of all was the fact that it cost only approximately twice as much as Stewart originally said it would. With such a monument around the Great Society doesn't need urban renewal; it needs a camouflage corps.

But now, oh let joy be unconfined, we are about to be treated to another sterling Stewart contribution to the beautification of Washington. At a starting price of just $34 million—a steal, really—he is going to stick the West Front of the Capitol out a maximum of 88 feet so it can house more offices, two big auditoriums, two cafeterias, four dining rooms seating more than a thousand people and an information lobby to take care of the tourist explosion. The sheer beauty of the Stewart plan is that in one fell swoop it will destroy the Capitol's historic vestiges—the last traces of the original work of Thornton, the West Indian doctor who won the $500 first prize for the building's first design; the embellishments of Latrobe, the contributions of Bulfinch, the famous Boston architect, and the terrace with its majestic flights of steps designed by Frederick Law Olmstead. You don't hardly get a demolition job like that anymore.

Indeed, while he's at it, Stewart might well consider razing the whole structure, including his other handiwork, the East Front, which cost $22 million, the customary double of his beginning estimate. Then the space could be used for a parking lot, which Washington needs anyway and the Congress could move down the street to Union Station.

An alternative plan, which I like better, would be to let Stewart run rampant on a field of bad taste across the entire face of L'Enfant's famous city. Thus with his ravenous appetite for eating places, we could hope to see a Stewart restaurant revolving around the tip of the Washington Monument to rival the space needle in Seattle. The lethal hydroplane races could be shifted from Hains Point to the reflecting pool, the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials could be converted into public rest rooms and shoe shine parlors.

Don't be too timid as to think all this is impossible. The Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, including those well-known aesthetes and city planners, Vice President HUMPHREY, Speaker MCCORMACK and Minority Leaders FORD and DIRKSEN, has already blithely gone along with Stewart's West Front job. All he needs now is money.

He figures he can easily wheedle that out of the Congress with the argument that the Front's ancient sandstone blocks are crumbling and a jet's sonar boom may bring the whole building down, dome and all. After careful study, the Fine Arts Commission reports the Capitol can be repaired, restored and its priceless architectural history preserved, all at a trifle of the cost of Stewart's folly. That would be the sensible way to do things. But thank Heaven that's not the way things are done in this crazy, wonderful town. Ask George Stewart.

OUR FOREFATHERS' GLORY

(By Joseph Alsop)

The first point to note about the official Architect of the Capitol is that he never has been, is not now, and never will be an architect.

J. George Stewart is an amiable, aging Republican congressional lame duck from Delaware, who was named architect of the Capitol by President Eisenhower. This was an appointment almost as whimsical as the Emperor Caligula's famous nomination of his favorite horse to the Roman consulship; and it has produced far more practical results, all of them perfectly godawful.

The worst of the damage might have been prevented by the normal operation of the laws of pork and patronage, if the Architect

of the Capitol did not have such a remarkable gift for attaching himself to speakers of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, however, at the very first leaders' meeting held by President Kennedy, Sam Rayburn's opening remark was:

"Now Mr. President, I want you to keep on George Stewart. He's a good man, and I want him to stay on the job."

Stewart was kept on, and therefore the great speaker and doughty old patriot is now cruelly commemorated by the Rayburn Building. It cost the taxpayers close on $130 million and is certainly the most monstrously ugly, ludicrously wasteful and vulgarly pretentious structure erected anywhere in the Western world since Joseph Stalin ruthlessly inflicted his Palace of Culture on the defenseless city of Warsaw.

After Speaker Rayburn died, one of President Kennedy's cherished projects was the replacement of the Architect of the Capitol with an honest-to-God architect. But the President was killed before the deed was done. And in very short order thereafter, non-architect Stewart apparently managed to attach himself to Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK.

So J. George Stewart's fell career continues. In fact, it is grimly appropriate to remember him at this holiday time dedicated to the founding of this republic. For the great non-architect is now planning the destruction of one of the last architectural momentoes of the Founding Fathers, the superb Bulfinch-Latrobe West Front of the Capitol itself.

It is an extraordinary record. It began with the new Senate Office Building, which seemed impossible to surpass in extravagance, impracticality and tastelessness until the Rayburn Building was constructed. Then followed the extension of the Capitol's East Front, with the machine-made marble exterior and the new interiors that appear to have been imitated from the costly men's rooms in the Moscow subway. The Rayburn Building followed. And now the West Front is to be extended, and this time, instead of an exact though machine-made copy as on the East Front, we are to have improvements on Latrobe and Bulfinch by non-architect Stewart.

If you seek the answer to this mystery of mounting horror in Stewart's lair in the Capitol basement, you find a kindly though occasionally testy old gentleman, with an antique congressional air about him. If you ask him if there is any committee of design to pass on his projects, he answers cheerfully that "it's usually confined to the leadership."

There is more to it than that, of course. Just how the pork and patronage work in this case is not immediately apparent. But there is an enormous amount of both, as the price tag on the Rayburn Building indicates; and it can hardly be accidental that the same architect's names seem to appear again and again as Stewart's associates."

One imagines them all together, cheerfully opening their meeting with the famous remark with which Speaker Tom Reed once opened a session of the House: "Well, gentlemen, what outrage shall we perpetrate today?" They can go forward with a high measure of grisly confidence, moreover, since non-architect Stewart not only has a knack for attaching himself to Speakers of the House, but is also a great one for doing costly little favors for lesser members of the House and Senate.

Does an eminent lawmaker desire redecoration of two of the Capitol's finest old rooms in pure Pedernales-Baroque? The job is done, instanter. Is there a demand for more Capitol-hideaways, for such congressional leisure-time pursuits as ingestion of bourbon and branch water? Then more than 100 can be provided by destroying the historic West Front. And does this cost the taxpayers incalculable sums of money? Yes, of course, but it does not matter in the least.

In our century, of course, deprovement is the trend, rather than improvement. But surely the old Capitol, our forefathers' glory, which shows they had so much better taste than we do, might at least be spared amid the general desecration. Surely, this thing can be stopped before it is too late.

FOCUS ON PRESERVATION

Senator PROXMIRE performed a useful service when he introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a survey undertaken for the Fine Arts Commission by the civil engineering firm of Bernard F. Locraft. Locraft, after examining the report of the consulting firms that advocated extending the West Front, concluded "that the restoration of the existing West Front of the Capitol is not infeasible."

This is the basis on which any consideration of renovation should be predicated. Until it has been established—by adequate public hearings before both Houses—that preservation of the historic walls of the Capitol is impossible, no other course ought to be considered.

The scheme put forth by Architect Stewart should sink under the weight of its own extravagance this session. But Congress will not complete its task merely by blocking the authorization for the project. The Nation is entitled to a guarantee that the Capitol will not be destroyed in the future by some scheme as ill-considered as that proposed by the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol. Several bills that would provide such a guarantee have been introduced and one of them ought to be adopted.

UNAUTHORIZED VANDALISM

The citizens of the United States who were shocked and surprised by the news that Congress had approved the demolition of the West Front of the Capitol will be comforted by the conclusion of Representative HENRY REUSS that Congress really never has approved the wrecking of the historic facade. If Congressman REUSS is right, his finding may not only rescue the Capitol; it may rescue the country's good opinion of Congress.

The Congressman has found that the Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was told in 1935 that: "All that anyone has thought of doing to the western side is to change the burned sandstone of the Capitol, of Thornton's walls, to marble."

Then in 1955, after a minute or two of consideration, under the heading of "Capitol Restaurant Facilities," the House passed a resolution authorizing increases and improvements in the restaurant facilities and steps to "extend and complete the east central front of the Capitol."

The Appropriations Act of 1955, according to Mr. REUSS, authorized the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, to undertake construction in conformity with a "Plan B" of March 3, 1905. As Mr. REUSS says, that plan called for the reconstruction of the west front in marble in its present location.

The Senate Appropriations Committee report on the legislative appropriations bill of 1964 stated explicitly: "The committee does not believe that there was any intention on the part of the Congress to proceed with the west front project when Congress voted the authority and funds for the extension of the east-central part of the Capitol".

In a report placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 29, Congressman REUSS concludes that "the extension of the west front of the Capitol is without conscious authorization by Congress."

What Congressman REUSS makes clear is that Congress as a whole has had its confidence abused and its trust betrayed and finds itself blamed for an intention to desecrate the west front of the Capitol. Perhaps it can be blamed for abdicating or neglecting its responsibilities for the preservation of the Nation's finest edifice. It can now remedy the charge of neglect by making it plain that it is opposed to the present plan to tear down the west front and against any similar plans hereafter. It has before it the legislation to do just this.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, June 30, 1966]

DISFIGURATION OF A SHRINE

(By Fulton Lewis, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The man responsible for what many critics call the ugliest structure in official Washington will direct a renovation of the US Capitol that one senator terms a "senseless disfiguration" of the national shrine.

He is J. George Stewart, the 76-year-old architect of the Capitol and father of the $134,500,000 Rayburn House Building. Stewart is not an architect but a former one-term congressman whose only college degree, an honorary one, was bestowed upon him 47 years after he dropped out of the University of Delaware.

Stewart has unveiled plans for a $34,000,000 extension of the Capitol's historic West Front. He would tack onto the Capitol 4.5 acres of movie theaters (two), restaurants (six), and "hideway" offices (109) for powerful senators and congressmen.

The hideaways are coveted as status symbols and Stewart has the backing of the Capitol Hill establishment—Vice President HUMPHREY, Senator Minority Leader DIRKSEN, and House Speaker MCCORMACK. A number of lawmakers who privately deplore Stewart's remodeling plans are reluctant to speak out and earn the wrath of the powers-that-be.

But a handful of senators and congressmen have opposed the project. They will fight an uphill battle to block what Sen. JOSEPH TYDINGS (D-Md) calls the "senseless disfiguration of one of our most historic landmarks."

Sen. WILLIAM PROXMIRE (D-Wis.), a maverick who has frequently antagonized the Democratic leadership by his independence, will lead a floor fight against the appropriation of funds for the project. Rep. HENRY GONZALEZ (D-Texas) has authorized legislation to prohibit the Capitol extension and Sen. JOSEPH CLARK (D-Pa.) is at work on a bill that would make it a Federal crime to "deface, mutilate, or in any other way desecrate" the building.

That Stewart's remodeling is actually desecration was charged last week by Washington's Fine Arts Commission. In letters to Vice President HUMPHREY and Speaker MCCORMACK, the commission said the Capitol is unquestionably the nation's most important building.

The prestigious American Institute of Architects has condemned Stewart's plan, asserting it would obliterate the architectural genius of Thornton, Bullfinch, Latrobe, and Walter. It would, writes one critic in an AIA analysis, turn the Capitol into a "shapeless mass signifying nothing but its own bulk."

DIRKSEN says that more space is needed for the millions of tourists who annually visit Washington. Replies Wolf Von Eckard, distinguished architectural critic of the Washington Post:

"If the Capitol needs more space now, how much more space will be needed 20, 30 or 50 years hence? Are we going to keep puffing out the Capitol into an utterly shapeless monster?"

Senator PROXMIRE insists that space is not, in fact, needed. The House and Senate restaurants operate at considerably less than capacity and annually run a deficit of several hundred thousand dollars.

"The need for additional (hideaways) is nil, zero, nothing," PROXMIRE says. And why the Capitol requires two movie theaters is something he cannot fathom.

Joining PROXMIRE in his fight against Stewart's "marble mausoleum" will be Sens. MIKE MONRONEY (D-Okla), FRANK LAUSCHE (D-Ohio), EUGENE MCCARTHY (D-Minn) STEPHEN YOUNG (D-Ohio), and PAUL DOUGLAS (D-Ill). The outspoken DOUGLAS has clashed frequently with Stewart, terming him the "most expensive, most wasteful, most incompetent architect we possibly could engage."

On the House side, the fight against Stewart will be lead by Reps. GONZALEZ, PAUL H. TODD (D-Mich), RICHARD FULTON (D-Tenn), JAMES C. CLEVELAND (R-NH) and SAM STRATTON (D-NY). STRATTON hopes to set up a National Committee of One Million To Save the United States Capitol. The ad hoc group would rally public opinion against the Stewart project.

WILL THE CAPITOL BE DEFACED?

We find heartening both the volume and the breadth of indignant reaction to J. George Stewart's newest scheme to build and rebuild Washington, D.C., in his own tasteless image. As Architect of the Capitol, he is an architect in name only and the nation can thank him for the "Early Mussolini" style of the monstrous Rayburn Office Building.

Mr. Stewart, who is a civil engineer, former Congressman and former builder, is proceeding with plans to extend the west walls of the Capitol to accommodate four and a half acres of additional office, restaurant and tourist center space. The price tag on this four-year job reads $34,000,000 at present, but that might easily rise to $41,000,000. Nobody ever knows with Mr. Stewart, who has already left his dubious mark on the east front.

Old sandstone walls in the west facade evidently need repair and perhaps rebuilding. Whatever this necessary work costs must be spent, of course. The protests of the American Institute of Architects, the Fine Arts Commission and discerning members of Congress focus more on the way in which a few men have decided to change a national monument so drastically.

Congress has not yet appropriated funds for the face-changing, but the five-member Commission for the Extension of the Capitol decided the historic and beautiful west front must go. Mr. Stewart joined House Speaker MCCORMACK and Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN in closed session to vote for the project. Vice President HUMPHREY voted yes by proxy. House Minority Leader FORD was not present and did not vote.

Some of the facilities planned for the extension would be useful. The feeling of opponents is, however, that tourists are most urgently in need of parking space. Existing restaurants lose money. At some point, moreover, Americans must realize not every structure is perforce improved by "remodeling" and "modernizing." Respect for our past, said critic Wolf Von Eckardt, is a mark of cultural maturity.

Senator PROXMIRE of Wisconsin, pledging to challenge the measure all along the appropriations route, summed up our reaction as well as anyone. "If Congress proceeds on this pitifully inadequate advice," he said, "it will deserve the ringing public denunciation for waste and extravagance this proposal is sure to bring." We have seen Mr. Stewart's disastrous touch time and again. He should keep his hands off the Capitol.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am glad to note that the Senator from Wisconsin has presented to the Senate for printing in the RECORD the column written by Edward P. Morgan with respect to the proposed extension of the west front of the Capitol. This article is worthy of reading because it deals rather pointedly with the folly of what is proposed to be done to the Capitol. Mr. Morgan points out that it is proposed to extend the west front of the shrine of the Capitol, with the inclusion of cafeterias and other services of that kind. The shocking thing is that he estimates it will cost $34 million. If Mr. Morgan is as right about that $34 million as he was about the cost of the Rayburn Building, we can anticipate that the cost will be not $34 million but $68 million.

I wish to commend my colleague [Mr. YOUNG] for the fight that he has been making on this subject.

Since the Senator from Wisconsin has presented Mr. Morgan's article for the RECORD, I shall not present it, as I had intended.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield, let me say that of course I am delighted to have read Mr. Morgan's article, but I am just as delighted to know that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has also gone on record as being against this extravagance and waste of $34 million for expanding the west front.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, and I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Wisconsin in what he has to say.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this is a great day.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, widespread opposition has been aroused by the recent announcement of plans for reconstruction and extension of the west front of the Capitol. Members of Congress have received numerous communications denouncing the proposal as one which would basically alter one of our most historic structures.

It seems to me that this criticism is thoroughly justified. No one would question the wisdom of repairing and restoring the west front of the Capitol if its condition is such as to make it unsafe, but there is no evidence that this could not be done without in any way changing its present appearance. The United States should preserve, not destroy, its historic shrines.

Among those who have pointed out the folly of this proposal are Mr. Lou Hiner, Jr., of the Indianapolis News Washington bureau, and Mr. Edward P. Morgan, of the American Broadcasting Co. In recent statements both of these respected newsmen have set forth their reasons for objecting to these grandiose plans.

Because of the national significance of this issue, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Hiner, which appeared in the Indianapolis News, and the comments by Mr. Morgan, which were broadcast over ABC Radio, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, June 25, 1966]

CAPITOL ARCHITECT STEWART PUSHES ANOTHER BOONDOGGLE

(By Lou Hiner Jr.)

The American people are being asked to do without luxuries but Congress is pushing ahead with plans for its own $34 million extravaganza.

That's the price tag put on extending the west front of the Capitol. If past performance is any indication, the completed job will run well over the $34 million estimate.

This little construction project came about when Capitol architect J. George Stewart (who isn't an architect at all) suddenly found the west front was about to collapse.

Instead of a modest plan to shore up the pillars and masonry, Stewart came up with a proposal full of frills to make the Capitol more or less a palace on the Potomac.

The blueprints call for the addition of 106 congressional offices even though the new $125 million Rayburn Building was opened last year and provided 169 new office suites.

Two theaters will be planted in the addition to the west side and two additional restaurants will be added to the present dining chain.

The House and Senate restaurants already are notorious money losers, subsidized by the taxpayers each year to the tune of several hundred thousand dollars. If the proposed restaurants are included, this subsidy may reach $1 million a year to feed the lawmakers and their army of employees.

Sen. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, D-Wis., is one of those sharply attacking Stewart's lavish plans. Of the restaurants, for example, he points out:

"They are losing money, in large part because the Capitol's present 600 capacity is not fully used. The additional proposed 1,100 capacity would bring the total to 1,700, a fantastic increase of nearly 200 per cent."

PROXMIRE says he is appalled by Stewart's proposals.

"If Congress proceeds to spend this money without a great deal of additional justification, it will be a disgrace," he explains. "Stewart's justification was a total failure."

The Wisconsin senator snorts, too, at the suggestion Congress needs more meeting rooms for its committees.

"The need for additional meeting rooms in the Capitol is nil, zero, nothing," PROXMIRE adds. "We have just finished an immensely expensive extension of the east front of the Capitol at a multimillion-dollar cost. The new meeting rooms are generally used only a very few hours each week."

He is highly critical of Stewart for failing to consult with construction experts and to obtain alternative plans on the costly project.

Incidentally, a national organization of architects already is on record as opposing any west front extension. The group wants the Capitol left as it is with the damaged areas repaired.

Rep. RICHARD FULTON, D-Tenn., has told the House:

"I feel compelled to strongly protest this construction and urge that it be abandoned

immediately. If there is $34 million available for this work then I say there is great need for it elsewhere."

One unusual development in connection with the extension plan came about when newsmen asked Stewart for photographs of the Capitol. None was available since the Capitol, one of the most photographed buildings in the world, is classified "secret." Stewart said pictures could be taken of a model of the Capitol in the basement.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 7, 1966]

A CAPITOL ATTEMPT TO DEFACE HISTORY

(By Edward P. Morgan)

(This report was delivered by Mr. Morgan over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network.)

After the British redcoats burned the U.S. Capitol in 1814 in the War of 1812, Congress had to move to a tavern called Blodgett's Hotel. Presumably this could have served the legislators as a permanent meeting place since, as legend has it, politicians most comfortably gather in smoke-filled hotel rooms. Blodgett's had a cloakroom too. Lobbyists traditionally contact lawmakers in cloakrooms. So everything was fine and dandy.

But then some busybody insisted on restoring the Capitol building and there has been nothing but trouble ever since. Additions here, alterations there; all very unsettling. So I, for one, simply cannot see what the fuss is all about when an ex-Congressman from Delaware named J. George Stewart steps courageously forward and starts to bury all this history under a facade of freshly cut marble.

Nobody, of course, is more eminently qualified for this delicate but heroic task than Stewart. He is not now and never has been a card-carrying architect and, as far as I know, never intends to be one. He does operate with the title of Architect of the Capitol and it was under that cover that he executed—one might even say, murdered—his most famous work, the Rayburn Building, named in travestied memory of the late Speaker of the House. Into this crypto-Fascist-style mausoleum, jestingly referred to as a Congressional Office Building, Stewart poured all of his supervisory talents and by some reports, considerably more than $100 million.

The result, naturally, was a happy combination of superlatives—the ugliest and most expensive edifice of its kind ever erected on the face of the earth. Perhaps the happiest note of all was the fact that it cost only approximately twice as much as Stewart originally said it would. With such a monument around the Great Society doesn't need urban renewal; it needs a camouflage corps.

But now, oh let joy be unconfined, we are about to be treated to another sterling Stewart contribution to the beautification of Washington. At a starting price of just $34 million—a steal, really—he is going to stick the West Front of the Capitol out a maximum of 88 feet so it can house more offices, two big auditoriums, two cafeterias, four dining rooms seating more than a thousand people and an information lobby to take care of the tourist explosion. The sheer beauty of the Stewart plan is that in one fell swoop it will destroy the Capitol's historic vestiges—the last traces of the original work of Thornton, the West Indian doctor who won the $500 first prize for the building's first design; the embellishments of Latrobe, the contributions of Bulfinch, the famous Boston architect, and the terrace with its majestic flights of steps designed by Frederick Law Olmstead. You don't hardly get a demolition job like that anymore.

Indeed, while he's at it, Stewart might well consider razing the whole structure, including his other handiwork, the East Front, which cost $22 million, the customary double of his beginning estimate. Then the space could be used for a parking lot, which Washington needs anyway and the Congress could move down the street to Union Station.

An alternative plan, which I like better, would be to let Stewart run rampant on a field of bad taste across the entire face of L'Enfant's famous city. Thus with his ravenous appetite for eating places, we could hope to see a Stewart restaurant revolving around the tip of the Washington Monument to rival the space needle in Seattle. The lethal hydroplane races could be shifted from Hains Point to the reflecting pool, the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials could be converted into public rest rooms and shoe shine parlors.

Don't be so timid as to think all this is impossible. The Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, including those well-known aesthetes and city planners, Vice President HUMPHREY, Speaker MCCORMACK and Minority Leaders FORD and DIRKSEN, has already blithely gone along with Stewart's West Front job. All he needs now is money.

He figures he can easily wheedle that out of the Congress with the argument that the Front's ancient sandstone blocks are crumbling and a jet's sonar boom may bring the whole building down, dome and all. After careful study, the Fine Arts Commission reports the Capitol can be repaired, restored and its priceless architectural history preserved, all at a trifle of the cost of Stewart's folly. That would be the sensible way to do things. But thank Heaven that's not the way things are done in this crazy, wonderful town. Ask George Stewart.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, starting with Calendar No. 1316, the calendar be called in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, IND.

The bill (H.R. 9599) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the donation of the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering a bill, H.R. 9599, a companion bill to S. 2886, introduced by myself and Senator BAYH, which would transfer certain historical properties in Vincennes, Ind., to Federal ownership and maintenance, giving Indiana our second national memorial. The Department of the Interior would maintain these properties as a national park—more specifically, as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park.

Few Americans could enumerate George Rogers Clark's major accomplishments; fewer still, perhaps, have even heard of Vincennes. This is not as it should be, for both the man and the city played noble and important roles in the early days of this Nation's life. It is in order to recognize more adequately their importance that I recommend the Senate's approval of this bill.

The Vincennes area much deserves designation as a national historical site, for Vincennes is a city rich in national historical significance; events occurred there which importantly affected the future history of the entire United States.

The story of the city's beginnings is half history, half legend; an old tradition says that it was founded by French priests who stopped to say mass on the banks of the Wabash River, at the site of the present city, in 1702. Around 1730, a fort rose at Vincennes, French-built, a link in the chain of defense designed to protect French trading interests in the Ohio Valley from British infiltration.

The city's proudest moments came but a short time later, in 1779. It was at Vincennes that a young Virginia colonel named George Rogers Clark won a distinguished place for himself in early American history. It was Clark who, on February 25, 1779, captured Fort Sackville at Vincennes from the British in an heroic surprise assault, with a force of only 127 men. Clark's action, the historian maintains, assured American control of the vast Northwest Territory, an area extending from the Ohio River to the Mississippi, in the final bitter years of the Revolutionary War.

Clark's capture of Fort Sackville is not alone important as a significant chapter in America's early history; it is also significant as it is a testimony to the heroism of the early settlers of frontier America, a heroism which seemed to know no limits. In order to reach Vincennes and Fort Sackville, Clark and his small band of frontier soldiers undertook, in the coldest months of winter, a 2-month-long march of better than 180 miles, over swampland alternately flooded and frozen, without sufficient food, along ill-marked trails, dogged by the constant menace of British-supplied Indians. It was Clark who rallied his starving and exhausted men to the final successful siege of Fort Sackville. His boldness and the brilliance of his strategy at Vincennes, at Kaskaskia, and in the greater Ohio Valley merit his designation as one of the greatest of America's military heroes. But he is, sadly enough, an all-but-forgotten hero, whose rightful place high on the list of distinguished early Americans is yet unacknowledged. It is my hope that the establishment of his memorial as a national historical site will help to correct this past inequity.

Vincennes' role in the formation of the American State did not end with George Rogers Clark in 1779. From 1796 until 1800, Vincennes served as the capital of the Northwest Territory, an area encompassing the present States of Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and most of Minnesota. And from 1800 until Indiana won statehood in 1816—150 years ago this year—Vincennes was the capital of the Indiana Territory.

It was to Vincennes that William Henry Harrison, later the Nation's ninth president, came in 1800 as the territory's first governor. It was at Vincennes that

he built Grouselands, the Harrison family mansion. Harrison parleyed with Tecumseh in Grouseland's front lawn and signed five Indian treaties at the house.

Abraham Lincoln grew to manhood in Indiana, in a small settlement located but 60 miles southeast of Vincennes, which was then the nearest important settlement, a town of better than 15,000 inhabitants.

Vincennes today is thus a city with a rich historical past. Its history forms a part—a proud and important part—of the history of our Nation. And we are here given an opportunity to acknowledge the importance of Vincennes' role in America's past. The Department of the Interior has recommended that the Congress authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept, as a donation from the State of Indiana, the George Rogers Clark memorial, along with three other sites of historical importance, to incorporate and to maintain as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park.

The keystone of the projected park will, of course, be the George Rogers Clark memorial, a round domed Doric structure begun in 1928 and dedicated by President Roosevelt in 1936. The memorial was erected at a cost of $2½ million, part of which was furnished by Federal appropriations. Inside the columned building is a bronze statue of Clark; on the building's walls is a series of seven large murals depicting Clark's progress through the Northwest Territory in the years of the Revolutionary War.

Under the terms of the bill, the memorial would be transferred from State to Federal ownership along with its 17 acres of property. There is no acquisition cost to the Federal Government involved in the transfer. The National Park Service would administer the memorial and its surrounding park, together with three other sites of historical value which would remain in non-Federal ownership. These three sites are further evidences of the importance of Vincennes' past.

The first is Grouselands, the Harrison mansion. Its designation by the Department of the Interior as a registered national historic landmark—in a 1961 ceremony in which I was privileged to participate—means that the site possesses "exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States." Harrison's handsome Georgian mansion, the territory's first brick building, has been thoroughly restored by the Francis Vigo chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which saved the house from destruction in 1909 and has maintained it ever since.

The second historical site to be federally maintained is the first capitol of the Indiana Territory, a simple two-story frame house containing the territory's court and council chambers. During its period of service as the territorial capitol, from 1800 to 1813, important decisions on land policy, Indian relations, and military affairs were reached within its walls. The State of Indiana at present owns and administers the building.

The third historical site which the Federal Government would agree to maintain is the St. Francis Xavier Church. This old cathedral, built from 1824 to 1834, is the third church to occupy a single site. French priest-missionaries first built a rude log structure there around 1749, just 19 years after Vincennes first fort, a French one, rose in 1730. The present church is brick, with tall pillars made from poplar trees supporting its roof. In its belfry still hangs a small and ancient bell, brought from France in 1742, which has rung for scores of historic occasions over the past 200 years.

The Department of the Interior estimates that costs for development of the memorial and the privately owned sites will total $299,000; annual operating costs will eventually reach about $49,000. The cost is not great, but the benefits are. The Department of the Interior has endorsed the idea of a national park in Vincennes—Indiana has but one other Federal park, at the site of Lincoln's boyhood home. The House has approved the park's transfer to Federal ownership by endorsing H.R. 9599, introduced by Congressman WINFIELD K. DENTON of Indiana's Eighth District. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will now concur to the transfer by approving this bill, and thus recognize in their turn the importance of Vincennes contribution to our Nation's past.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, H.R. 9599, which will establish the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, merits the support of all the Members of this body.

The park will be centered around a large domed memorial to Clark, the Revolutionary War hero, and will be located in Vincennes, Ind., capital of the old Northwest Territory. The site is important as the place where our ancestors established an outpost to prevent British incursion into the Ohio River Valley, and then governed territory which would later become five States in the heartland of America.

H.R. 9599 will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the Clark Memorial as a donation from the State of Indiana. That memorial is near the site of Fort Sackville, which Clark and his band of 127 soldiers captured in the cold winter of 1779 after a grueling 160-mile march up the flooded Wabash River Valley.

H.R. 9599 will further authorize the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with owners of property in Vincennes associated with Clark and early settlement of the Northwest Territory. Such historically interesting property includes Grouseland, the mansion built by territorial Governor and later President William Henry Harrison in 1803–04. Also, the 140-year-old St. Francis Xavier Catholic Church which serves as a reminder of the constructive religious influence exerted in the early development of this part of our country, as well as a replica of Elihu Stout's printing office, where in 1830 Abraham Lincoln first saw a printing press, will both be maintained under the provisions of this legislation.

Passage of this measure will afford gratification to many individuals who have worked so hard for its enactment, but I am sure it has most significant meaning for my good friend and colleague, Congressman WINFIELD DENTON of the 8th District in Indiana, who introduced this bill in the House on July 1, 1965, and who has exerted effective and tireless legislative effort on its behalf. He has made a major contribution to the establishment of the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park.

As chairman of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which considers appropriations of over $1 billion each year for conservation of our natural resources, Congressman DENTON is well aware of the importance of conserving our resources and cherishing our national heritage. His sponsorship of H.R. 9599 will add still another accomplishment to the legislative record of this distinguished Hoosier.

It is with pride that I have joined Senator HARTKE in cosponsoring S. 2886, the companion measure to H.R. 9599. The national and enduring significance of this project undoubtedly warrants support of the Senate in giving recognition to this historical site and authorizing its preservation and development.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has unanimously reported H.R. 9599, Congressman DENTON's bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation by the State of Indiana of the George Rogers Clark Memorial for establishment as the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, and for other purposes. A similar measure, S. 2886, was introduced by our colleagues, Senators HARTKE and BAYH, both of whom presented testimony before the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee in favor of the proposal.

The committee was particularly pleased to have before it a bill in which the State offered to donate the property to the Federal Government. This follows the pattern established by the State of Virginia when Shenandoah National Park was established and the action of the State of North Carolina in the creation of the Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout National Seashores.

The measure cleared the House at the urging of the Congressman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], the sponsor of H.R. 9599. The testimony of this very distinguished gentleman was particularly effective in his appearance on the Senate side. He is a recognized conservationist, as indicated by his record as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, where his active interest and support for projects of this kind have contributed substantially to the success of the parks and recreation programs undertaken in the last few years. I congratulate him on his efforts.

The bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, 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. 1354), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The principal purpose of H.R. 9599 and a companion measure, S. 2886, introduced by Senators HARTKE and BAYH, is to provide for the creation and administration of the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park in the city of Vincennes, Ind.

NEED

White settlement of Vincennes began in the early 1730's when the French, under the leadership of Lt. Francois Margane Brissot, Sieur de Vinsenne, established a small fort, a chapel, and a few log huts on the Wabash River at the Piankeshaw Indian village of Chippecoke. This outpost was lost to the English in 1763 when the Treaty of Paris, which ended the French and Indian wars, was signed. The fort was enlarged and strengthened by the English and renamed Fort Sackville.

Fort Sackville became a center of British and Indian activity against the colonists during the American Revolution. The importance of getting it and the territory surrounding it into American hands was clear. It was George Rogers Clark (born 1752, died 1818) who conceived the plan, induced Gov. Patrick Henry, of Virginia, to support it, and led the 175-man expedition which captured in turn Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and Vincennes in 1778–79 and then went on to consolidate his gains and to prevent the British from retaking control of the country west of the Alleghenies. To him more than anyone else, the historians are agreed, the young Nation owed Britain's cession of the Northwest Territory when the Treaty of Paris was signed in 1783.

Even as short a summary as this makes clear the justification for including a national memorial to George Rogers Clark among the sites administered by the National Park Service. The proposal contained in H.R. 9599 is that the United States accept as a donation the fine memorial to him that already exists in Vincennes. Built between 1928 and 1936, partly at the expense of the State, Knox County, and the city of Vincennes and partly at the expense of the United States, it is located on 17 acres of land on the banks of the Wabash close to, if not actually on, the site of Fort Sackville and is presently administered by the State of Indiana.

Though George Rogers Clark's exploit is the most dramatic episode in the history of Vincennes, it is far from the only one. As the history outlined above indicates, the town was important in the pre-Revolutionary contests between the British and the French and Indians. In addition, there remain in it several important historical structures which, under the terms of the amended bill, may be included within the new historical park if suitable arrangements can be concluded between their owners and the Secretary of the Interior. If these become a part of the historical park, the Secretary of the Interior will be authorized to assist in their interpretation, preservation, and renewal. The three most important of these structures are the capitol of the Territory of Indiana which, at the time it was so named in 1800, included the whole of the former Northwest Territory except the State of Ohio; St. Francis Xavier Cathedral, built 1824–34 on a site which had been used continuously from 1749 to that time for missionary activities; and Grouseland, built by William Henry Harrison as his home during the time he was Governor of the Territory of Indiana, 1800–12. The owners of the first two of these have already indicated their willingness to enter into appropriate cooperative arrangements. There is thus an opportunity for the National Park Service, through the development of this historical park, to display to the people of the whole country the remains of an outstanding segment of their historical heritage which deserves to be remembered and kept intact.

COST

The acquisition costs for the George Rogers Clark National Historical Park will be nil. Development expenses will, it is estimated, amount to about $300,000. Annual operating costs, given present wage and salary levels, will be about $50,000.

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 309) creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment, on page 7, line 17, after the word "than", to strike out "January 31, 1967" and insert "two years after the Commission is established"; so as to make the bill read:

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

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that traffic in obscene matters and materials is a matter of grave national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. The Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation. The State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials. Governmental action to be effective needs the support and cooperation of an informed public. It is the purpose of this Act to bring about a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat by all constitutional means this pernicious traffic.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twenty members, appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) One from the Senate;

(2) One from the House of Representatives;

(3) Two from the Post Office Department;

(4) Two from the Department of Justice, one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(5) One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(6) Three from the clergy;

(7) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of secondary education;

(8) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of higher education;

(9) One who shall be a prominent librarian;

(10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;

(12) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;

(13) One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industries;

(14) One from among the attorneys general of the several States;

(15) One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government; and

(16) One who shall be a chief law enforcing officer of a city or county government.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacany in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP UPON CHANGE OF STATUS.—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Eleven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) INVESTIGATION, ANALYSIS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials at the various levels of governmental responsibility;

(2) to provide for the development of a plan for improved coordination between Federal, State, and local officials in the suppression of such traffic;

(3) to determine ways and means of informing the public as to the origin, scope, and effects of such traffic, and of obtaining public support in its suppression;

(4) to secure the active cooperation of leaders in the field of mass media for the accomplishment of the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(5) to formulate recommendations for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic; and

(6) to analyze the laws pertaining to traffic in noxious and obscene matters and materials, and to make such recommendations to the Congress for appropriate revisions of Federal laws as the Commission may deem necessary in order to effectively regulate the flow of such traffic.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than two years after the Commission is established. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission (1) may constitute such advisory committees within States composed of citizens of that State, and (2) may consult with Governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local government and private organizations, as it deems advisable. Any advisory committee constituted pursuant to this subsection shall carry out its duties without expense to the United States.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commissions, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to urge today that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 309, of which I am a cosponsor. This measure provides that a commission be established to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene and noxious material that are found daily throughout America. It is the purpose of this legislation to bring about a workable and effective program to fight this traffic. The Congress has previously taken note of the many instances of the harm done to youth and others by the distribution of lewd materials, but we have never done anything about it.

Mr. President, we now have a chance to deal an effective blow to this industry which preys on the ignorance of the unsuspecting. The commission which would be created would have the opportunity to coordinate Government actions in this field and to alert the public, especially parents of school-age children, to the seriousness of this undesirable traffic. It is important to note, that we are not here trying to legislate the morals for the Nation.

This commission is not a censorship bureau; what it does provide is protection for those Americans who wish to remain secure from openly lewd material, openly proffered.

It is obvious that in dealing with legislation of this sort, we must chart a cautious course. We are dealing in nonobjective terms when we use the terms "obscene and noxious." What noxious means is open to wide debate. What is considered obscene by some is often considered as serious art by others. As an illustration, I am sure that some "art" of former centuries must have struck the Victorians as reprehensible.

Nonetheless, I am convinced that a wide range of publications are being openly distributed today which could not be tagged as artistic by any stretch of the imagination; and could not escape, by any definition, the tag of "smut." It is this sort of publication which is endangering our unsuspecting young people, and which is an insult to the eye of adults.

It is a difficult area to deal in, Mr. President, but I am convinced that the need is worth the attempt. I support this bill in the hope and conviction that it is in the best national interest, and that the Commission established by the bill will exercise its authorized functions in a constructive and proper manner.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to speak in support of S. 309, which would create a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Materials to explore methods of combating the traffic in pornographic materials in particular, and to make recommendations about necessary additional legislative and administrative action. I joined Senator MUNDT and other Senators in sponsoring this bill which follows from a bill we sponsored in the last Congress, and I believe its work would be useful in meeting the problems which have been found to exist in this field. I believe this Commission that would be established by passage of this bill in the Senate today would also help alert the public to the traffic and distribution of obscene matter, and I hope the Congress can enact the bill into law this year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1355), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

S. 309 provides that a Commission will be established to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene and noxious materials, and to (1) seek means of improving coordination between various levels of government to suppress such traffic; (2) endeavor, through the cooperation of various information and communication media, to inform the public about the problem and to further the objectives of the Commission; and (3) report its findings and recommendations as to what legislative, administrative, or other forms of action needs to be taken to combat the traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

S. 309 is identical to S. 162, a bill introduced in the 87th Congress, which was favorably reported by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate (S. Rept. 284) and passed by the Senate.

In the 86th Congress, the Government Operations Committee of the Senate reported S. 3726 (S. Rept. 1749) and this bill, which was also identical to S. 309, was passed by the Senate.

This legislation has been introduced in an effort to bring about a workable and effective program to fight the traffic in obscene and noxious matters and materials. While considerable interest has been show by Congress and by the general public in the serious problems involved in the distribution of pornographic literature, no single effective piece of legislation has been adopted which deals a crippling blow to this insidious industry.

Many religious, patriotic, and service organizations and groups have been continually urging Congress to take action on this serious and menacing problem. The Congress has taken note of the widespread harm done to youth and others through the dissemination of lewd, obscene, and noxious materials, and a number of bills have been introduced in Congress on the subject.

Twenty-eight additional Senators have joined in the sponsorship of this bill. It is the belief of the sponsors that the best approach to the problems resulting from the distribution of obscene materials would be through the establishment of a commission which could thoroughly examine all the facets of the problems and could then recommend steps to be taken both by legislative bodies and by private groups and citizens to meet the threat posed by the dissemination of obscene matters.

It is the belief of the sponsors that this small group of experts, drawn from a wide area of interests, could make recommendations and initiate action more effectively.

The Commission is to be made up of persons from several walks of life who have knowledge of the seriousness of the problem and the many legal problems connected with the suppression of the traffic in obscene materials.

The Commission will study the need for any new Federal regulations for controlling such traffic, as well as the general need for State laws or local ordinances for this purpose.

Efforts will be made by the Commission to alert the public, especially the parents and school-age children, about the seriousness of this pernicious traffic and give guidance to the public in suppressing the distribution of such lewd and obscene matters, or in bringing the purveyors of filth into court.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

The following Government agencies will have representatives on the Commission: The Post Office Department, the Department of Justice (including the Federal Bureau of Investigation), and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There will also be one Member from the House of Representatives and one Member of the Senate on the Commission.

Public members are selected from groups knowledgeable on this question both from a moral aspect and from a law enforcement aspect. These will include three clergymen, a secondary school official, a State attorney general, a county or city prosecutor, and a county or city law enforcement officer.

Representatives from the information and communications media will sit on the Commission. One member will come from the moving-picture industry, one from the radio-television industry, and one from the publishing industry.

This group will represent all segments of the population concerned with the problems resulting from distribution of noxious and obscene matters and materials.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND THE TAKING OF A SCHOOL CENSUS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2060) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes" which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after "1925", to strike out "(43 Stat. 870; sec. 31–28, D.C. Code)" and insert "(43 Stat. 807; sec. 31–208, D.C. Code)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1 of article II of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved February 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 807; sec. 31–208, D.C. Code), is amended by striking therefrom "all children between the ages of three and eighteen years permanently or temporarily residing in the District of Columbia, and annually thereafter or" and inserting in lieu thereof "all children under eighteen years permanently or temporarily residing in the District of Columbia".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, 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. 1351), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law so as to assure an accurate school census and to provide a greater source of data for anticipatory planning purposes with respect to zoning and school construction in the District of Columbia. The bill would specifically accomplish the following:

(1) Provide that all children below the age of 18 years be listed in the taking of the school census, instead of the present requirement that only those between the ages of 3 and 18 years be listed. The committee was informed that this provision is desirable and would be very helpful to the Board of Education in making projections of future enrollments. It would also be of assistance in anticipatory planning with respect to zoning and school construction, with the ultimate result benefiting the District financially; and

(2) Provide that the census be made in accordance with such frequency as the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education find necessary and desirable instead of annually, as required in present law. This provision was recommended to the committee on the basis of a more economical use of funds than is possible under existing law.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia favor enactment of the bill. They informed the committee that enactment of the measure could result in a financial saving to the District, and that in any event, passage would involve no additional expense.

The Subcommittee on Public Health Education, Welfare, and Safety held public hearings on the bill on June 14, 1966. No one appeared in opposition.

Similar bills, S. 560 and S. 999, passed the Senate in the 87th and 88th Congresses respectively.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES ACT

The bill (S. 1312) to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 5 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act (65 Stat. 369; sec. 31–1404, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by striking the comma following "motor trucks" and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking the remainder of such sentence.

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 6 of such Act, as amended (sec. 31–1405, D.C. Code, 1961 edition) is amended to read as follows: "Appropriations are authorized for all necessary expenses of the Office of Central Management, Department of Food Services, in the public schools of the District of Columbia, including the payment of compensation for personal services and Government contributions to related insurance costs; for the acquisition, maintenance, and replacement of equipment used or acquired for use in the conduct of the Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for reimbursement of the District of Columbia public school food services fund for lunches served in accordance with section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (60 Stat. 233, title 42, sec. 1758, U.S.C., 1958 edition), to children without cost to such children or at reduced cost."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1352), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSES OF THE BILL

The purposes of the bill are (1) to authorize appropriations of public funds to pay salaries and related costs of operating the Office of Central Management of the Food Services Department in the public schools and (2) to provide for appropriation of public money to pay for lunches furnished to all needy secondary public school children whose parents are not recipients of public welfare.

Under existing law (65 Stat. 369) the expenses, salaries, and related costs of conducting the Office of Central Management of the Department of Food Services of the public schools in the District of Columbia are paid from the food services fund. This fund is a revolving account into which all revenues from the operation of food services in the public schools are placed. These receipts are used for the "purchase of foods, supplies, and all other services and expenditures of whatever nature which are necessary for the conduct of the Department of Food Services, including personal services, the operation and maintenance of motortrucks, *and the expenses of conducting the Office of Central Management.*" [Emphasis supplied.]

In reporting on the bill, the Board of Commissioners made the following statement concerning the need for striking the above italicized language from the existing law:

"Experience has shown that these costs cannot continue to be borne by the school lunch program (salaries and related insurance costs of employees of the Office of Central Management) without this assistance. The superintendent of Schools reports that conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture and with food services directors of other cities and States tend to the conclusion that such costs should not be borne by the students any more than the other costs of administering the school system. The superintendent points out that the staff of the Office of Central Management of the food services department serves in a dual capacity of State and city administration for three Federal programs; namely, the national school lunch program, the special milk program, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture donated-commodity program for District of Columbia schools and institutions. The superintendent further notes that comparable functions in the States are administered by State officials of education, and administrative staff salaries are paid from State appropriated funds, whereas the District of Columbia school lunch program is forced to bear this expense."

In the District of Columbia public schools elementary needy lunch program, authorized by Public Law 86–104, all students certified as needy by the school principal, whether or not their families are receiving public assistance, have their lunches paid for from public funds. In the secondary school program there is a distinction made between lunches served to needy pupils whose families receive public assistance and lunches served to needy pupils whose families do not receive public assistance.

Public Law 85–901, enacted by the 85th Congress, provides authorization for reimbursement to be made to the secondary schools only in cases where free lunches are served to children of families who are re-

cipients of public assistance granted by the government of the District of Columbia.

During the school year, September 1964 to June 1965, 351,857 lunches were served without charge to needy children in the secondary schools. Of this number, 87,252 were reimbursed for from public funds in accordance with Public Law 85-901. Reimbursement is made at whatever the current student price is at a given time and for this year that price was 39 cents. The cost of the remaining 264,105 free lunches served to needy secondary students was absorbed in the overall operation of the Department of Food Services. In other words, sufficient "profit" was made on the lunches sold to nonneedy students in the elementary and secondary schools to defray the cost of furnishing free or reduced-cost lunches to the needy students in secondary level schools whose families did not receive public assistance.

Although the Department of Food Services to date has been able to operate without a deficit, this committee was advised that in all probability in the next fiscal year a deficit could occur. Consequently, the Department of Food Services would be required to find additional means to pay for these free lunches and might probably have to curtail such lunches to needy secondary students unless the reimbursement authority for secondary school lunches provided by this bill is enacted. Likewise, in the event the food services fund is reimbursed with public funds for all needy lunches served in the secondary schools, the Food Services Department will be able to improve the quality of the meals furnished, particularly with respect to the variety of food. It will also make it possible for the Department of Food Services to pay its cafeteria workers a better wage.

The cost of the central office operation for the fiscal year 1966 is estimated to be approximately $95,977 for the salaries and related insurance costs for 3 officers and 10 clerks. The cost of providing free lunches to needy secondary school pupils whose parents do not receive public assistance payments from the District will be approximately $79,231. The total estimated annual cost of the bill is $175,030.

Upon enactment of this legislation, the committee urges and is most hopeful that the Office of Central Management of the Food Services Department take the necessary steps to improve the quality of the school lunches.

On June 14, 1966, the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety held public hearings on S. 1312. At the hearings, a representative of the District of Columbia government appeared and recommended enactment of the bill. No one appeared in opposition.

Identical bills, S. 3314 and S. 1078, passed the Senate in the 87th and 88th Congresses, respectively.

SPECIAL REGULATIONS FOR VISIT OF NOBLES OF THE MYSTIC SHRINE TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1178) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc., on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, 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. 1353), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

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

PURPOSE OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION

The purpose of this joint resolution is to authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners and certain Federal officers to provide for the comfort and protection of all persons within the District of Columbia during the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, which will convene in the District of Columbia on July 10, 1967, and conclude 3 days later on July 13, 1967.

The committee has been advised that the magnitude of the forthcoming Shrine convention will present special problems, as well as exert a heavy burden on the municipal services of the city. These problems relate to the handling of traffic and large crowds, and the erection of reviewing stands for the Shrine parade. In addition, there is a need for the services of the Police Department and the Department of Public Health to be adequately supplemented in order to protect the personal safety and health of the citizenry of the District and the many visitors who will be here.

The enactment of House Joint Resolution 1178 will, in some large measure, take care of these related problems and provide the District Commissioners and certain Federal officials with the authority needed to cooperate fully with Shrine officials in implementing a safe and successful Shrine convention in the District of Columbia.

The principal provisions of House Joint Resolution 1178 are as follows:

1. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to make regulations to preserve peace and order, specially regulate traffic, and issue special licenses to peddlers and vendors, such regulations to be effective during the period of the meeting, defined by the resolution as a 10-day period beginning July 7, 1967, and ending July 16, 1967, both dates inclusive.

2. Appropriations are authorized to pay the cost of providing additional municipal services and to pay for other municipal expenses connected with the convention, estimated at $225,000.

3. The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioners are authorized to grant permits for the use of public space under their respective jurisdictions, subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

4. The Commissioners are authorized to permit the installation of temporary electrical facilities of all kinds, also subject to certain limitations imposed by the resolution.

5. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend certain equipment belonging to the Department of Defense to be used in connection with providing for the well-being of the expected crowds, also subject to limitations imposed by the resolution.

6. The temporary placing of wires along and across the line of any parade for use by electric lighting and communications is authorized.

7. The effective period of the regulations authorized to be adopted and a penalty for their violation are prescribed.

8. The resolution requires the corporation to indemnify and save harmless the District of Columbia and Federal Government against loss, damage, or liability, and provides that such requirement shall be satisfied by the corporation's submitting to the District of Columbia Commissioners and the Secretary of the Interior an insurance policy or a bond, or both, in such amounts and subject to such terms as these officials may deem adequate to protect the interests of the respective governments.

9. Finally, the resolution specifically exempts from its provisions the U.S. Capitol Buildings and Grounds, and other property under the jurisdiction of the Congress.

Legislation similar in scope to House Joint Resolution 1178 has been enacted by the Congress in past years when conventions and other public gatherings have brought great numbers of people into the District of Columbia. An identical resolution (H.J. Res. 888) was enacted in the 88th Congress in order to accommodate the 91st Annual Shrine Convention that was held in Washington during July 1965. On July 25, 1958, Congress adopted a resolution (72 Stat. 412) similar to House Joint Resolution 1178 when the Middle Atlantic Shrine Association meeting of APONMS was held in the District of Columbia in September of that year. Similarly, another resolution was adopted in connection with the American Legion Convention of 1954 (68 Stat. 743). H.J. Res. 1178 is patterned substantially after the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1049).

On June 21, 1966, the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs held a public hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 165, a companion resolution to House Joint Resolution 1178. During such hearing, the committee was informed that the Imperial Shrine Convention is held annually in one of the major cities of the United States, Canada, or Mexico, and further, that when the forthcoming 93d annual session is scheduled to convene in the District of Columbia, it is estimated that 100,000 Shrine delegates will be in attendance. As is generally the custom, the Shrine during the course of its convention will present two parades, one at night and the other during the day. It is anticipated that these colorful events will attract more than a million viewers into the downtown area of the city. The committee was also advised that the many Shrine delegates with their families, and the hundreds of thousands of spectators to the Shrine parades and activities may be expected to result in the spending of $15 to $20 million in the District of Columbia during the convention.

A representative of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia appeared at the public hearing, and supported enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 165. The committee also received a letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, wherein it was indicated that the Department had no objection to the enactment of the joint resolution.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 201(c) OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

The bill (S. 2610) to amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit further Federal use and donation of exchange sale property, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2610

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 481(c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In acquiring personal property, any executive agency, under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, may exchange or sell similar items and may apply

the exchange allowance or proceeds of sale in such cases in whole or in part payment for the property acquired, except that (1) before any such exchange or sale is made, such property shall be offered for utilization by Federal agencies under section 202(a) of this Act and thereafter for donation under section 203(j) of this Act, and (2) any exchange or sale transaction carried out under the authority of this subsection shall be evidenced in writing."

(b) The amendment made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the third month beginning after the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1356), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill would amend section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the head of each agency, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services, to exchange or sell equipment, furniture, fixtures, and other items of personal property and apply the proceeds of sale or exchange allowance against the purchase price, except that before such sale of exchange is made the property shall be made available for transfer (1) to other Federal agencies for further utilization; or (2) made available for donation to health, education, civil defense, or research; or (3) traded in under the exchange sales provision of section 201(c) of the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

The bill also provides that the items exchanged must be similar to the ones procured and that such transactions shall be evidenced in writing.

BACKGROUND AND USE OF SECTION 201(C)

Section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, authorizes agencies to exchange or sell personal property and apply the trade-in allowance or proceeds of sale for property acquired, as follows:

"In acquiring personal property, an executive agency, under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, may exchange or sell similar items and may apply the exchange allowance or proceeds of sale in such cases in whole or in part payment for the property acquired: *Provided*, That any transaction carried out under the authority of this subsection shall be evidenced in writing."

This part of the Property Act was designated to supersede 21 statutes or provisions of laws which were repealed by section 602 of the act. The original statutes authorized the heads of some of the departments and agencies to trade in used equipment and apply the allowance against the cost of new equipment. Those statutes were enacted during the period 1912–41 at which time it was common practice to turn in motor vehicles, typewriters, adding machines, and other office equipment and apply the allowance against the cost of new equipment.

Initially this authority was limited to a few items; however, during the postwar period the number of items that could be exchanged or sold, and the proceeds applied to new procurement, steadily increased throughout the Federal service.

During the past few years the committee has received a number of communications from the State agencies for surplus property and other local officials complaining about the sale of Government property which is usable and needed for educational purposes. Most of these complaints have centered around the growing tendency of the Government to sell more and more property under section 201(c) which, in turn, diminishes both the quality and quantity of property available for donation to the States.

(The State agencies for surplus property are responsible for locating, screening, warehousing, and distributing surplus property for donation to schools, colleges, and medical institutions, and are therefore vitally concerned with the operation of the Government's surplus property program.)

State officials have expressed concern over the increased sale of property under the exchange sales provision of section 201(c), which adversely affects the donation program authorized by section 203 of the Property Act. They further contend that section 201(c) is not being used with discretion, as intended, but as a means of augmenting the annual appropriations of Federal agencies. It is their contention that if this or a similar bill is not enacted, the Defense Department, which currently follows the procedures prescribed by this bill, will, undoubtedly, change its regulations to conform with the GSA procedure, and, since a large amount of surplus property is generated by the military, such action would be fatal to the donation program.

There is obviously a close relationship between exchange sales of property and the donation program, in that as more property is turned in for new equipment, less property becomes surplus thus reducing the volume of property available for donation purposes.

Section 203(j) of the Property Act permits the Administrator of General Services discretionary authority in the donation of surplus personal property as follows:

"Under such regulation as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, any equipment, materials, books, or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for any such purpose."

In 1955, the Congress enacted legislation to overcome administrative action similar to that presented in this case. At that time the Department of Defense proposed to prohibit the donation of surplus property which was carried in a revolving fund. That prohibition would have seriously curtailed the amount of surplus property available for the donation program. Legislation to nullify those regulations was promptly introduced in the House by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and in the Senate by Chairman Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN and 21 cosponsors. Those measures were approved on June 3, 1955, as Public Law 84–61. The law specifically provided that for donation purposes, "no distinction shall be made between property capitalized in a working-capital fund established pursuant to section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947 * * *."

HEARINGS

No specific hearings were held on S. 2610. However, the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures held extensive hearings on a number of related bills during the 1st session of the 89th Congress. This bill emanated from those hearings and is intended to reassert and clarify congressional policy with regard to the disposal of unneeded personal property.

The hearings revealed that an increasing amount of Government property is being sold to the public, or traded in under the exchange sales provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, with the result that a great deal of property is diverted from the regular channels of disposal to health, education and civil defense activities.

The committee noted that section 201(c) of the Property Act has been used as the legal authority for selling Government property under a spot bid, or the open competitive bid method for moving property out of the supply system. The legislative history and background of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act does not support this interpretation of the law. Selling property under this authority further reduces the volume of surplus property which would otherwise be available to schools and colleges through the donation program.

Many of the items currently being sold under section 201(c) could be used in the classrooms, laboratories, and vocational schools but can only be obtained now by the schools by bidding against the surplus property dealers. Some of the items offered for sale under the exchange sale procedure consist of cafeteria equipment, battery chargers, gasoline pumps, aircraft jacks, machine tools, household ranges, sterilizers, conveyors, bathroom fixtures, drinking fountains, sinks, and hand drills which are seldom, if ever, exchanged by private concerns.

Officials of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property testified that the sale of property under section 201(c) denies the schools and colleges of much needed property, and noted that some of the school administrators are at a loss to understand why the Government was selling the same property which the schools and colleges need.

On March 26, 1966, the General Services Administration released new regulations designed for the ostensible purpose of tightening up the exchange sales procedures under section 201(c) of the Property Act (see vol. 31, No. 59 of Federal Register).

The new regulations reduced the number of items which can be exchanged from 69 to 41. However, some of the items formerly listed under several categories are now combined into a single listing, while some of the others which were omitted never were available for donation anyway with the result that very little, if any, improvement has been made, or is expected, from the new regulations.

The committee is convinced that the original intent of section 201(c) was sound but that so much property is now being sold under its provisions that the effectiveness of the surplus property donation program is being seriously diluted.

The Congress has repeatedly endorsed and supported that program, which has contributed much to the health, education and civil defense activities of the States, and this committee does not intend to have the program crippled by administrative action.

AMENDMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

The bill (H.R. 10607) to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States was considered, ordered to

a third reading, 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. 1357), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

This bill would amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving and storage expenses of Federal employees when transferred from one official duty station to another, in the interest of the United States.

The bill would authorize, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the head of each Federal department and independent agency to reimburse employees for moving their household goods and personal effects, transportation and subsistence of their families, and other allowances when such employees are transferred. At the present time, only a part of such expenses are paid by the Government, and the remainder must be paid by the transferred employee. The Civil Service Commission conducted a survey of over 5,000 employees transferred by the Government in fiscal year 1962. It found that approximately 83 percent of those employees incurred losses averaging more than $500 and that a significant number lost more than $1,000 per move.

Unreimbursed expenses frequently incurred are those for moving household goods and personal effects in excess of 7,000 pounds; the subsistence expense of members of the moving employee's family while enroute to the new duty station; the cost of an advance trip to seek satisfactory living quarters for himself and his family; the rent of temporary quarters while waiting for permanent living quarters; the cost of selling and buying a residence or in canceling leases; and a range of miscellaneous expenses such as connecting and disconnecting appliances, adjusting rugs and draperies, among many others.

This bill seeks to remedy this situation by providing additional benefits and allowances, so that employees will not have to incur financial losses when transferred at the request of the Government.

The principal features of the bill provide for—

1. An increase in the weight limitation allowed for shipment of household goods from 7,000 to 11,000 pounds for each family.

2. One round trip to the new location for the employee and his spouse for the purpose of obtaining a place to live; and financial assistance for subsisting the employee's immediate family while en route to the new station.

3. Storing an employee's household goods in certain areas where housing is in short supply, or not immediately available.

4. Payment of certain real estate transactions resulting from the employees' sale or purchase of residence, or lease settlement of rented quarters, incident to transfer from the old to the new station.

5. The payment of a cash allowance up to $632 to cover miscellaneous expenses of the transferred employee.

Although not in the nature of allowances, the bill contains two additional significant provisions. In order to assure that the Government does not pay the moving expenses of employees who do not intend to remain in Government service after they are moved, the bill provides that employees must agree in writing to remain with the Government for at least 1 year after they move, unless separated for reasons beyond their control. If the agreement is violated, the amounts allowed by the Government as moving expenses must be refunded.

The other provision would permit the Government to exercise judgment in deciding whether an employee's household goods shall be shipped by the Government on Government bills of lading or shall be shipped by the employee under the commuted rates system applicable under the current law to transfers within the contiguous 48 States. Under the commuted rate system the employee selects the household goods carrier and has his goods moved. He is then reimbursed by the Government under a scale of reimbursement which is based upon commercial tariffs, applicable to the general public and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This method has proven satisfactory generally but in some instances the use of the Government bill of lading method would be less costly to the Government. The bill would permit the Government to use the more economical method, depending upon the circumstances.

EXISTING LAW

At the present, under the Administrative Expenses Act, civilian employees of the Government may be reimbursed for four kinds of moving expenses, they are: (1) The cost of transporting up to 7,000 pounds of household goods, (2) the temporary storage of employees' property, under certain conditions, (3) the transportation of employees and their families, and (4) subsistence expenses of employees—but not their families—when traveling to the new duty station.

For the military the Government provides a special relocation allowance, equal to the basic monthly allowance for quarters, for a member of the uniformed services whose dependents move when he has a permanent change of station. (Career Incentive Act of 1955, Public Law 20, 84th Cong.)

In addition, the Government provides for officers and employees transferring under the Foreign Services Act of 1946 allowances and reimbursement covering many expenses of the kinds proposed to be covered under this bill (60 Stat. 1025, 1026, and 1027). Legislation passed in the 86th Congress provides other civilian employees assigned to foreign areas with special transfer allowances for extraordinary, necessary, and reasonable expenses, not otherwise compensated for (Public Law 86-707).

BACKGROUND

H.R. 10607 was drafted by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and submitted to Congress for introduction during the early part of 1965. Similar proposals were introduced in the Senate, as S. 2374 and S. 2516, and referred to this committee for consideration. The Civil Service Commission urges enactment of this legislation stating that:

"Such action is needed if we are to facilitate administrative action lessening the economic hardship employees must face when forced to move at the convenience of the Government. This is especially true because the program for closing surplus bases of the Department of Defense is continuing.

"If the Government expects to attract, retain, and develop top-quality people, it must provide, in addition to pay, the kind of working conditions necessary to achieve those sound objectives. Agencies now hesitate to require employees to move because of the financial losses they sustain. It is not only a question of fairness to employees, it is a matter of prudent administration to protect the Government's investment in its skilled manpower by paying the legitimate costs of transfer.

"* * * most private employers reimburse moving expenses to the extent recommended in this legislation and in many instances they go substantially beyond the limits that are proposed here."

The Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations held extensive hearings on H.R. 10607, at which time Mr. John W. Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and Mr. Elmer B. Staats, former Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget testified in support of the bill. Three Members of Congress, a representative from the General Accounting Office, and several officials from labor unions and Federal employee organizations also appeared and urged the committee to take favorable action on the proposed legislation. The bill was reported by the committee on October 21, 1965, and passed the House of Representatives, with amendments on March 23, 1966.

The amendments approved by the House of Representatives provided for (a) Making the limitations imposed by section 23 on subsistence expenses apply to transfers taking place within the United States; (b) limiting reimbursement for brokerage fees and other expenses to those fees customarily charged in each community; (c) limiting the allowance for miscellaneous expenses to 2 weeks base pay for an employee with a family and 1-week compensation for an employee without a family—but in no event to exceed GS-13 salary and (d) extending from 6 months to 1 year the period of reemployment after separation when an employee will be eligible for reimbursement of moving expenses.

This bill would enable the Government to more nearly meet the actual expenses incurred by the transferred employee who is uprooted and moved in the interest of the Government. It will provide uniform financial assistance for moving each member of the family, rather than paying all of the expenses of the employee but making no allowance for members of his immediate family. It has been estimated that more than 35,000 employees a year are involved in transfers at the request of the Government and that the vast majority must use personal funds to help pay the cost of moving to the new place of employment.

Except for some relief for postal employees, similar to that proposed by H.R. 10607, no change in the basic law or allowances has been given to Federal employees since 1948.

THE ALLOWANCES AUTHORIZED BY H.R. 10607 SHOULD NOT BE TAXABLE

The Internal Revenue Service has held that, under the present law, allowances or reimbursements to employees for moving expenses constitutes taxable income to the employees, with the exception of allowances, or reimbursements for moving an employee's family and household goods, his personal effects, and meals and lodging while in transit to the new location. The Service maintains that with this exception, allowances or reimbursements for moving expenses are compensation paid to an employee, and furthermore maintains that employers should withhold income tax on the amounts paid. Thus, allowances or reimbursements for such items as house-hunting trips, temporary living expenses, and real estate fees are presently deemed reportable as income and taxable. The committee considered a proposed amendment to H.R. 10607 which would specifically have exempted the allowances and benefits authorized by this bill from taxation, unless, of course, the taxpayer should realize a gain from such reimbursement.

The committee endorses the intent of this proposed amendment. However, in view of the jurisdictional problems which might be raised as a result of adding such language to this bill and in view of the fact that general legislation similar to the proposed amendment is currently pending before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the

Finance Committee of the Senate, the amendment was not adopted.

The committee is of the view, however, that the general purpose and effect of H.R. 10607 would be seriously diluted if the benefits and allowances authorized thereunder are deemed taxable as income. In this regard the committee is in full accord with the following testimony given on this matter by John W. Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission before the House Committee:

"* * * the basic philosophy behind this legislation would indicate that this is not compensation, this is not additional income. This is reimbursement, and therefore, should not be taxable."

ESTIMATED ANNUAL COST

The committee was informed that enactment of this bill might cost as much as $40 million per year, depending on the number of transfers authorized by the head of each agency, the number of employees and size of the families transferred from one location to another.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bills (S. 3583) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward internal and external security; (S. 3584), to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; the bill (S. 3467) to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; and the bill (S. 3112) to amend the Clean Air Act, and so forth, were announced in sequence as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these four bills go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

PROPOSED 5-YEAR HYDROLOGIC STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE DELMARVA PENINSULA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2287) to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "through the Geological Survey,"; in line 10, after the word "means", to insert "from the standpoint of hydrologic feasibility"; on page 2, line 24, after "(6)", to strike out "consider the most effective means of developing and managing water supplies giving" and insert "give"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "officials", to strike out "information and recommendations for" and insert "any results of this study and investigation that would be appropriate for their use in"; in line 17, after the word "consider", to strike out "admissible" and insert "desirable"; on page 4, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. In carrying out the study and investigation authorized by this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with other Federal, State, and local agencies now engaged in comprehensive planning for water resource use and development in the Delmarva Peninsula area by making available to those agencies his findings and to cooperate with those agencies in the Northeastern United States Water Supply Study as authorized by the Act of October 27, 1965 (79 Stat. 1073).

And, at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to make, a comprehensive study and investigation of the water resources of the Delmarva Peninsula with a view to determining the availability of fresh water supplies needed to meet the anticipated future water requirements of the Delmarva Peninsula area, and with a view of determining the most effective means from the standpoint of hydrologic feasibility of protecting and developing fresh water sources so as to insure, insofar as practicable, the availability of adequate water supplies in the future. In carrying out such study and investigation with respect to the Delmarva Peninsula, the Secretary shall—

(1) appraise the water use, requirements, and trends, and determine the availability of water in the streams and underground sources for the entire peninsula;

(2) determine the depths, thicknesses, and permeabilities, the perennial yield, and the recharge characteristics of major aquifers, and the quality characteristics to be expected from each such major aquifer;

(3) determine with respect to ground water resources the continuity and extent of important water-bearing formations;

(4) determine the yield from stream systems under natural flow conditions and under varying degrees of storage and the amounts and quality of waters available from such systems during drought, flood, and intermediate conditions;

(5) determine whether sea water has moved inland into heavily pumped coastal aquifers;

(6) give special consideration to conditions which may invite the invasion of sea water into fresh-water supplies;

(7) compile and make available to appropriate State and local officials any results of this study and investigation that would be appropriate for their use in long-range planning, development, and management of water supplies;

(8) cooperate with State and local agencies for the purpose of using any information and data available to carry out the purposes of this study; and

(9) consider such other matters as the Secretary may deem appropriate to the study and investigation herein authorized.

SEC. 2. During the course of the study and investigation authorized by this Act, the Secretary may submit to the President for transmission to the Congress such interim reports as the Secretary may consider desirable. The Secretary shall submit a final report to the President for transmission to the Congress not more than six years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics, to the Secretary upon his or his designee's request.

SEC. 4. In carrying out the study and investigation authorized by this Act, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with other Federal, State, and local agencies now engaged in comprehensive planning for water resource use and development in the Delmarva Peninsula area by making available to those agencies his findings and to cooperate with those agencies in the Northestern United States Water Supply Study as authorized by the Act of October 27, 1965 (79 Stat. 1073).

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor of S. 2287, and as one who knows firsthand the serious water-shortage problems of the Delmarva Peninsula.

The Delmarva Peninsula is a natural geological formation of great beauty. It is steeped in tradition and it represents one of the most promising areas in Maryland for recreational and commercial development.

In recent years, the continuing drought has taken its toll on the water resources of the Delmarva Peninsula. The extent of this effect is not known since there has been no overall analysis of the ground water supply on the peninsula for almost 50 years.

What we do know is that the fresh water resources have recently been so seriously depleted through pollution, through run-off into the Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, through intensive irrigation, and through the invasion of sea water, as to seriously threaten the future development of the peninsula.

President Johnson took cognizance of this problem when, on July 14, 1965, he requested the Secretary of the Interior, who also serves as Chairman of the Water Resources Council, to assess what actions should be taken to assist the States in meeting the drought problem.

In the report to the President of the Water Resources Council, it was indicated that another year of the drought could be anticipated and that an inventory of ground water availability with emphasis on critical areas and on potential salt water contamination should be undertaken.

With this in mind I joined with several of my colleagues to cosponsor S. 2267. This bill will authorize a 5-year hydrologic study of the Delmarva Peninsula, the purpose of which is to appraise the water use requirements and the availability of water in the streams and the underground systems for the entire peninsula, paying close attention to the conditions which may invite the invasion of sea water into fresh water bodies.

We are now in the middle of another summer, and all indications are that drought conditions have not been alleviated. The situation in the Delmarva Peninsula is more critical than ever; S. 2287 is needed more than ever. This legislation is vital to the future of the peninsula, and I urge my colleagues to give it speedy approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, 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. 1362), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 2287 is to express clear congressional intent that a hydrologic study and investigation of the Delmarva Peninsula should be carried out by the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior. The Geological Survey presently has authority to conduct this study and has recognized its importance, but funds have not as yet been allocated for the purpose.

NEED

The Delmarva Peninsula, located between the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays, is experiencing rapid growth as a part of the expanding northeastern megalopolis. The millions of people and the huge industrial complexes of this region require ever-increasing supplies of fresh water. However, the Delmarva Peninsula is a low-lying area largely dependent on underground water resources. It also has a long coastline making its fresh water bodies subject to invasion of sea water. Little specific information is presently available on the extent, characteristics, and quality of its aquifers on which to base decisions on the amount of water which can safely be drawn from the various potential sources.

To obtain the necessary information, a detailed hydrologic study of about 5 years' duration is required. Such a study would develop information on the quantity and quality of water available from stream systems under various conditions, allow a determination of the continuity and extent of important water-bearing formations in the peninsula and provide information on the perennial yield, recharge characteristics, and water quality in each of the major aquifers. Survey data would be obtained for these purposes and additional test drilling would be carried out.

As one aspect of the study, the extent of an ancient gravel-filled channel located between Salisbury, Md., and Delmar, Del., would be carefully explored. This channel may represent a former course of the river which created the Chesapeake Bay and constitutes a potential ground water reservoir of major importance. It is estimated that individual wells tapping these channel deposits could yield 3 to 4 million gallons a day per well. The study should also reveal whether similar channels exist in the peninsula.

Because the Delmarva Peninsula is an integral unit comprising portions of three States, it is appropriate that the study be conducted as a Federal undertaking. The study would produce basic information that could be used in more intensive local investigations required for local water development and for alleviation of local water problems.

COST

The total cost of the 5-year study would not exceed $500,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3035) to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PRACTICAL NURSES' LICENSING ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8337) to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "Virginia", to insert a comma and "and shall include those areas adjacent to the District of Columbia within a radius of thirty miles from the United States Capitol Building".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was 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. 1364), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act (Public Law 86–708, effective as of July 29, 1961) so as to permit the licensing without any written examination of an applicant otherwise qualified to be a licensed practical nurse, who, for the year immediately preceding the effective date of this act, has resided in the District of Columbia and been actively engaged in caring for the sick in the Washington metropolitan area.

The effect of the amendatory language of this bill will be to broaden the "grandfather clause" of the 1961 Practical Nursing Act. Under the existing "grandfather clause" contained in section 10 of the act, nurses otherwise qualified are not required to take a written examination as prescribed by the 1961 Licensing Act in order to be licensed as a practical nurse if they have actively engaged in caring for the sick in the District of Columbia for the year immediately preceding the effective date of such act.

This bill will amend section 10 so as to provide that practical nurses in the District of Columbia may now qualify for a practical nurse's license without a written examination if, together with possessing the requirements of section 10 of the D.C. Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, they resided in the District and engaged in the care of the sick in the Washington metropolitan area for the year immediately preceding the effective date of the 1961 Practical Nurses' Licensing Act.

The provisions of the bill further provide that applicants will have a period of 90 days from the effective date of the enactment of H.R. 8337 in which to apply for such license without written examination.

In the case of applicants who have been denied a license for the reason that they did not qualify under the "grandfather clause," as it was initially written into the 1961 Licensing Act, they may be reconsidered without payment of any new application fee, except such part of the fee which may have have been refunded.

The bill, as amended, defines the metropolitan area as including various counties and townships adjacent to the District of Columbia, and any other geographical area within a 30-mile radius of the U.S. Capitol.

The committee, in amending the House definition of the "metropolitan area," recognized that certain portions of nearby counties in Maryland and Virginia would not qualify under such definition even though they are located geographically much closer than some portions of the immediately adjacent counties now included in the definition.

For this reason the committee was of the view that a radius mileage definition should be included as part of the definition in order to establish a more uniform geographical definition of "metropolitan area" for the purposes of this act.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

In its administration of the Licensing Act, the Office of Occupations and Professions of the District of Columbia government has found that section 10 of the act has caused an inequity in the licensing of practical nurses in the District of Columbia. It has been reported to the committee that there are many competent nurses who resided in the District of Columbia during the year immediately preceding the effective date of the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act but who were actively engaged in caring for the sick in the metropolitan area outside the District of Columbia. This being the case, such nurses would not qualify under section 10 of the act, and thus would not be eligible for licensing as practical nurses in the District of Columbia without written examination. On the other hand, nurses with less nursing experience, but who were fortunate enough to care for the sick in the District of Columbia immediately prior to the effective date of the act, would qualify for practical nurses' licenses without written examination.

The enactment of the pending bill, as amended, will remedy the inequity as it now exists in present law.

It is the view of your committee that the amendments to the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act are overdue, in fairness to the large number of experienced practical nurses in the District of Columbia who have been denied the advantages of licensure. Also, your committee feels strongly that in view of the inadequate supply of competent nurses, the provisions of this proposed legislation will be very much in the public interest.

Public hearings were held on S. 2062, a companion bill to H.R. 8337, by the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety on June 13, 1966. Representatives of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia government appeared at the hearing and supported enactment of the bill.

A bill (S. 933), similar in purpose to H.R. 8337, passed the Senate in the 88th Congress.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL AGENCY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 15860) to establish the District of Columbia Bail Agency, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 3, line 1, after "section 3", to strike out "(a)", and on page 7, line 5, after the word "necessary", to insert "but not to exceed $130,000 in any one fiscal year".

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. 1365), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 15860 as amended is to create a fact-gathering-and-reporting agency to provide to any judicial officer as defined in the bill, in the District of Columbia reports containing verified information concerning any person about whom the judicial officer is to make a bail determination.

The Bail Agency shall, except when impracticable, interview and report on any person detained pursuant to law or charged with an offense in the District of Columbia, who is to appear before the U.S. commissioner or whose case arose in or is before any of the following courts: the Supreme Court of the United States, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, the District of Columbia, Court of Appeals, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia. (Coverage in the Juvenile Court will extend only to criminal nonsupport and desertion charges.)

Upon request of an appellate court included above, or a judge or a justice of such court, or any other judicial officer, the Agency will furnish reports to the appellate court judges or justices or other judicial officers, when such judicial officer is to make a bail determination. The services of the Agency will thus be available whenever a bail determination is to be made regardless of whether the Agency initially undertook an investigation of the individual.

The reason for H.R. 15860 is to establish an agency in the District of Columbia to promote a system whereby worthy defendants and material witnesses will be able to secure their release from detention pending court appearances on nonfinancial conditions and to furnish a judicial officer with information about a person's background so he can make an appropriate bail determination.

It must be emphasized that the Bail Agency will not encroach upon the functions of the courts. The Bail Agency will interview defendants, verify facts, and submit reports concerning the individual, his family, community ties, residence, employment, prior criminal record, and other relevant factors, together with a recommendation as to whether the individual shall be released pending trial. The recommendation, if any, would be limited to nonfinancial conditions. The bail decision, however, remains with the judicial officer. He may accept or reject the recommendation, and may set conditions for release, including financial conditions, as appear warranted to him.

The proposed legislation is designed to implement the Federal Bail Reform Act of 1966, signed by the President on June 22, 1966, and will supersede the experimental District of Columbia bail project, which has been operating since 1964 under a Ford Foundation grant due to expire in September 1966.

More than 50 experimental bail projects are currently in operation. Among the States where such projects are operating are the following:

California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

The President of the United States, in a special message to Congress on March 9, 1966, on the issue of crime, proposed, in his first-stage recommendations to enhance justice in the courts, as follows:

"We must reform our bail system.

"The administration of criminal justice must be fair as well as effective.

"Whether a person, released after arrest, is likely to flee before trial or endanger society is not determined by the wealth he commands. Yet all too often we imprison men for weeks, months, and even years—before we give them their day in court—solely because they cannot afford bail.

"Effective law enforcement does not require such imprisonment.

"To correct this injustice, I urge the Congress to complete action on the pending Federal Bail Reform Act and to give favorable consideration to the District of Columbia Bail Agency bill."

The Federal Bail Reform Act has recently been enacted into law; the District of Columbia Bail Agency bill will, as indicated, implement that act on the local level.

On March 23, 1966, the Subcommittee on the Judiciary had a full hearing on S. 2721, a bill similar in most respects to H.R. 15860, and the committee has agreed to report, with amendments, H.R. 15860, which has been passed by the House of Representatives. The bill has the support of the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit, the Office of Criminal Justice of the Department of Justice, the District of Columbia bail project, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, among others. There was no opposition to the bill.

AMENDMENTS

Your committee suggests two amendments to H.R. 15860. One amendment is to limit the annual appropriation for operation of the Agency to $130,000. Your committee believes that a limit should be set on the annual appropriation of funds, and has agreed to the stated amount, which, the committee has been advised, will enable the Agency to function satisfactorily. The other amendment is technical and is to correct a section citation reference.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

One of the problems confronting the community under the existing financial bail system is the huge burden placed on the District of Columbia jail by pretrial incarceration of defendants unable to supply bail and the resulting cost to the community of maintaining a large number of people in jail because of their financial plight. For example, in 1962, before the bail project began, it cost the District government more than $500,000 a year to maintain in jail defendants who were eligible for bond. Statistics compiled prior to the bail project revealed that between 30 and 40 percent of the population of the District of Columbia jail were defendants awaiting trial or sentencing, and that more than 84 percent of these defendants were eligible for release on bond.

A recently completed study by the District of Columbia bail project reveals that the approximate average length of time spent in jail awaiting trial by persons charged with felonies is 84 days, and 26 days is the average length of pretrial incarceration of misdemeanants.

In addition to the increased operating costs of the jail, the community faces also increased welfare costs to maintain the family of the individual detained in jail and the costs arising as a result of the frequent loss of employment by the individual. The savings resulting from the pretrial release program are considerable. Your committee has been advised that a comparative study of persons released on bond before the project began operations, with persons released on bond in 1965 when the project was at maximum operating capacity, has revealed that over $72,000 could have been saved in jail costs, transportation costs, and in welfare costs. This figure represents the projected number of people who, if not released on personal bond, would have been held in jail for the astonishing amount of 47,157 mandays. Projecting the jail costs alone it is estimated that with operation capacity identical to that in 1965, the bail project would save in 1967 a total of over $61,000. The increase, of course, is attributed to the current trend of rising jail costs.

A projection, on the basis of current operations, of the saving to the District of Columbia resulting from enactment of the Federal and District bail reform bills, indicates increased future saving. Assuming these two statutes would increase nonfinancial condition releases, through changed standards for recommendation and additional conditions of release, by at least one-fourth of those presently held because they cannot now qualify for recommendation or cannot afford the bond premiums, it is estimated that the District will save $110,000 per year in jail costs alone.

But incarceration is not the only bad effect of the money bail system. Studies have shown that failure to release may adversely affect the accused's preparation for trial, family relations, and the outcome of trial and severity of sentence upon conviction. For example, the defendant who is held in jail does not have the same access to counsel as one who is free on bail. He is not free to aid in the preparing of his defense, or in securing witnesses.

BACKGROUND

In 1962, the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit appointed a Committee on Bail Problems which studied the bail system in the District of Columbia. The committee worked in conjunction with the junior bar section of the District of Columbia Bar Association. Based upon its findings that most defendants who were held in jail prior to disposition of their cases were eligible for release on bail, the bar committee recommended that a pilot project, similar to a pretrial release program conducted by the Vera Foundation in New York City, be established in the District of Columbia.

In May 1963, the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit adopted the recommendation, and proposed, through its Committee on Bail Problems the establishment of an experimental project designed to allow release of bail applicants with stable community connections.

The Ford Foundation granted funds ($65,000 per year for 3 years) to the Georgetown University Law Center to finance the project. After a year of operation under the supervision of the Committee on Bail Problems of the Judicial Conference, supervision of the project reverted to the law center. A supervisory committee was then appointed, representing area law schools, civic institutions, the Police Department, and the bench and bar of the District of Columbia.

The project began operations in January 1964 covering only felony cases. In August 1964, coverage was expanded to include misdemeanor cases in the U.S. branch of the District of Columbia court of General Sessions as well.

EXPERIENCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAIL PROJECT

Since the bail project became operational in 1964, recommendations for release on personal bond—the only recommendations which can be made by the project—have been made in 2,456 instances through June 3, 1966. Judicial officers accepted the recommendations in 2,084 cases, or about 85 percent. Felony defendants accounted for 769 of the releases, and misdemeanor defendants for the remaining 1,315. The bail project considered for possible recommendation about 40 percent of those persons brought to court after arrest; others included persons whose cases were disposed of at initial appearance, who put up bond before they could be interviewed, or who were committed to St. Elizabeths Hospital for mental observation. Of those who were interviewed by the project staff in 1965, for example, about two-thirds were not recommended for release on personal bond, either because of their prior criminal record or because they lacked sufficient community ties.

The selective process of the project has been proved to be accurate. More than 97 percent of those released have appeared in court as promised. While no figures about the experience of private bondsmen have been obtainable, it is believed the 3 percent default rate is less than that encountered by private bondsmen. Significantly, out of a total of 59 releases who subsequently failed to appear in court, 50 faced misdemeanor charges only at that time. Forty-seven of the fifty-nine defaulters have been returned to custody, and, interestingly, 40 of them were rearrested in the Washington, D.C., area.

The criteria utilized by the bail project to determine whether an individual should be recommended for release have been significant regarding the safety of the community. Of the 2,084 releases, 2.5 percent were charged with serious subsequent offenses arising during the release period; 5 percent were charged with less serious offenses, and 1.6 percent with municipal code offenses. Fifty-two percent of the subsequent charges resulted in convictions, and 31 percent were dismissed, nolled, ignored, or resulted in acquittals. Seventeen percent are pending.

Operation of the agency

Under this bill, the Bail Agency would interview the accused, seek independent verification of information derived from the interview, and obtain a person's prior criminal record. The Agency would evaluate this evidence with regard to whether the person's community ties and prior record would reasonably justify the person's release pending trial. It would then prepare a written report for the judicial officer before whom the accused is to appear for bail determination, setting forth information about the person's background, and whether, and on what nonfinancial conditions, the person should be released. The Agency recommendations would not be based on the offense charged or the facts of such offense. The judicial officer, acting on the basis of this report, plus other information concerning the charge derived from other sources, would then set bail or other release conditions. Among the nonfinancial conditions established by the Federal act are personal recognizance, appearance bond, release in custody of another person, restrictions on travel or association, or other conditions as may be appropriate.

Past experience with the project indicates that the entire procedure may be concluded within a few hours or, in some instances, a matter of days.

Cost of the legislation

The bail project has operated for 3 years on an annual grant of $65,000. According to testimony before your committee, a budget of $95,000 per year would be required to maintain an agency with coverage and standards similar to those existing under the experimental project. Subsequently, your committee was advised that, because of the expanded coverage contemplated by the bill and the cost for office space and equipment, the budget estimate would have to be revised upward. The District of Columbia bail project now estimates that a budget of approximately $124,000 per year would permit the Agency to provide full coverage in the trial and appellate courts as provided in the bill, and minimal coverage in the District of Columbia and traffic branches of the court of general sessions. The bill provides, in this regard, that interviews of persons charged with intoxication and traffic violations—the vast majority of the caseload in these branches—shall be undertaken on request of a judicial officer, thus avoiding a potential burden on the effectiveness of the Agency's operations.

Your committee believes that a limitation on appropriations be included and have agreed that an annual appropriation of $130,000 be authorized.

Your committee has noted that H.R. 15860 was amended by the House to provide that appropriations for operating the Agency be to the District of Columbia rather than to the judiciary. The effect is to put the full cost burden on the District, rather than allowing a cost-sharing relationship between the District of Columbia and the United States as is provided in the annual judiciary appropriation acts. However, because the Agency is primarily local in character and purpose, and because it has been estimated that its operation would include about 90 to 95 percent of the caseload of all courts combined, your committee is not opposed to the provision that the appropriation be to the District of Columbia, without a cost-splitting arrangement.

Conclusion

Your committee believes that bail reform is urgently needed in the District of Columbia, and this bill will, in conjunction with the Federal Bail Reform Act of 1966, do much to alleviate inequities and unnecessary costs in administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955, AS AMENDED

The bill (S. 2574) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2574

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13 of the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other puposes", approved August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 521, 529; D.C. Code, sec. 31-1542), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(d) (1) The Board of Education of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to pay additional compensation, over and above the salaries in the salary schedules in section 1 of this Act, in the amounts hereafter fixed or prescribed in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, to classroom teachers in salary class 15, at the indicated levels, who are assigned to perform extra duties, on a continuing basis: *Provided,* That a teacher, to be eligible for such additional compensation, must also be assigned the standard load for a regular day school teacher at his respective school level. The Board of Education is further authorized, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, to fix or prescribe the amount of additional compensation for teachers who perform such extra duty.

"(2) Payment of such additional compensation shall be made monthly following the rendering of such service. Such additional compensation shall not be subject to deduction or withholding for retirement or insurance, and such additional compensation shall not be considered as salary (i) for the purpose of computing annuities pursuant to the Act entitled 'An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia', approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875; D.C. Code, sec. 31-721 et seq.), as amended, and the Civil Service Retirement Act, or (ii) for the purpose of computing insurance coverage under the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Civil Service Commission to make available group life insurance for civilian officers and employees in the Federal service, and for other purposes, approved August 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended. Such additional compensation may be paid for more than one activity assigned to a classroom teacher so long as such activities are not performed concurrently."

SEC. 2. The Board of Education of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. This Act shall take effect September 1, 1965.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1366), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 2574 is to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to pay additional compensation to classroom teachers who are assigned to perform extra duties on a continuing basis.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The District of Columbia public schools are now conducting many programs in the early morning hours, late afternoon and evening hours, and on Saturdays and holidays. School sessions are planned for summer and other holiday periods. Existing and proposed programs requiring extra-duty assignments include those relating to sponsorship of cultural activities such as music, forensic, science, and dramatics clubs; parent education classes; after-school tutoring; coaching athletics; returning dropout programs and similiar activities. These programs cannot be fully implemented unless the District of Columbia Board of Education has the authority to employ teachers after regular hours and on days when school is not in session.

The authority to employ teachers beyond the regular schedule of hours provides flexibility for the development of new programs. In order to make programs efficient, it is necessary to use the talents of regular teachers who are willing to accept additional duties and who should be entitled to extra compensation for such duties when they are related to regular classroom functions. There is equity in paying a staff for work beyond the

regular school hours and on nonschool duties. Many teachers are now giving time, which they could be using for their personal benefit, to assist in extracurricular activities. In many instances, teachers who do not have extra-duty assignments use their extra time for outside employment, which is not available to teachers who assume extracurricular duties. Those teachers who work extended periods of time on extra duties should also be paid, when the student is securing a better and more rounded education as a result thereof.

A survey conducted by the Classification and Wage Administration Division of the District of Columbia Government Personnel Office for the purpose of determining the practice of providing extra-duty pay to teachers in 20 cities with over 500,000 population revealed that 17 of 18 large city school systems responding to the survey have some type of extra-duty pay covering at least athletic coaches. Most give compensation to extra duty involved in the supervision of major school activities. The school systems responding to the survey overwhelmingly recommend the adoption of an extra-duty pay plan.

In the Washington metropolitan area, the school systems having extra-duty pay plans include Arlington and Fairfax Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia and Prince Georges County in Maryland, which has just adopted the program.

Other major cities of the country where extra-duty compensation is paid include Baltimore, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Houston, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Diego, and Seattle.

Your committee is informed that the Board of Education, handicapped by the lack of authority to pay for overtime service, now resorts to the principle of compensatory time. A coach, for example, is given two free periods during the football season, after which he returns to the regular five-period teaching schedule. Forty percent of his teaching skill is lost during the football season and, when he does take up a five-period schedule, pupils have to be shifted from one teacher to another. Schools are not efficient when operated under the compensatory time principle. The fact that overtime pay is practiced in most school systems throughout the country shows that school officials do not favor the Washington practice. Football coaches, for example, are required to report for duty in late August, as much as 2 weeks before the official opening of school, so that their teams may be ready by mid-September. This time is not paid for. In a survey recently conducted by the District of Columbia Coaches Association for the 1963–64 academic year, it was found that coaches performed 24,000 hours of coaching time. Of these hours, only 7,000 hours were compensated for in the form of "compensatory time." The balance, or 17,000 hours of coaching time, constituted unpaid or uncompensated work.

The failure of this District of Columbia school system to pay for extra duty has placed the District of Columbia school system at a competitive economic disadvantage. Teachers have either transferred to another school system in the area which does pay for extra duty, or have left the school system entirely, because they were not being compensated for extra duty.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill authorizes the Board of Education, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, to fix an amount of additional compensation for teachers, now assigned a standard workload, who are assigned to perform extra duties on a continuing basis. Such additional compensation is to be paid monthly following performance of service and shall not be subject to deduction or withholding for retirement or insurance, nor considered as salary for those purposes. The bill allows such additional compensation to be paid for more than one activity assigned to a classroom teacher so long as such activities are not performed concurrently.

Section 2 authorizes the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to make necessary regulations to carry out the purposes of the act. Section 3 provides the act shall take effect September 1, 1965.

ANNUAL COST

The committee was informed that the annual cost of S. 2574 is estimated to be $225,000 for 450 teachers expected to participate. The bill provides the Board of Education of the District of Columbia with the authority to determine compensation schedules and select teachers coming under the program.

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, on June 21, 1966, held public hearings on S. 2574. At this hearing, representatives of the Washington Teachers Union, the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the District of Columbia Coaches Association appeared and testified in support of S. 2574. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia testified in favor of the principle of extra-duty compensation.

SHARP RISE IN PRESIDENT'S POPULARITY REFLECTED IN BOMBING OF OIL DEPOTS IN HANOI AND HAIPHONG

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I note with great interest in this morning's Washington Post, there is published a report entitled "Bombing Raises L.B.J. Popularity: Many Now Expect Shorter War."

The decision to bomb the oil depots of Haiphong and Hanoi has resulted in a sharp increase in the popularity of the President. This reflects what I believe the President has known for some time, that the earlier decline in his popularity was due to what was going on in Vietnam and had nothing to do with the fact that we were doing too much there. Evidently, the people of this country think that we should be doing a lot more there than we have.

It is the view of the American people that we should fight and win the war in Vietnam, or get out. We recognize that the Communist powers have just as much determination and staying power as we have, in a long and drawn out stalemate. It is my judgment that no President could take this country into a war and fight over a long period of time, pulling our punches, and taking heavy casualties over an 8- or 10-year period, with no hope of ever winning it, and be reelected.

So far as the people of this country are concerned, they want to know why they would have to accept a stalemate when we possess the military capability to overwhelm aggressors and maintain our position.

My judgment is that this country cannot stand a military defeat in Vietnam and remain a major military power, or, for that matter, a major world power at all. Those nations which have not shown courage and fortitude to back up their nation's policies with national will and determination are no longer first-rate powers.

This Nation is the hope of the free world. I personally applaud President Johnson for his decision that we must make the cost of aggression ever greater, that we must make the aggressor pay an ever higher price as the cost of aggression, particularly when the United States is committed to help victims of aggression defend themselves.

Mr. President, I notice that those in opposition to the President's Vietnam policy of bombing the enemy's oil facilities, according to the Harris survey as reported in the article to which I have referred, appear to have only 15 percent of the American people on their side.

This is very interesting, in view of the great deal of conversation we have heard from them, as well as the views of powerful newspapers, particularly some in the East, which strongly support the policies of retreat and defeat. Accordingly, when it comes to seeing how the majority of our people feel about this situation, these powerful newspapers and other voices raised in opposition to the President's decision, apparently are speaking the judgments of only 15 percent of the American public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article to which I have referred.

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

THE HARRIS SURVEY: BOMBING RAISES L.B.J. POPULARITY—MANY NOW EXPECT SHORTER WAR

(By Louis Harris)

By ordering the bombings in the Hanoi and Haiphong areas of North Vietnam, President Johnson has sharply reversed the trend of public disaffection with his handling of the Vietnam war to the point where today a majority of 54 per cent of the American public supports his conduct of the struggle.

The specific move to bomb the oil depots on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong meets with better than 5–1 approval of the American people. In actual percentages, 62 per cent are in favor of the action, 11 per cent opposed, and the remaining 27 per cent are undecided. This projects to an 85–15 per cent support for the Administration if the undecided are eliminated.

On the eve of the bombings, the Harris Survey had just completed interviewing a cross section of the public. This study found the Johnson rating on handling the Vietnam war was at a 17-month low with a positive score of 42 per cent. A week later, after the bombings had begun, that rating has risen 12 points to 54 per cent.

The dominant argument advanced by Americans who go along with the bombings is the hope that it will hasten an end to the war.

By a 6-to-1 ratio, people accept the military need for bombing fuel supplies. A rather high 39 per cent, however, feel the bombings would be harder to justify if they hit civilian population centers. And an even higher 43 per cent of the American people believe that as a result of the new escalation, the Chinese Communists are now likely to enter the war.

In short, it is apparent that Mr. Johnson has gained at least a temporary victory with American public opinion. But he has also

tacks, the President will be severely criticized. come back to damage his basis for support.

If it is proven out that large numbers of civilians are killed in the new bombing attacks, the President will be severely criticized. If the Chinese come into the war with ground troops, sizable numbers of Americans will hold Mr. Johnson responsible.

But probably the most critical dimension is the overwhelming expectation on the part of the people that these new bombings will "get it over with" in Vietnam. In effect, this puts a time limit on the part of the American people within which they will expect the conflict to be concluded, either by military victory or by negotiations.

The response of the public, it should be pointed out, is partly a matter of hard-headed reasoning, but also contains a sizable measure of emotion born of the long frustration over the war.

Here is the trend of President Johnson's ratings on the way he has handled the Vietnam war since January 1965, in response to the question:

"How would you rate the job President Johnson has done in handling the war in Vietnam—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

L.B.J. handling of Vietnam

[In percent]

	Good to excellent	Only fair to poor
Postbombings, July 1966	54	46
Prebombings, June 1966	42	58
May 1966	47	53
March 1966	49	51
January 1966	63	37
September 1965	66	34
May 1965	57	43
January 1965	41	59

The President's biggest gains have been scored in the South, where confidence in his handling of the war rose 17 percentage points following the bombings. In the East and Midwest, his Vietnam rating went up 12 and 14 points, respectively. In the West, however, the rating rose only two points—from 46 to 48 percent positive.

The trend of public opinion on bombing Hanoi and Haiphong had moved gradually toward favoring such a move over the past nine months. Before the bombings were ordered, the public was asked:

"Do you think the Administration is more right or more wrong in bombing Hanoi and Haiphong?"

Bombing Hanoi and Haiphong

[In percent]

	For	Against
Post bombings, July 1966	85	15
May 1966	50	50
February 1966	42	58
September 1965	30	70

Perhaps the most far-reaching question for the long run is one dealing with the public's expectations as a result of the bombings:

"It is argued that by bombing Hanoi and Haiphong we can slow down North Vietnamese reinforcements to the Communists in South Vietnam and this will hasten the end of the war. Others disagree and argue that the more we bomb North Vietnam, the more their resistance will increase. Which do you think is more likely to be the case—that the bombing will hasten the end of the war or increase the will to resist among the North Vietnamese?"

Public expectations

[In percent]

	Total public
Bombings will hasten war's end	86
Will increase will to resist	14

Clearly, there is a lot of hope intermingled with calculated risk in this last response of the public. Mr. Johnson has now given the American people a concrete military step which they firmly believe will work to end the Vietnam war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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 be rescinded.

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

CHILD NUTRITION BILL CONTINUES SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM IN TRIED AND TRUE TRADITION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the desk of every Senator this morning is a copy of the hearings and the report on the child nutrition bill. Today or tomorrow, the Senate should consider S. 3467, which amends the National School Lunch Act by expanding and strengthening the school lunch and special milk programs, as well as setting up a breakfast program.

I am happy to say that section 13 of the bill accomplishes pretty nearly every aim I had in mind when I introduced my bill to make the school milk program permanent. Although the bill extends the program for only 4 more years, it makes it clear that the program is to be continued in its present form rather than as a program primarily for the needy. It also authorizes up to $120 million for the program in fiscal 1969 and 1970. This should be good news, indeed, to Senators, 67 of whom cosponsored my school milk bill, and dozens of whom spoke out on the floor of the Senate or in committee in support of the program.

To quote from the committee report on S. 3467, the bill:

> Requires the Secretary to administer the program in the same manner as in the past. This last change was considered necessary to make clear the intention of Congress that the course of the program is not to be changed. The language of the existing law provides the Secretary with very broad authority as to the manner in which the program is to be conducted. He might administer it in the same general manner as in the past; or he could place much greater emphasis on assistance to schools in low-income areas, schools without school lunch programs, or otherwise change the course of the program. The change described in item (3) above would require the Secretary to administer the program insofar as practicable in the same manner as in the past.

This language makes it crystal clear that the school milk program as we now know it is to continue. It indicates beyond a shadow of a doubt that plans to provide milk only to the needy and those in schools without a lunch program have been disapproved. I want to congratulate and thank the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for presenting such an unequivocal report on the bill. Chairman ELLENDER as well as the other committee members deserve the deep gratitude of the Nation's schoolchildren and dairy farmers for the hard work put in on this all-important program.

THE SITUATION OF PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES OPERATING IN ARGENTINA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Buenos Aires publication Economic Survey on May 24, 1966. This article pertains to a serious situation in Argentina affecting all pharmaceutical companies operating in that country. One year ago I rose on the floor of this body to protest the action of the Government of Argentina. Since that date the various companies operating in Argentina have complied with the decree of the Ministry of Health. However, no relief has yet been granted to the industry.

I am hopeful that my remarks might indicate to the new Argentine Government and to the Minister of Health the concern here in the United States about the severe restrictions being placed on this industry. I am hopeful that the Minister of Health under the new Argentine Government will relax the restrictions under which the Argentine pharmaceutical industry is now laboring. Not only are the people in Argentina who work in the pharmaceutical industry affected, by the inaction of the Minister of Health, but the employees in the pharmaceutical industry in the United States are also affected.

Many of the companies in the United States export raw materials to their Argentine plants. If these American firms were to be freed from the current restrictions it would be helpful to the industry in both countries and to the families dependent upon the industry for their livelihood. I look forward to hearing some good news from Argentina that these restrictions have been removed and that the industry is again growing with the rest of the economy of our fine neighbor to the south.

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

[From Economic Survey, Buenos Aires, Argentina, May 24, 1966]

THIRTY MONTHS OF PRICE CONTROL AND NO BRIGHT OUTLOOK

The arbitrary freeing of prices on medicinal products established by the Ministry of Health and Welfare in 1963, continues rigidly after 30 months during which production costs have increased steadily.

This has created a very serious situation in many firms, particularly the smallest ones. The Ministry promised to process speedily the applications for readjustment of prices in relation to the cost of production of specific items. But in fact the procedure is being carried out in a slow, cumbersome and arbitrary manner. The job is done manually, and it is entrusted to 10 or 12 hired men, instead of using electronic equipment which the Health Minister has repeatedly promised to employ. A simple application from a small firm takes about 2 months to process. Applications for large and complex enterprises, manufacturing a series of finished products or raw materials for their own use, takes an extraordinary length of time; an application from an

American laboratory took over 6 months. On the other hand, the Ministry, after promising equal and fair treatment for all, sets prices indiscriminately and absurdly in a way that has no relation to the actual cost of production.

Among the very few price adjustments granted in the past 30 months of price control, we do not know of any allowing for an increase over 20%. We know of two large domestic laboratories, operated with Argentine capital, on which the Ministry wants to impose prices even lower than the frozen ones. Another enterprise, manufacturing a medicament whose actual cost of production is easy to verify, was granted a 5% increase while the actual cost of manufacturing this product has gone up at least 15%.

PROJECT HOPE—THE BEST WAY TO WIN FRIENDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him on the subject of Project HOPE, and an article printed in the Knoxville News Sentinel in connection therewith be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BASS

PROJECT HOPE—THE BEST WAY TO WIN FRIENDS

Propect HOPE (Health Opportunity for People Everywhere), organized by the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., is doing an outstanding job as America's floating Ambassador. In 1960, the U.S.S. *Consolation*, a 15,000 ton Navy Hospital ship, was refitted and loaned to the Foundation to enable them to carry out their project of teaching medical, dental and paramedical personnel in developing countries the latest techniques of U.S. medical science. The *Consolation* was aptly renamed S.S. *Hope*.

In five years HOPE doctors, nurses and technicians have trained more than 3,000 medical personnel, treated over 100,000 persons, conducted some 8,000 major operations, vaccinated one million people for polio, typhoid, tetanus and diptheria, and distributed nearly two million cartons of milk.

This outstanding record has been compiled by volunteers who have interrupted their medical careers to lend a helping hand to the people on three continents.

The Knoxville News Sentinel recently described the experience of a Knoxville surgeon who served on board the U.S.S. *Hope* in Nicaragua. Dr. David H. Waterman, a chest surgeon, described his experience as the "best way to cement friendship." I want to commend Dr. Waterman for his dedication and enthusiasm in this very worthy project.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, May 15, 1966]

SURGEON WORKS FOR NOTHING IN NICARAGUA: DR. WATERMAN GIVES 5 WEEKS TO "HOPE," FINDS IT BEST WAY TO CEMENT FRIENDSHIP

(By Carson Brewer)

A Knoxville surgeon has returned from a tour of duty aboard the SS *Hope* in Nicaragua, where he did his own laundry, got no pay, sweated in temperatures over 100 degrees—and where he'd like to go back.

"I've never been in a country where the people are warmer, more appreciative," said Dr. David H. Waterman, a chest surgeon.

"I fell in love with the country and with the people. It's the one country where I've been that I think I'd like to go back to when I retire."

The *Hope* is the former USS *Consolation*, a Navy hospital ship which now serves as a floating hospital-medical school on sort of a private Peace Corps-like mission to underdeveloped countries. It is staffed by volunteer teams of U.S. physicians and dentists in 20 specialties. They serve up to two months, without pay. Dr. Waterman was in the Central American country five weeks.

OX-CARTS SPELL DANGER

"I got to be an authority on ox-cart injuries," Dr. Waterman joked. "The first child I treated had been run over by a horse and buggy. The last one was run over by a reckless ox-cart driver."

Dr. Waterman performed several operations aboard the *Hope*, which has three operating rooms, and did others at a general hospital in Managua, the capital, about 100 miles from where the *Hope* was docked at Corinto.

The *Hope* docks at the countries which invite it and where it is most needed. It is needed in Nicaragua, a country where there is only one doctor for each 10,000 persons, where life expectancy is 35 years and infant mortality is 50 per cent.

"The two principal causes of death are gastro-intestinal diseases and accidents," Dr. Waterman said.

The *Hope* has been going from port to port over the world for the past five years. It stays 10 months in each country. Its volunteer dentists and physicians have treated more than 200,000 persons performed 8,000 major operations and vaccinated more than 2,000,000 people against polio, typhoid, tetanus and diphtheria.

The name *"Hope"* comes from the initials for "Health Opportunity for People Everywhere." It is not a U.S. Government project, though the Government helps. It is financed through private contributions by Americans.

"The biggest advantage to a thing like this is that it gets to the people," Dr. Waterman said.

OPERATING ROOMS FIRST CLASS

"Local doctors set up the indigency rules. The HOPE doctors first see patients in a clinic on shore. Then, if surgery is needed, the patients are brought aboard ship. The ship's operating rooms are as well equipped as those in any Knoxville hospital."

Dr. Waterman said the patients were "the most appreciative patients I think I've ever treated. I think this is because the doctors gave them more personal attention than is usual.

"It was a tremendous experience. I think most doctors go into medicine because they want to help people and not for material reward. And in work like this the personal satisfaction far exceeds anything else."

The feeling of most people in Nicaragua is pro-United States, Dr. Waterman says. However, wages of workers are low, and Communists have tried to take advantage of this to start trouble.

"I heard no Communist sympathy expressed," the surgeon said.

Part of the HOPE's program is teaching native physicians, interns and nurses. This training program was partly aboard ship and partly at the University of Nicaragua, at Leon.

Laundry at the university hospital is all done by hand and hung outdoors to dry, Dr. Waterman said. So rainy weather hampers hospital operations.

(The volunteer doctors aboard the HOPE also do their own laundry, and this is only one of the inconveniences. Another is a cramped sleeping area they call the jungle.)

MOST SATISFYING EXPERIENCE

Though the hospital doesn't have washers and dryers and many other pieces of modern equipment, doctors and medical professors there are "doing a tremendous job with what they have," Dr. Waterman says.

Dr. Waterman also praised the permanent staff of nurses, lab technicians, dental hygienists and others aboard the HOPE. "They're as fine as you'll find anywhere."

The founder and president of the HOPE project is Dr. William B. Walsh, a heart specialist. He started it in 1958. He works with the U.S. State Department each year to ascertain where the HOPE can serve best. More than 30 countries have asked for the ship to visit their shores.

"This is an ideal way to cement friendship among nations," Dr. Waterman said. "It's the most satisfying experience I've ever had in medicine."

THE PLIGHT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the American farmer and rancher has come upon dark days. Blame for inflation has been placed on the shoulders of rural America by the Johnson administration which is trying to cover its own blame for the cost-of-living increases.

Those who raise the food and fiber of this Nation are now alerted. They have decided to take steps to offset the lack of cooperation on the part of the Department of Agriculture in trying to get the farmer back on his feet.

Pat Goggins, writing his column in the Western Stockgrower has outlined the problems in great detail. He also suggests some ways in which action can be initiated in the farmlands to help offset the bad publicity which Agriculture officials have given those who feed America.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

AS I SEE IT

(By Pat Goggins)

The pressure is on in agriculture . . . the farmer, the diversified man, the cattleman, the land owner . . . all are riding the same canoe down a very fast stream, at the present time. We are in the most critical period in the history of agriculture as far as its freedoms, heritage, way of life, and profit picture are concerned.

First of all, agriculture has got to get the agricultural department of our Government back on its team. As it has been, we would have been better off without a Department of Agriculture the last six months. It's more a direct consumer organization than it is one to represent the farmers and ranchers of America.

Secondly, this reapportionment idea is the biggest step toward direct socialism this country has ever witnessed. It's going to put, without a doubt, political power into the hands of a few big manipulators handling the urban city areas to get done exactly what they want done.

And what are people in agriculture doing about it? It's sad to admit, but for the most part, nothing.

Attending several of the state cattlemen's conventions the past few weeks, the same questions and about the same fears are on the minds of everyone. But in visiting with some of the Representatives and Senators in Washington from these agricultural areas, it's surprising the little amount of mail, phone calls and wires they are receiving. They tell me that they get quite a volume but they keep coming from the same people.

They say the masses of people in the various counties and states are evidently not too

concerned, and if they are concerned, it's mostly at the local bar or over at the neighbor's kitchen table in a house-to-house visit. And you know, folks, this conversation is good. It enables each and every one of us to get ideas, exchange ideas, but that's where it stops.

I am sure that the average cowman attending one of these conventions spends more time down at the headquarters lounge in any given hour or two than he'd spend in a week writing letters or getting on a long distance telephone and calling his Congressman or Representative's office in Washington, D.C., and telling him what he thinks ought to be done and what he thought is happening in his area back home.

Get excited, folks! This is serious! If you don't think so, just take a pencil out and start writing down the freedoms you've lost in the last three years in your business of agriculture. And to make it worse, these same freedoms you've lost, these same extra taxes you've assumed, are going to break your back, they're going to break my back. Agriculture can no longer stand to subsidize the populace of this country in such a big way. Don't leave this chore up to someone you think you elected into office to take care of for you. Don't leave this job of suggestion and complaint and advice up to your neighbor. It's your chore, it's your country, it's your ranch we're worried about.

And if you don't have the intestinal fortitude, and if you don't think you've got the time, or if you think you don't want to spend five or six dollars in a long distance telephone call, then when it comes time to complain about what's happening to agriculture and how you're not being taken care of, don't you dare complain to anybody about how things are being run.

I could hardly believe it when visiting with many cowmen in attendance at these conventions about their problems in their areas, especially in Government attitude toward agriculture. When I asked them, "Have you talked to your Senator or Representatives in Washington lately?" "Have you written Orville Freeman?" "Have you tried to call the offices of those in charge of these departments in Washington?"

Almost without exception, the answer was "No, I've been planning to do that and I just haven't gotten around to it."

"Well, I want you to know that the Government is getting around to taking care of our business. They happen to have time to get us into a position that we can't wiggle out of and they're just working at it 24 hours of every single day. If you and I feel that we haven't got the time and do not wish to take an active part in this problem, then we as individuals here in the United States have absolutely no right to complain of what someone else is doing.

The rights of agriculture, in fact the rights of American citizens, are being changed at the present time and too few people don't seem to give a darn about it.

There are bigger problems across the United States than moisture, and almost every place you go people all want to talk about drought and grasshoppers and troubles. But the biggest problem involved is your own future. You could have the best rains from now to kingdom come and in the present trend you're not going to have a market anyway.

The other day, at a Junior Breeders Association meeting, I happened to be watching a group of enthusiastic young boys wearing those blue and gold jackets with a FFA, (Future Farmers of America) written on them, and I couldn't help but to recall the speech that the Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota, gave in the Senate of the United States in April of this year when he said, "FFA used to mean the Future Farmers of America. It now means the Forgotten Farmers of America!"

DAY CARE CENTERS IN MARYLAND

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on April 27, I rose to praise the efforts of the Baltimore regional joint board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America in establishing child day care centers. Today, I would like to comment on the work of the Maryland Committee for Day Care of Children, a voluntary organization which provides care for preschool children of working mothers. These volunteers are dealing with a problem of national concern and deserve our gratitude and support.

An article in the Baltimore Sun on Monday, April 25, 1966, describes the Maryland committee and its work. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD.

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

PRESCHOOL CHILDREN: DAY CARE CENTERS

(By Susan M. Anderson)

The working mother is a national problem. Labor Department statistics show that in 1965, some 6,000,000 women who were employed full-time or part-time had children less than 14 years old. One fifth of all American children have working mothers. The projected statistics indicate that there will be a 55 per cent increase from 1960 to 1970 in the number of working women with children under 6 years old.

Child day care is concerned with what services are available for supervising children when their mothers are employed. Day care is not a limited concept referring only to underprivileged children or exclusively children of employed mothers, but rather all children who, for whatever reason, need outside supervision.

VOLUNTEER GROUP

The Maryland Committee for Day Care of Children is a voluntary organization concerned with the problems of caring for preschool children. Its members are professional people in related fields of health, education and welfare, as well as interested laymen.

The committee has been campaigning for increased facilities—to meet growing needs—that would be available at reasonable costs and would not be babysitting or nursery schools but a combination of recreation and constructive activity.

Tomorrow, the committee will hold its annual meeting and dinner, during which progress reports will be given. Dr. Edward D. Greenwood, co-director of the school mental health programs of the Menninger Foundation, will discuss "Horizons for Young Children." The dinner will be at 7:30 P.M. at the Sheraton-Belvedere Hotel.

ART ON TABLES

Each of Baltimore's 44-day care facilities will be symbolically involved in the committee's dinner program, since the table decorations will be art work by the children from each center.

One member of the Maryland Committee for Day Care of Children is Mrs. Rex Wilkes, headmistress of Grace and St. Peter's School in the 700 block of Park avenue. The children at Grace and St. Peter's have been working on a paper sculpture project that will be used as a decoration for the dinner. Ten 5 year olds are making an animal cage, as a manifestation of their interest in animals and the circus, which they saw last fall on a field trip.

This creative project demonstrates the children's proficiency in art crafts. The paper sculpture involves not only cutting and pasting figures of wild animals from construction paper, but also the technique, advanced for most 5 years olds, of slitting paper to make joints. Then the children's own imaginative use of color comes into play and the resulting menagerie makes an appealing decoration.

The cage, in its other life, was a bird cage but in the children's eyes, is a circus tent. Their teachers, Mrs. George Kay, supervisor of the preschool, and Mrs. Kerwin Roche, supervisor of art at Grace and St. Peter's, have interlaced the animal cage with chartreuse pompoms. They will select the most recognizable animals to be assembled under the big tent.

SCHOOL A MODEL

Grace and St. Peter's school is a model of what the best in day care offers. Mrs. Wilkes says people come to observe the school, "because it is so convenient." Grace and St. Peter's far exceeds the minimum requirements of keeping the children off the street from 7.30 A.M. to 5.45 P.M. and confined in one place, which the mothers can feel confident is clean, well heated and supervised, and will provide a hot lunch.

Grace and St. Peter's also provides instruction in those skills that will better prepare children for elementary school. This is more comprehensive than those programs being established by the Office of Economic Opportunity through the Welfare Department. Grace and St. Peter's provides the background of math and reading readiness, and learning preparedness all year long which Project Headstart valiantly tries to cram in eight short summer weeks for children whose progress has been slowed down by the effects of poverty.

Only a limited number of families can avail themselves of the quality of day care that Grace and St. Peter's provides, since it has a capacity of 185 children. The 44 licensed day care centers in Baltimore serve only 5 per cent of the 22,500 small children of working mothers. The Maryland Committee for Day Care of Children is trying to encourage more people to operate day care centers.

NO STATE FUNDS

The only center that is completely publicly supported is the Agnes Bevan Park Center in Westport. None of the existing centers in Baltimore receives any state or city funds, although some receive Federal funds, particularly those affected by the recent grant of $357,500 by the Office of Economic Opportunity to establish group and family day care in Baltimore.

Grace and St. Peter's has a tuition of $600 a year and some scholarship aid is available. Many families could not afford to send their children there, even if there were enough room. The Labor Department statistics say that 85 per cent of mothers who work do so because of financial need.

The Maryland Committee for Day Care of Children, is currently seeking methods of getting Federal matching funds, and allocations from the state and city through the welfare departments to finance the centers. In January, the city health department recommended that 35 centers and 450 family day care homes be established to meet Baltimore's needs. But this would cost an estimated $3,000,000 annually.

FOUNDATION AID

The financial situation is not static. In December the Hoffberger Foundation made a $30,000 matching grant to Baltimore over 3 years. This grant will help pay the salaries of day care center workers.

The committee itself informs the public of problems and abuses of day care, and recommends ways of solving them. It distributes literature, holds fund-raising dinners, works with civic and community groups, and serves as a clearing house for questions and suggestions.

Members of the committee try to expedite the activities of a particular agency if, for example, a time lag is evident in the establishment of a community center. If the reason turns out to be that facilities cannot be located, then the committee coordinates the finding of a suitable facility.

The committee's role was evidenced recently with regard to the licensing of day care centers. The committee felt that this was desirable to insure minimum standards of health, sanitation, safety and personnel. A survey with the Governor's commission on day care indicated that 18 per cent of the centers were inadequate or substandard.

SLIDE SHOW HELD

The committee held a luncheon and slide show for delegates to the Legislature, explaining advantages of regulating day care. The result was a House bill, providing for the State Welfare Department to license home centers caring for fewer than five but more than one child in a private home for money. The bill costs the State nothing, but it will receive $40,000 in Federal funds to implement licensing and supervision.

Another project of the Committee for Day Care of Children is trying to determine the feasibility of inclusion of day care centers in housing projects, which now have a limited amount of space for recreation. A permanent location to accommodate the day care would require a building addition. But also involved in this suggestion is the requirement of one third local matching funds. What progress the committee has made will be revealed at its annual dinner.

The committee feels that the problem of child day care is the unmet need of the American domestic social scene. Since working mothers are increasing in numbers faster than facilities for their children, the goal of the committee is to make the child happy away from a home situation.

INVITATION TO ENJOY THE ADVANTAGES OF VACATIONING IN ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, everybody talks about Alabama these days and I want to talk about my State, too. I want to go a step further and invite each of your constituents to come to Alabama and see what our State is really like. I invite you to consider vacationing in lovely Alabama, where you may enjoy mountains, ocean beaches—the whitest, firmest in the world—clear lakes and historic homes and buildings—all within a single State.

I should like to remind you that a string of remarkably beautiful lakes stretch across north Alabama along the Tennessee River. This is wonderful fishing water, and more and more people come to Alabama to enjoy it each year. Around Guntersville, where annual boat races and other water events are held each year, there are numerous marinas, motels, and campsites to please every taste. The grain elevators at Guntersville stand like white castles against the green hills along the river.

At Decatur, Florence, and other cities along this system of TVA lakes there are all the facilities which any traveler could want to make his stay enjoyable—and all this is with Alabama hospitality thrown in. At Tuscumbia, incidentally, near Wilson Dam, is the Helen Keller home where Miss Keller's training began so that she could become living proof that handicaps do not close the way to growth and success. Up the river the great space center at Huntsville is within sight of the river. All this and much more awaits any traveler who comes to northern Alabama, for a brief visit or for life.

A little to the south there is Lake Martin on the Tallapoosa River, a lake created by Alabama Power Co. This great lake has a shoreline of more than 800 miles and covers more than 50,000 acres. Near Alexander City, Wind Creek Park has 1,800 campsites and miles of beaches, plus 36 boat-launching ramps. There are fine facilities at Kowaliga Beach, made famous in a song by the late Hank Williams, of Alabama.

In the same area is Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, where Andrew Jackson broke the back of Creek resistance 150 years ago. The Park Service has created a fine museum and park here in the bend of the Tallapoosa, and all who are interested in the story of America's westward expansion after the Revolution should visit this historic spot. Incidentally, I introduced the legislation which made possible the establishment of this park.

This is great country, and a companion string of lakes extends along the Coosa River just a few miles from Martin—just over the ridge, in fact.

If one is traveling by car, Montgomery, first capital of the Confederacy, is only a few miles from the Alexander City area, and the route goes through Wetumpka, a lovely old city once the home of William Lowndes Yancey.

The capitol at Montgomery is a building of great beauty. On its steps Jefferson Davis took the oath as President of the Confederate States. Across the street to the south is the first White House of the Confederacy, maintained as a museum, and adjoining it is the museum and library of Alabama's archives and history department.

I could continue—but this gives you a brief hint of the things to see and enjoy in Alabama. I would like to give each of you a packet of facts about Alabama and its tourist attractions. These packets are available in my office.

Meanwhile, I repeat: Come to Alabama and see us. As a former Governor of Alabama puts it: "Y'all come."

ASSISTANCE TO LOW-INCOME HOMEMAKERS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, for approximately a half century county extension agents have met the needs of farmers and homemakers through a grassroots approach. Recently in three counties in northwestern Indiana, extension home economists, with the cooperation of other agencies, have used this approach in an imaginative program to assist low-income homemakers.

The aim of this project has been to help these homemakers make better use of their resources for family living by training in basic housekeeping skills, food preparation, clothing skills, and personal development. Participants have gained greater self-respect through their accomplishments. Each homemaker is asked to teach one thing she has learned to five other women.

The success of the program among various disadvantaged groups and migrant workers in northern Indiana has encouraged similar undertakings in other parts of the country.

Among those who should be particularly commended are A. D. Leurs, agent for Lake County, Ind., whose initiative was instrumental in developing the program, and Mrs. Minerva Partin, who is project director. Also to be congratulated for their assistance in the program are the directors of the Purdue Extension Service.

Because of its general significance, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Extension Service Review entitled "Low-Income Homemakers Respond," which describes this program in detail, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

LOW-INCOME HOMEMAKERS RESPOND TO TRADITIONAL EXTENSION TEACHING METHODS

(By Evelyn P. Quesenberry)

A half century ago, Cooperative Extension had a successful beginning as county Extension agents met the needs of farmers and homemakers with a "grass-roots" approach.

In three counties in northwestern Indiana, Extension home economists continue to have success with the "grass-roots approach," as they work with disadvantaged Whites, Negroes, and Spanish American migrant workers. The results of their efforts emphasize the effectiveness of this approach to programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Programs for low-income homemakers are being conducted and continue to grow under the leadership of Mrs. Minerva Partin in Lake County; Mrs. Esther Singer, in St. Joseph County; and Miss Janith Masteryanni, in La Porte County.

The agents attribute success of the programs to the personal touch—that of meeting homemakers where they are and providing information to fit their needs.

A current concern in Extension home economics programs is helping families in need—to help them to be as happy as possible with their family members and to improve their living conditions.

The broad objectives of low-income programs in these Indiana counties are to help people make better use of their resources for family living and to improve their income situation. Clothing, cooking, and basic housekeeping skills provide the basis for these programs.

FOOD PREPARATION

Mother can prepare tasty meals for her family quite well when the father is working and has a steady paycheck.

But what about the many homes where there is no father, or where the money just "doesn't go round?" It takes more planning and determination to stretch the food budget and prepare attractive and appetizing dishes from ingredients which consist mostly of government surplus foods.

Surplus foods available to families in need are usually: flour, cornmeal, powdered milk, peanut butter, chopped meat, butter, lard, beans, rice, dried eggs, rolled oats or wheat,

and cheese. Families who receive these foods are glad to get them, but meals can be drab and tasteless unless mother knows how to add variety with different kinds of recipes.

In her cooking schools, Mrs. Singer teaches homemakers some "tricks" to make surplus-food meals more attractive and delicious.

Some of her tricks include the proper seasoning of powdered eggs to eliminate their "eggy" taste and the addition of a flavor stimulant, such as chocolate, when mixing powdered milk. In some cases mothers didn't know how to beat powdered milk into warm water, so their children simply ate it dry.

A typical breakfast prepared and demonstrated by Mrs. Singer includes: hot chocolate, oatmeal, baked scrambled eggs with meat cubes, and slices of homemade bread with butter. Nearly all ingredients were surplus foods.

Other tasty dishes prepared from surplus foods were bean soup, cornmeal muffins, refrigerator rolls, rice and cheese dishes, peanut butter cookies, and baked custard.

Mrs. Partin has done similar work with low-income homemakers in her county on the use of surplus foods. Both she and Mrs. Singer stress the importance of using equipment which these homemakers are likely to have in their homes.

Women who did not have pans in which to bake rolls, were shown how to improvise with peanut butter tins (which resemble coffee cans).

One homemaker came back to a following meeting with rolls which she had baked in the tin, to show to others in the group. She was proud of her accomplishment. Her pride is an example of increased self-respect—an important benefit—which homemakers gain from participation in these programs.

BASIC HOUSEKEEPING SKILLS

Housekeeping is routine and relatively easy with modern appliances to help get the job done. However, it is a different story with homemakers who lack not only the knowledge or correct procedure, but who do not have proper equipment or money to buy it.

In Lake County, under the guidance of Mrs. Partin, women—who need to count pennies—are helped with basic housekeeping skills. Some of the topics covered are: simple directions for keeping a house clean, making of beds, storing of cleaning supplies (out of reach of children), tools for cleaning, how to keep down household pests, and work schedules for getting housework completed.

CLOTHING SKILLS AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

Basic sewing courses for low-income homemakers also have been successful in these three counties. Homemakers learn how to make clothing for family members and receive experience in social and civic activities.

After a get-acquainted session in LaPorte County, Miss Masteryanni starts the basic sewing course with instructions for making sewing boxes. In order to utilize equipment found in the homes, sewing boxes are made from oatmeal boxes.

From there the group moves into simple construction techniques and progresses until each homemaker has a garment to model on "graduation night". Similar procedures are followed in Lake and St. Joseph Counties.

Social skills including: refreshments at each meeting, serving as hostess, behavior at a social affair, and participation by family members at the graduation session, are important experiences for the homemakers. For some of them it includes many firsts—the first time to take part in an organized adult session, first time to make a garment, and quite often, the first time to appear before a group.

RECOGNITION FOR HOMEMAKERS

In all three counties a graduation ceremony at the end of the course is a highlight for the homemakers. Graduation day in sewing is often held close to a special day, such as Easter or Valentine's Day, to make it a very special occasion.

In addition to special programs for "graduation", homemakers are proud to receive certificates of recognition for completion of a program or course.

In presenting certificates to one of her groups, Miss Sara Naragon, formerly assistant county Extension agent in St. Joseph County and now on leave, commended her class for the following: S—skill, E—energy, W—willingness, I—initiative, N—need, G—good job well done and graduation.

Mrs. Partin encourages each homemaker to teach one thing she has learned to five other women. Statistics, to date, show that class members have shared their knowledge with 1,450 others. Sharing with others provides satisfaction and recognition to the one who shares.

COOPERATING AGENCIES

County Extension agents attribute much of their success with low income programs to cooperation of many individuals and agencies.

Cooperating agencies in Lake County include the Gary Housing Authority, Lake County Department of Public Welfare, Goodwill Industries, Township Trustees, Neighborhood Houses, Hammond Housing Authority, and Hammond Community Council.

St. Joseph County cooperators include: Neighborhood Youth Corps, South Bend Civic Planning Association, South Bend Community School Corporation, Poor Relief Agency, Public Housing Recreation Center, and the Welfare Office.

Assisting agencies in LaPorte County include: The Federal Housing Authority, Department of Public Welfare, Parks and Recreation Board, YWCA, YMCA, and Girl Scouts.

Many volunteers have assisted Extension agents in planning and teaching. These include leaders of Home Demonstration clubs, graduate home economists, women from churches, school trustees, and housing authorities.

In order to offer more programs for low-income homemakers in St. Joseph County, a Negro Extension agent in home economics, Mrs. Bessie Woolridge, has been added to the county Extension staff. Mrs. Woolridge has made many personal contacts, and has been instrumental in planning and carrying out additional programs.

A B C'S OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMMING

The A B C's of successful programming for low-income families in Northwestern Indiana seem to be: active participation, basic skills, and cooperation coupled with methodology that is simple and concrete, something that can be demonstrated, and include something to take home to show or taste.

REVOLUTION IN CORRECTIONS—AN INTERVIEW WITH MYRL ALEXANDER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as a member of the National Penitentiaries Subcommittee, I have had a continuing interest in the administration and operation of the Federal prison system. My work on the subcommittee has led to close contact with the Bureau of Prisons and its officials. It has been my privilege to have visited most of the Federal correctional institutions—some of them more than once.

In the course of this legislative oversight function, I worked closely with Mr. Myrl Alexander, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons. He has had an outstanding 30-year career with the Bureau, and, in 1964, was appointed its Director upon the retirement of his distinguished predecessor, Mr. James V. Bennett.

Mr. Alexander also has had a significant exposure to academic life having served as head of the Crime-Correction Center at Southern Illinois University, one of the few such programs in this country.

Director Alexander, therefore, speaks with a solid record of practical experience as well as academic expertise.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate an excellent interview with the Director that appeared in the July 11 issue of U.S. News & World Report.

In the interview, Mr. Alexander gives an up-to-date picture of the revolution now taking place in the treatment of convicted offenders in the Federal system.

Particularly impressive were the comments in the article concerning the Prisoner Rehabilitation Act of 1965, of which it was my privilege to be a principal cosponsor along with the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG].

A major feature of the new act is the work-release program, in which carefully selected inmates are allowed to work at jobs or obtain schooling outside prison walls during the daytime, returning to the institution evenings and weekends. Mr. Alexander states that during the first 4 months of operation about 500 of the 21,000 Federal prisoners participated in work release. During that time there were 15 escapes, but more than half of the escapees had histories of alcoholism. Now, very few with such backgrounds are included in the program.

Mr. President, it is vital, if we are to reverse the present skyrocketing increase in the incidence of serious crime in this country, that there be a breakdown in the traditional role of the prison as the breeding ground for careers in crime. The progress described by Mr. Alexander in combating recidivism is most encouraging.

Mr. President, 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:

WHAT LIFE IS LIKE IN TODAY'S FEDERAL PRISONS—INTERVIEW WITH MYRL E. ALEXANDER, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF PRISONS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A revolution in the treatment of criminals now is under way in this country.

Rehabilitation, not punishment, is the byword. Guidance centers, offering psychiatric help, are being set up to speed release of criminals from prison. New job-training programs let inmates leave jail for part-time work or schooling.

How is this new approach working out? Can it really cut the rising crime rate? What about hardened or violent offenders?

For official answers, editors of U.S. News & World Report invited the man who runs the federal prison system to the magazine's conference room for this exclusive interview.

Question. Mr. Alexander, is the approach to the punishment of crime in this country being changed?

Answer. Yes, there are remarkable changes in the treatment of offenders.

Question. What kinds of changes?

Answer. There has been a change from the internal kind of prison orientation that was directed only to what goes on behind the walls. The new approach is oriented to the offender's release and adjustment to the community.

The old idea of keeping a man in prison for one year, or five years, or 10 years, and then—when some magic date occurs—turning him out as reborn hasn't done the job at all. Our high rate of repeating offenders shows that. A substantial part of all crime in this country—it is much higher than 50 per cent—is committed by people who have been in prisons.

Question. Is that the reason for the changes—that the old-fashioned prison wasn't doing society any good?

Answer. A major reason, yes. The old prison did prevent criminals from committing crime in the community during the time they were locked up. In terms of offenders' contributions to society after release, the traditional prison was almost a failure. A great majority of habitual offenders really are doing life terms on the installment plan—in and out, in and out.

Question. Are you trying to do anything about this?

Answer. Yes. The orientation of correctional practices in this country is rapidly swinging toward the youth and young adults in our prisons. They're the ones with whom most may be accomplished. They're the ones who have 40 to 50 years ahead of them—either to live in crime, or to become producing members of society. It's toward these young people that attention is being directed.

Question. Are most of your prisoners young people?

Answer. The median age of the 21,000 federal prisoners is 29 years and six months. So half of our offenders are under age 29½. Our psychologists report their mental age compares precisely with that of the general population.

Question. So they're as smart as the average American—

Answer. There are just as many who are mental defectives, just as many who are geniuses, and just as many who are normal.

Our psychiatrists find that diagnosable mental illness is present in about 15 per cent of our federal prisoners. This means that 85 per cent have no such mental illness. Educationally, our total federal prison population is four to five years behind the general population. And, of all offenders committed to federal prison last year, 92 per cent had no employable skill. That gives you the pattern of the kind of people with whom we deal.

Question. Why do you think anything can be done with these people?

Answer. We remotivate them to continue with education and learn employable work skills. Emotional instabilities are treated by our psychologists and psychiatrists. Then, as the critical time of release nears, strong supportive control and supervision in the community is required.

To this end, four years ago we established four prerelease giudance centers as experimental facilities in Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit and New York. These were for youthful offenders, primarily between 20 and 23.

Question. Are they what are known as "halfway houses"?

Answer. Yes. And for four years now we have been putting youths through these centers, in which they live from three to six months. The centers are staffed by trained vocational counselors and some of our most skillful correctional officers.

We have now had 1,400 young people go through these prerelease guidance centers. We are continuing to follow up on those who are released on supervision. The figures we now have show that 70 per cent of those released in 1962 were successful under parole supervision for a period of two years after release. By contrast, the parole-violation rate for a similar period for prisoners who just went out to the community on the magic day of release, without having been through guidance centers, was about 48 per cent.

Question. What is the main thing you have learned from this program?

Answer. The thing that stands out, perhaps above all others, is that, even though the youth's educational level has been raised, and even though, while imprisoned, he has been taught a trade or skill, he has all kinds of problems of adjustment when he leaves prison. He doesn't know what to do about the temptations of the tavern. He hasn't learned how to accept criticism of his work. Without the experience he gets at a guidance center, one of these fellows, if bawled out by a foreman on a job, more than likely will say, "I quit."

Most of these fellows have never met a decent girl. They don't know how to behave in relationships with girls.

At the prerelease guidance centers, whatever the problem may be that emerges in adjustment, the young offenders are under constant supervision with competent counselors to help them work out their problem. They receive day-to-day help from people who are interested in them. This is a primary reason for the substantially lower parole-violation rate among those who go through this two to six months of supervision.

Question. Besides the guidance centers, what else is new and different in your rehabilitation program?

Answer. We found that the kind of training we had been giving in institutions was not equipping people for actual life situations. For example, we were training cabinetmakers when the world needed bricklayers or skilled apartment-maintenance men. As a result, we have developed a whole new series of vocational-training programs.

In four of our institutions, we are training automated-data-processing programmers. Also, we are training card punchers, because there is a great demand for them. To be a programmer, a person needs an intelligence quotient of 110 and on up. A card puncher can have an I.Q. of 90.

In a number of places, we have established bricklaying schools, because there is a great need for bricklayers. In each of these instances, the bricklayers' union is working with us, not only with the training but in helping men find jobs when they get out.

Question. Have you had any resistance from other unions?

Answer. No. As a matter of fact, the law under which these programs operate requires, first of all, that these men are not to be put in a community where there is a high rate of unemployment; second, that they do not displace employed workers; and third, that we do it with the knowledge of the labor unions.

Question. You're talking now about your work-release program—

Answer. Yes. We use this, by and large, in the last few months of the sentence.

Question. How does work release differ from halfway houses?

Answer. They are interrelated. Both help to build a bridge between the prison and the community. The law—passed last year—governing work release provides that inmates may go outside the institution for work, study or training, returning to the institution during nonworking, nonschool or nontraining hours.

Question. How many people are leaving prison each day for a period of work or training? What kinds of jobs do they take? Or, if they're studying, where do they go to school?

Answer. Out of 21,000 federal prisoners, approximately 550 are on work release. Their jobs vary from tire recapping to greenkeepers on golf courses, from laying brick to operating drill presses, from painting to plumbing. We have about 55 in junior colleges or universities.

Question. Do you pay for their schooling?

Answer. Under the law, we can for youthful offenders. At this point, we don't.

Question. Who pays, then?

Answer. They pay for it themselves, or earn it themselves. For example, we have two boys in a junior college in Texas, near Dallas, who are carrying a 16-hour course and working three hours a day at janitorial jobs. What they earn is applied to their tuition. These two boys made the dean's list last quarter.

Question. Many of your institutions are in smaller communities, where not many jobs are available. Do you permit people to go farther afield—to the nearest big city, for instance?

Answer. A man on work release can end up in a city, if he came from one. Let's take an example:

A boy who lives in Los Angeles will steal a car and get picked up in Denver. He's committed to our institution at El Reno, Okla. There he'll be educated by machine teaching methods and some other new methods. He may advance three or four grades within a period of six or eight months, achieving an educational level where he has the competency to begin vocational training.

At this point, dependent upon what the psychologists and industrial counselors determine to be his best skill, he may be transferred to our institution at Lompoc, Calif., let's say, to take vocational training in bricklaying or tile setting. Tile setting is an occupation in much demand in southern California.

When he has passed State tests and can be certified as an apprentice tile setter, he'll be transferred to our institution at Terminal Island, Los Angeles, and begin work release in his home community under the supervision of that institution.

Generally, our policy is to return people for work release to the area nearest their place of residence, in which there is high employment, with jobs needing to be filled.

Question. Do some of these work-release people just walk away?

Answer. In the first four months of operation, of our first 500 on work release, we had 15 abscond. Of those, eight got drunk. All eight had histories of alcoholism. At that point, I issued directives to go slow on people with such histories. The work-release program for the stable nonalcoholic is too important to experiment on alcoholics.

Question. If these people are allowed out of prison for varying lengths of time, why keep them in prison at all? Does confinement make any sense under those conditions?

Answer. Yes, it makes very much sense. First of all, those on work release are in the last stages of sentence. They have received education or vocational training that they needed when they came in. Work release teaches them how to use—in an actual life situation—the training they have received in the institution.

WORK FOR OLDER PRISONERS

Question. Most of the changes you have described apply to the younger half of your prison population—those who seem to offer some hope of rehabilitation. What about the hardened criminals—the older offenders?

Answer. First of all, with the older offenders there now is a frank recognition that you do not easily change them. So we are concentrating on getting older habitual offenders put to productive work inside the

institutions. We operate major federal-prison industries in most of our institutions, which produce goods solely for the use of the Federal Government.

We have all but eliminated idleness. The important thing is that the older offender is contributing. He's making shoes that go to Vietnam. He's making tarpaulins used over there. We're recapping tires used on military vehicles and airplanes. In one institution, we're retreading tank tracks.

But we have no illusions about the older offender. If a man does not drop out of the crime picture by the time he's in his mid-30's, the odds against rehabilitation are high.

I must confess that those of us in the prison business daily release people that we know full well are going out and commit crime again. But the sentence is up, and they go out.

Question. Do Federal prisons get people who are convicted of armed robbery and burglary?

Answer. We get most of the bank robbers. One of our more notorious bank robbers wrote a book on bank robbery between sentences six or seven years ago.

I was walking down the corridor of one of our prisons recently and somebody said, "Hey, Mr. Alex! Times are getting tough." I said, "I know you without looking. How are you?" We talked a little bit, and I said, "How are things going?" And he said, "They're going to hell." I asked, "What do you mean by that?" He said, "There isn't anybody left who knows how to rob a bank. Look at all these kids coming in here—water pistols, all this stuff. They don't know how to listen to a lock drop. They don't know how to use 'soup' [nitroglycerin]. Times have gone to hell. By the way, could I go out on work release?" I said, "You want to bet?"

HANDLING THE VIOLENT

Question. What about the rapists and muggers who make life dangerous for people on the streets?

Answer. We have very few persons in federal prisons for such crimes. These are typically State violations.

The violent, aggressive or assaultive offender is the target of special study and research. We need to know a great deal more about how to handle him. I doubt that his problems can be dealt with effectively in the traditional prison. The answer may well lie in special psychiatric centers, such as have been developed in Denmark.

Question. Can any prison system, federal or State, rehabilitate the really depraved and violent criminals, no matter how young they are?

Answer. We must recognize that there is a hard-core group of criminals who, in the present state of knowledge, cannot be changed by imprisonment. The prison does provide protection to the community by keeping these men locked up as long as the law allows. But we need to continue the search for ways and means to remotivate even this group.

Question. Is fear of certain punishment a deterrent to crime?

Answer. I have many doubts about the extent to which the fear of punishment deters people from crime. The assumption that this is the case has never been validated by any objective measure that I know of.

Most criminals believe that they can beat the game. Others act impulsively and immaturely, without regard for the consequences. Some commit crimes with the sure knowledge that they will be caught and committed. For them, consciously or unconsciously, the "flight into custody" represents a relief from the pressures of day-to-day existence.

Question. If the average criminal feels fairly safe from severe punishment, is he more likely to ply his trade?

Answer. Yes, of course.

Question. Many people still believe in capital punishment for certain crimes of violence. Do you think execution is the answer in some cases?

Answer. After 35 years in prison work, I have come to believe that execution solves no problems. It is a remnant of those barbaric punishments which have since been abandoned. The Department of Justice favors abolition of the death penalty.

Question. Is there such a thing as a "criminal type"—a kind of person who would be a criminal in any environment?

Answer. I don't think there is a congenital-criminal type. There are those for whom delinquency can be predicted, even in the lower levels of school. It's at this point that the deprivations, the influences of the home or alley in which they live begin to appear. There has been some progress in this area of predicting.

But as for a criminal type, a congenital criminal: Unless there has been brain damage or something of that sort, I think that such a classification would not be accepted in our field or in those of the other behavioral sciences, such as psychiatry and psychology.

CRIME AMONG WELL TO DO

Question. You speak of deprivation as a factor in making criminals, but isn't it true that there has been an increase in crime—particularly in the suburbs—among youngsters from fairly well-to-do families? What accounts for that?

Answer. Deprivation can take a great many forms. Economic deprivation is one thing. Educational deprivation, cultural deprivation, emotional deprivation are others.

Of offenders who come from the middle class or the upper financial class, in almost every case there is a pattern of emotional deprivation accompanied by overindulgence.

I'll describe a case to illustrate my point:

I spent a couple of hours recently with a young man 25 years of age who is serving life for bank robbery. This young man's father is a successful businessman. The parents divorced when this lad was 6 or 7 years old. He was sent to the most expensive schools here and in Europe. He spent five years in universities. His dad paid for an apartment for him, furnished him with an expensive sports car, and gave him $1,000 a month spending money—with more if he needed it.

The boy got to be a gambler. He fell into the hands of gamblers. His dad bailed him out once or twice on gambling debts, but the boy decided, "The old man is going to get tired of this pretty soon." So he and one of the gamblers decided to stick up a bank.

They were nabbed right outside the bank—and now we've got him for a life sentence. He told me that his dad was going to hire a $10,000 lawyer to get him out of this. I got in touch with his dad and said, "Don't do it—it's going down the drain. Your boy is lucky he wasn't executed."

Question. Where was the deprivation in the case of this boy?

Answer. The indulgence of the father, and childhood and youth spent outside a home, had some very direct relationship to the kind of crime that he ultimately committed.

Question. Do you think the boy can ever amount to anything?

Answer. At age 25 and facing a life sentence—I don't know.

Question. Actually, what is a life sentence now?

Answer. In federal institutions, the man with a life sentence is eligible for parole at 15 years. The average length of time in prison is about 20 years.

But we have lifers who have been in for many, many years. I talked to one last week who has been in 31 years. He has made some very good superficial adjustments, but the psychiatric report pretty clearly indicates better-than-even probabilities that he would be dangerous if released. Even though he has adjusted to an institution, the probabilities of his release are nil.

Question. Is crime committed by youths from middle-class homes an increasing problem in an affluent society?

Answer. No. Offenders from the middle class are a very small proportion of our inmates. The incidence of crime and delinquency is far lower in the middle-class family.

Question. Is the number of federal prisoners going up?

Answer. No. We have 3,000 fewer now than three years ago.

Question. How does that happen when, overall, crime is rising?

Answer. It's primarily due to the rising use of probation in federal courts. Last year, for the first time, more than 50 per cent of all defendants in federal courts were placed on probation.

Question. So that more than 1 out of every 2 persons convicted of a federal crime didn't go to prison at all—

Answer. They didn't go to prison—they went on probation.

The second thing that is reducing our prison population is that, as new education and vocational-training programs have developed, the length of stay in prison has tended to be somewhat less than before.

Question. Do you mean that inmates get paroled faster?

Answer. Yes. The average time served by youth offenders has been reduced by a few weeks, over the past two or three years. Also, many adult offenders, committed under indeterminate-sentencing laws, are released somewhat earlier than would have been the case with definite sentences.

The parole board is attempting to return men to the community when they have shown that they are ready and have good possibilities of "making it" there.

Question. If 1 out of 2 convicted criminals goes on probation instead of into prison, and if those in prison get out earlier, doesn't this lessen the fear of punishment for crime? Could that be one cause of the rising crime rate?

Answer. As I said earlier, it is very rare that a person planning a crime calculates the consequences of his act, such as the probabilities of his receiving probation or parole, if caught and convicted. And no increase in failure rates of probationers or parolees has resulted from the greater use of these techniques.

HOW PRISONS EVOLVED

Question. Weren't prisons set up in the first place to punish criminals?

Answer. The prison was created by the Quakers in the latter part of the eighteenth century in Philadelphia. Punishment of offenders up to that time was never by confinement. There were jails in which people were held awaiting trial and disposition. But the punishments usually were banishment by transportation to some place of exile, death, or mutilation.

The Quakers thought there should be some better method, and they concluded it would be far better to isolate offenders from society—put them in a room by themselves where they could, through introspection and reading the Bible and prayer, reach a state of penitence. So they called it a "penitentiary." Their theory was that, after a stated period of time, the offender would be penitent and, when released, would not commit offenses.

The trouble was that, as we know now, if you isolate persons long enough they'll blow their tops, and this is what happened. The initial Quaker concept of absolute isolation of every person in prison failed very early in Pennsylvania, but the prison idea itself swept all over the United States.

New York, at Auburn, developed the industrial-type prison, where prisoners began to produce revenue for the State rather than costing the State. In the South, there developed prison plantations and work gangs for the roads—the chain gangs. But it was the Pennsylvania system that went from this country throughout the world.

Then, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, a great reform movement began. The reformatory developed from it. That was the idea of an indeterminate sentence, with younger offenders going to school, or to work, or to military training. This was one of the early modifications of the prison idea. For the last 50 years there have been many other changes. Doctors were brought in to treat the prisoners—educators and vocational trainers. We've gone through several heydays of finding panaceas—the heydays of the psychiatrist, the psychologist, the social worker, and others.

But all of these up until recently were internally oriented, inside the prison. Now these disciplines and the resources of the community are oriented toward integrating the offender in society through carefully designed programs of control and supervision.

A BASIS FOR OPTIMISM

Question. The papers keep reporting about serious crimes committed by people who are on parole or on probation. What assurance do you have that your halfway-house and work-release programs won't add to this problem?

Answer. Our limited experience to date gives us a basis for optimism. Of course, it has to be a calculated risk. Most of the chiefs of police with whom we talk would far rather have men coming out under this kind of very rigid control with gradual release.

There are certain offenses which we have administratively ruled out from work release—heinous offenses, violent offenders, notorious cases. These aren't the guys it's intended for. It's geared to the improved youthful or young-adult type of offender.

Question. First offenders only?

Answer. No. We get fellows who began by stealing a bicycle, then maybe another one. Then a fellow like that does time in a State training school or a reformatory, and we pick him up for interstate transportation of a stolen car at 21 or 22. He's far from being a first offender, yet he's far from being an old, habitual criminal.

Many young fellows of this type are responsive to our educational and vocational-training programs.

Question. With all the changes, is discipline still fairly strict within prisons?

Answer. Yes, of course. Good order and control are essential in every institution. But the kind and degree of discipline required varies with the differing types of inmate populations.

For example, we have the Atlanta Penitentiary. Even there, some 25 or 30 men are "locked up within the lock-up of the lock-up." We have camps—a group of youthful offenders, for example on Mount Lemmon just north of Tucson, Ariz., building recreation areas. We have a psychiatric hospital at Springfield, Mo., at which we have some of the most dangerous offenders possible—commonly called, I guess, the "criminally insane." The prison business is not one in which you say, "Well, everybody's alike in every situation." Our 36 institutions are widely diversified.

Question. Do you have any maximum-security institutions now, like the old Alcatraz Prison in San Francisco Bay?

Answer. Since Alcatraz was closed, we use Leavenworth and Atlanta for that type of offender, and some of them at the psychiatric medical center at Springfield, Mo. They pose problems, of course, but we're quite satisfied that our handling of these people is far better than it was in the days when we had Alcatraz.

We are now trying at Marion, Ill., which was built as a maximum-security institution, an education-psychiatric-industrial system with young offenders who present extreme behavior problems.

Question. What kind of people are these?

Answer. Very difficult young fellows in their 20s who are strong-arm men around an institution. They go around shaking down lockers, stealing, trying to force weaker inmates into submissive or supportive roles—you know, demanding payoffs under threat of beating up a weaker fellow.

We're moving this type to Marion, with the expectancy that we will develop very intensive psychiatric and educational programs. We're working with one university in this, and with the Public Health Service and the National Institute of Mental Health.

Surprisingly, I suppose, this is a group of prisoners in which there is a rich potential for change, because they are nearing an age when some offenders burn out—just get tired of this sort of thing. You know this is happening when they start to talk in terms of maybe getting out and getting married and settling down, or you see them begin to enroll for an education course or seek out the psychologist.

Question. In general, do State prisons lag behind the federal prison system in physical plants and up-to-date methods?

Answer. Well, we have 51 different systems and, of course, we have wide variations in problems, approaches and resources. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, under the leadership of Attorney General Katzenbach, is seeking ways and means to bring knowledge of modern correctional methods to all the States.

Question. Do good State prisons have the programs you're using?

Answer. Yes, in the main. For example, the work-release law actually goes back to the State of Wisconsin, which began using it in jails 15 years ago. Our ears perked up when we found that inmates sentenced to the county jail in Milwaukee earned three quarters of a million dollars a year on work release—and half a million of it was applied to support of their families, who otherwise would have been on relief.

North Carolina has now used it successfully for several years. A number of other States are moving to authorize work-release plans.

PRISONS THAT BREED CRIME

Question. Are prisons breeding places of crime?

Answer. It's true that some of them are. I am firmly convinced, after a lifetime in the work, that, in the old-style, tough prison filled with idleness, we breed far, far more crime than we do in those where there is work and where there are active training and education programs.

Question. Is prison life being made easier by programs of work release and other things related to rehabilitations?

Answer. Easy? There isn't an inmate in a federal prison today—unless he's an old geriatric case or is ill—who isn't working eight hours a day for a pittance, so to speak. We keep the monkey on their backs to show evidence of change and to accept responsibility.

It's not easy to be deprived of your liberty. It's not easy to face up to your own problems and your own weaknesses. I can't foresee the time when the biggest concern of every inmate is anything but "How do I get out of this place?"

People don't like to be in prison, and in many respects we're making it tougher. The demands are greater. You can't do time in federal prison by just lying around.

We don't have anybody knocking at our doors to get in, and I don't think that prison life is becoming easy.

TIRE SAFETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on March 29 the Senate passed an historic and long overdue piece of legislation—the Tire Safety Act of 1966 which would establish Federal safety standards for tires and a system of grading and labeling.

The tire safety issue is a complicated one and its importance can be easily obscured in a mire of technical language which the layman finds difficult to understand. But it is an issue of lifesaving importance for every American motorist and one which he should be aware of.

Last week the New York Times carried a three-part series by Walter Rugaber on the background of the tire safety controversy, the need for Federal safety standards and the effect such standards will have on the industry and the consumer. Mr. Rugaber has performed a valuable public service by making tire safety an understandable issue and I commend his articles to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1966]

TIRE SAFETY: THE CONTROVERSY AND OUTLOOK FOR FEDERAL CODE

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, July 4.—The automobile tire, a target of sustained attack by both motorists and experts concerned with its reliability appears headed for a stiff regulation by a safety-minded Federal Government.

The Senate has approved legislation that would set minimum safety standards and a straightforward system of quality grading for tires. A similar measure advanced in a House committee last week.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Democrat of Wisconsin, has spoken darkly of an "American tire scandal." Other concern has stemmed from extended investigations in Washington and elsewhere.

Is there an American tire scandal? The main charges lodged by the critics of the rubber and automobile industries include the following:

Prior to this year's models, it was difficult for a motorist to find out how much weight he could carry in his car without overloading it and placing a dangerous strain on the tires.

Before a hasty change in the tire load figures, a number of American autos—especially station wagons—were overloaded even when standing empty.

Detroit's interest in a soft, quiet ride has produced a tire that critics insist lacks the traction and maneuverability crucial in emergencies.

Poor materials and lax quality controls in the construction of certain cheaper tires, some selling for less than $8, mean poor wear and dangerous failures.

The presence of at least 250,000 retail dealers and about 950 different tire names makes the task of choosing a new tire hopelessly confusing and uneconomic.

There might be dozens of reasons for poor performance or outright failure by a tire, but whenever it happens the effect is usually serious and sometimes fatal.

A 42-year-old woman, observed over closed-circuit television cameras that monitor traf-

fic congestion, drove north along Detroit's busy John C. Lodge Freeway one day last week. Suddenly, it was later reported, helpless traffic officials watching the television monitors saw a front tire blow out and the car begin to weave back and forth.

The auto struck a curb and went out of control, then slammed into a concrete bridge abutment and burst into flames. The woman, alone in the car, was killed instantly.

The policemen who investigated the accident noted a collapsed right front tire, but despite this and the dramatic scene that was witnessed on television, the cause of the crash was not officially established.

"There won't be any prosecution," a police spokesman said, "so we don't have to pinpoint exactly what happened. It's an unknown as far as we're concerned."

There are many such unknowns and the tire's exact responsibility for accidents is a project of intense controversy. Estimates of its culpability range from less than 1 percent to more than 10 percent.

Despite official uncertainty, a number of consumer surveys have indicated that even drivers with a lukewarm interest in most aspects of auto safety would like to have a more adequate tire.

A recent sampling, conducted by The Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, showed that 91 percent of 1,115 readers wanted safer tires on their cars.

The bigger rubber companies have made noticeable improvements in their tires over the last several years, and the customer who is willing to pay the price can get a clearly superior grade.

Blowouts are the more sensational aspect of tire safety, but the rubber companies say the problem has substantially subsided with advent of tires without inner tubes.

Today's tires consist of two or more layers of rubber-impregnated fabric, usually rayon or nylon, covered over with a slab of heavier tread and sidewall rubber.

They are engineered with great precision. When installed on an automobile, the portion touching the ground is designed to flatten—or deflect—just the right amount for best performance.

HEAT IS THE ENEMY

Each time a tire revolves it must bend on touching the ground and bend again on leaving it, a constant flexing that builds up heat as high as 250 degrees. This heat is the great enemy of tires. It weakens the adhesives that hold the tire together and is quick to search out any weak spots that have developed.

The woven fabric, called a ply, gives the tire its strength but is often "bruised" by striking a curb or a pothole. The heat may then weaken a damaged area until it gives away.

Damage or weakened fabric, hidden in the tire, is one of the factors that can make tire retreading a dangerous practice. In retreading, worn tires have new tread rubber applied for an additional life. According to recent estimates, there are more than 60 million retreaded tires now in use, some marketed as replacements and others processed individually for motorists.

If a motorist has his own tires retreaded he can be reasonably aware of the condition of the fabric. However, if he buys a retreaded tire from a dealer he has no indication of any damage or weakening that may have occurred during its earlier life.

There are thousands of retreaders, and quality varies widely. Proper adhesion of the new tread is the big problem, as chunks of rubber along some highways testify.

TWO MAIN CAUSES

Aside from the pavement's contribution, there are two main generators of heat in tires:

1. High speeds mean faster flexing of the fabric and consequently more friction.

2. Greater weight on the tire—or less air pressure inside to hold it up—means more deflection on the ground and hence a greater bending of the fabric.

Ideally, inflation pressures should be altered every time weight—even that of a single passenger—is added to or taken from a car. Thus, if the load is increased, a few more pounds of air pressure should be added to increase the inflation and restore the proper degree of deflection.

In actual practice, of course, the tire has sufficiently wide tolerances to permit three or four passengers to get in or out without real effect.

When a motorist goes beyond the maximum load he can reduce the danger somewhat by lowering his speed. But even if he avoids a blowout, the tread wear increases substantially.

Any tire can be loaded beyond its capacity to take in more air pressure and thus accommodate the added weight. One of the main points of the critics has been that it is difficult, if not impossible, for a motorist to determine his car's load limits.

This year, after criticism in Washington and elsewhere, automobile companies have made it easier for the motorist to tell when load changes require inflation changes.

This year's model cars have abbreviated information, usually on the inside of the glove compartment door, and further details are listed in the owner's manual.

Ford, for example, specifies one inflation for a "moderate load" (five persons or less) and a greater inflation for "full rated loads" of six persons and 200 pounds of luggage.

Proper loads for different sizes of tires at various inflation pressures are established by tables published by the Tire and Rim Association, a standard-setting organization of tire and rim producers.

The load that each tire will carry is established by a very complex mathematical formula. The formula and the tables are adjusted once every 10 years or so.

However, steady technological improvements between formula changes supposedly make the tires capable of carrying greater loads than the association tables allow. This is what has taken place in recent years, the industry says.

Hence, according to a number of sources, automobile companies actually begin to exceed the association's standards by about 10 per cent when deciding on the tire size needed to carry a given load. In effect, the sources explain, a car that weighs 4,400 pounds may get tires that, according to the tables, are adequate only for 4,000 pounds.

When Congressmen and independent experts began comparing the tires on cars with the association's apparently "maximum" load tables, a torrent of criticism boiled up. Some cars were overloaded standing empty, it appeared, and many others had tires adequate for no more than an "average" load of three passengers and no luggage.

In other words, the critics summed up, auto companies first installed easily overloaded tires and then were extremely vague about the point at which that overloading occurred.

DETROIT DEFENDS TABLES

In its defense, Detroit sought to convince people that the tables were only a "guide," but the critics kept pointing out that the figures were plainly marked "maximum" and had been widely regarded as such.

The tables "have never been intended to show maximum safe loads," industry spokesmen insisted. "The tables have indicated load values for a car under three-passenger condition."

The industry said that if loads went beyond three passengers the "three-passenger" tables would be exceeded—but the tires could carry the added weight anyway. There simply are not any established load limits, Detroit contended.

The Tire and Rim Association, which has never acknowledged publicly that its earlier tables were faulty, nevertheless quickly devised a new formula and issued higher ratings that would permit greater weight on the tires.

The National Bureau of Standards noted recently that "no basis for the higher load has been presented."

"Even the lower ratings in the [earlier tables] are not as conservative as those published by the Society of Motor Manufacturers and Traders Ltd., in Great Britain," it declared.

LARGER TIRES INSTALLED

At the same time that the load ratings were changed, Detroit, although hotly denying that any of its cars were undertired, moved to install substantially larger sizes on many of its '66 models.

Another key safety factor—more important, many experts agree, than overloading and blowouts—is the somewhat subjective question of performance.

Differences in the grade and mixture of the rubber compounds that are used can have a striking effect on the traction and stopping capabilities of tires. Slight changes in the pattern of the fabric can give a tire either a softer, quieter ride or a harder one with better handling and stability. Performance is affected because the fabric changes give the tire either a stiffer or more flexible body.

Rayon fabric offers a generally smoother ride. Nylon, largely boycotted by Detroit because it is noisier, is widely regarded as stronger and better at resisting heat buildup.

Critics complain that the automobile's emphasis on esthetic characteristics, such as ride, impair the handling and maneuvering capability in an emergency.

EUROPEAN MODELS NOTED

European models usually involve a harsher ride, the critics point out, but these cars' ability to swerve safely around an obstacle or stick to the road on curves is far superior to most American autos.

There are three sets of tire safety standards in force today, but they have had only a limited impact. A Federal specification applies only to tires purchased by the Government.

State level standards devised by the Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission and voluntary standards published by the Rubber Manufacturers Association are widely regarded as less stringent than the Federal purchasing requirements.

The more successful rubber companies and the auto manufacturers conduct their own elaborate tests of a tire's performance one-company for example, puts sample tires through 75 or 80 laboratory tests.

Even the tire manufacturers who say they meet self-imposed safety levels concede, however that there are important differences in performance beyond their minimum standards.

How does the consumer find the proper tire? The task is so difficult that Congress shows signs of imposing a nationwide system of uniform grading.

Currently, the motorist depends on a marketplace long noted for its confusion and absence of specific information, and getting the right tire can be purely accidental.

[From the New York Times, July 6, 1966]

TIRE SAFETY: PROFUSION OF TYPES AND GRADINGS CONFUSE BUYERS

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, July 5.—A consumer who faces the confusing array of automobile tires now on the American market may get the one

best suited for his purposes, but many observers think his chances are less than even.

Congress, which is considering legislation to establish a system of uniform grading, recently received a report on the tire market from the Senate Commerce Committee. After an extended study, the panel declared:

"The committee knows of no consumer commodity more sharply characterized by confused and misleading nomenclature than the tire. Though no uniform grading system presently exists, the great majority of the private label marketers and domestic manufacturers market tires on the basis of an apparent grading system.

"Thus 'premium,' 'first line,' 'second line,' and '100 level,' imply that an objective grading system exists. Yet these designations today have no uniform fixed meaning or definitive value.

"One marketer's 'premium' is the inferior of another's 'third line' tire—and a single manufacturer may market a tire under its own brand name as a 'third level' tire while his private label customer markets the same tire as a 'first line' tire."

As continuing tests by independent laboratories have shown repeatedly, there are radical differences between tires. Even within the same price range, the tests show that one brand often performs substantially better than another.

Tire safety critics have hurled a heavy barrage of charges at the rubber industry over the last year or so, and Congress is considering legislation to establish minimum performance standards and a quality-grading system. The tire companies stoutly deny that most tires are unsafe or inadequate, but many officials agree that the retail market can be confusing to many customers.

Edwin H. Sonnecken, director of corporate planning and research for the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, concedes that it is not an "easy decision" to choose a tire. But then, he says, it is difficult to buy a lot of things, and that does not mean that the Government should grade everything.

"Sure," Mr. Sonnecken says, "it's always convenient (to have established grades). But what grade chair are you sitting in? What grade of suit are you wearing? I get confused by all the different kinds of suits they have out these days."

Most people would not spend a lot of time studying a complicated Government grading system, Mr. Sonnecken believes. He cites Government statistics that indicate that a consumer who spends $5,000 a year devotes only $20 of that to tires and four times as much on liquor.

"I think most tire lines could be simplified," Mr. Sonnecken acknowledges. "The problem is this: We live in a competitive world."

It might be "more efficient" to "make just one model and bang it out," he says, but the difficulty is that each tire represents a different segment of the contemporary market.

950 NAMES ON MARKET

In pursuit of this market, about 120 concerns offer tires with about 950 different names. Of 900 listed in a directory published by the Rubber Manufacturers Association, a trade group, at least 185 contain the word "premium."

In addition to the confusion of the market place, much of the public's dissatisfaction with tires appears to have stemmed from a tendency for Detroit auto makers to impose ever-increasing demands on Akron tire manufacturers. Some of the rubber companies have kept pace better than others.

Today's tires must start quicker, run faster, turn harder, wear longer and ride much more smoothly than they did 10—or even five—years ago.

"We've improved tread wear about 80 per cent," one tire company engineer said recently, "but the consumer got only about 20 per cent of it. The car stole the rest."

CAR'S HORSEPOWER CITED

Detroit's drive to increase the horsepower of its engines, which got started in earnest in the early 1960's, meant cars that generated considerably greater torque and, hence, more stress on the wheels.

"The tire people weren't really ready for the horsepower race," said Robert H. Snyder, manager of product engineering for the tire division of the United States Rubber Company. "There was a couple of years lag I think, before we caught up, and I would have to say that there are some smaller private brands that still haven't caught up."

Although the demands have soared, wholesale prices have stayed right where they were, and in some cases the auto companies have even succeeded in driving them down slightly.

Sources close to the industry's tire-buying activities indicated recently that although prices were now "fairly stable," the over-all trend since 1957 had been "slightly downward."

Ever since Dr. B. F. Goodrich built a plant there in 1870, Akron has been to the tire industry what Detroit is to the world of automobiles. Today, three top rubber companies besides Goodrich have headquarters there.

The city, with a population of about 300,000, is the home of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company and the General Tire and Rubber Company. The other major manufacturer, the United States Rubber Company, has headquarters in New York and its main plant in Detroit.

Akron is a drab industrial city with a worn-out central business district that resists renewal efforts. There are, however, prosperous sections of shaded homes, and the workers, who earn an average of $3.90 an hour, can be heard debating the virtues of various luxury cars.

A tire consists of hooplike arrangements of steel wire, called bead bundles, which hold the tire to the rim; two or more layers of rubber-impregnated fabric, called plies, which run from one bead to the other to provide shape and strength, and an outer slab of heavy tread and sidewall rubber.

TWO MINUTES TO MAKE

A workman assembles these components by placing them one by one on a revolving drum built especially for the purpose. The process takes as little as two minutes. When it is completed, the drum is collapsed so that the "green" or "uncured," tire can be removed and vulcanized.

The tires, shaped more like open-ended barrels at this stage, are placed automatically into a vulcanizing press, which forces the centers outward and the ends together. Thus forced into molds and cooked at temperatures between about 335 and 385 degrees, the tires are vulcanized, a chemical process that eliminates the tendency of the rubber to become brittle in winter and sticky in summer. The molds in the press give the tire its familiar shape and tread design.

The endless complexities of tire production affect the quality of a tire in two basic ways, neither of them especially apparent to the consumer when he is shopping for a tire.

First, the large amount of hand labor still involved in building a tire, together with the sensitive and flexible nature of the components, can lead to dozens of serious, manufacturing defects.

The leading problem is adhesion. The rubber companies make considerable efforts to bond various layers of a tire together, but once on the road they can start to pull apart. The most common form of this is the separation of large chunks of tread from the tire carcass.

HANDLING IS FACTOR

A major headache in most plants is proper handling of the fabric. If it is pulled out of shape while rolling it up for storage or while placing it onto the drum, it may mean a tire that runs unevenly.

Another important quality control difficulty involves the splicing of plies and tread rubber around the drum. If they overlap too much or wind up on the same side of the tire, the weight distribution can be seriously affected.

The consumer's only real protection from many of the most prevalent tire problems is careful inspection and testing throughout the production process. The cheap tire, some of them selling under $8, get less attention as well as less rubber.

The worker, paid by piece rates, may tend to let quality slide if inspection is lax. But at most of the rubber companies his name or number is stamped into every tire he builds, and defects can be traced to him months later.

Examinations are becoming more and more intense. Goodyear, for example, recently started inflating every one of its new car tires and running them under full load on specially built testing machines. The other big companies do similar work.

DESIGNS ARE VARIED

The second production factor affects tire quality by design rather than by accident. Some of the more common and important ways that tires are made different from one another are the following:

Rubber compounds, which may contain 13 types of natural and synthetic rubbers and 35 other ingredients, from sulphur to carbon black, can resist skids or offer superior tread life. More of one quality usually means less of another. Turning ability and the absence of squeal are also characteristics that generally conflict in a tire.

Each of the most popular fabrics, nylon and rayon, offers something that the other does not have. Nylon is considered stronger and better at resisting heat; rayon offers a smoother, quieter ride.

The fabric runs diagonally from one side of a tire to the other, crossing the center at an angle. If this angle is increased so the piles run across more directly, the ride is smoother. If the angle is reduced, the distance from side to side is longer, the tire stiffer, the handling better—and the ride harsher.

There is sharp debate over the relative performance of two-ply and four-ply tires. The industry contends that new two-ply fabric is as strong as the old four-ply. Furthermore, proponents of two-ply tires argue, they are less bulky and, hence, run cooler and ride over sharp blows easier. Also, two-ply supporters contend the greater flexibility permits the engineer to improve maneuverability of the tire without making the ride harder, and with the reduced bulk and rolling resistance there is a slight bonus in fuel economy. The United States Rubber Company recently reported that an average of 69 two-ply tires were returned under warranties for every 100 four-ply tires returned. The two-ply backers have implied that those clinging to four-ply tires are the same people who would not give up inner tubes, but among Government officials, independent authorities and large segments of the retail market there is a wait-and-see skepticism.

Cheaper tires not only have a thinner tread but a poorer quality rubber compound that is likely to be filled out with oils or other substances. Furthermore, the fabric is likely to have a more open weave, with fewer cords per inch that would be found in the better tire.

CHOICE IS AN ISSUE

How does the man who wants a soft ride, minimum noise and the longest possible tread wear avoid getting a tire built for the motorist who prefers extra stability and maneuverability, better skid resistance and top-notch durability?

Tire dealers, when they offer any comparative information at all, typically confine it to "extra traction," "34 per cent more tread wear," or "wrap-around tread with 9,184 gripping edges."

Within a single retail line, price may be a rough guide to tread wear. For some consumer, the kind of fabric employed and the number of plies involved may have special significance.

There are, however, no standard, precise guidelines that permit a motorist to grade the performance of one tire against another.

For Everyman, Detroit orders tens of millions of tires for its new automobiles, and the rubber industry sells millions more as "100 level" replacements.

These are the common denominators of the tire world, an attempt at combining the best in wear, performance, noise and ride. It is a balance—but an agonized one.

[From the New York Times, July 7, 1966]

AUTO TIRE SAFETY: THE DETROIT ROLE—AKRON FOLLOWS SPECIFICATION OF CAR MANUFACTURERS

(By Walter Rugaber)

DETROIT, July 6.—The automobile industry, under steady attack by safety critics in recent months, has a far-reaching influence over the reliability of today's tires.

The American motorist spends a substantial portion of his time riding on tires chosen for him by the auto makers and installed at their factories. Then, when the original tires wear out, he often buys replacements that again reflect Detroit's wishes.

The critics argue that the auto companies ignore safe tires in favor of smooth rides and lower costs, while the industry replies that it is perfectly possible to have all three in reasonable amounts. The battle is currently centered in Congress, where legislation that would establish minimum standards of safety and a uniform system of quality grading, is under consideration.

The auto industry's link to Akron is considerable. The manufacturers, buying from five major rubber companies, are expected to purchase a third of all the tires sold in the United States this year.

"When Detroit snaps its fingers, Akron jumps through the hoop—backward, if necessary," according to Harry C. McCreary Jr., the outspoken board chairman of the McCreary Tire and Rubber Company. Mr. McCreary, whose relatively small company does not sell tires to Detroit, has bluntly said:

"If you are a tire manufacturer, you are not apt to argue very loudly with your biggest customer. You give him what he demands, not what you feel he should have. If you don't like it he can always get his tires from your competitor, right across the street."

Is Detroit demanding inadequate tires, or is it shopping for the best available? How do the engineers and sales specialists in Akron and Detroit develop a new tire that is satisfactory to the companies involved? What are the special characteristics that the auto industry seeks in a tire?

There are only 14 independent rubber companies in the country today, but together they turn out a bewildering array of about 950 different names of tires—for themselves and for some 120 so-called "private label" concerns.

The private label brands are small marketing companies without manufacturing facilities of their own. The 14 rubber companies produce the private label tire to the marketer's own specifications.

A top quality tire produced by a major company can cost over $100, but there are cheap tires offered by some of the smaller companies for less than $8.

The retail prices of new-car tires varies somewhat but an average is probably $25 or $30. A rubber company might produce two grades of better tire (one company calls them "premium" and "semi-premium") and perhaps three grades of tire below the new-car level.

In addition to its own brands, the manufacturers also make a variety of tires for other. The United States Rubber Company, for example, has no grades below its standard new-car tire. But it makes cheaper tires for private label marketers.

A sharp controversy erupted several months ago when Ralph Nader, the Washington-based safety critic, charged that auto companies had managed to drive the wholesale prices they paid for tires down to as low as $2 for some models.

Executives in Akron are still steaming over that accusation. One official noted wryly that perhaps these reports had confused our selling prices with the Federal excise tax, which averages about $2 a tire. The wholesale prices are secret, but there have been indications from some industry sources that the range is between about $7.75 and $14.

TIRES AND MODELS IN TIME

The lower priced brands, called "cheapies" in the industry, get the blame for much of the criticism now being hurled at the tire manufacturers generally.

Company officials and retail dealers agree that much of the consumer dissatisfaction with poor quality stems from the corner-cutting that is essential in the production of a cheap tire.

Only five of the 14 manufacturers sell new car tires to the auto companies. The five, in order of their size, are the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, the United States Rubber Company, the General Tire and Rubber Company and the B. F. Goodrich Company.

All these major companies have engineers based in Detroit to consult with the automobile companies on the development of new car tires. The car manufacturers often require annual changes to keep the tires in tune with the new-model developments.

Most of these changes are minor refinements in construction that do not affect the outside proportion or the tread design. As in the auto industry, full-scale design changes occur only once every three or four years.

The larger tire companies conduct extensive programs of research and development that can lead to everything from a greatly improved tire cord to a new tread wear indicator, in which small sections of the tread are molded two thirty-seconds of an inch shallower so as to appear bald when the tire needs replacement.

A big company may choose a completely new model from as many as 200 experimental tires that it has designed and tested over several years. When a likely tire is picked, several thousand may be built for testing on taxi cabs and rental car fleets.

A DUAL EVALUATION

Samples then go to Detroit, and if it is an entirely new model, the tire gets a sort of dual evaluation from engineers at all the auto manufacturers that the company hopes to interest.

First, the auto companies must approve the outward proportion and tread design in order for the rubber company to have a uniform-appearing tire that can be sold as a replacement on the retail market.

Goodyear, for example, sells tires to all four of the auto companies and hence must satisfy each of them.

Once that hurdle is cleared, the laborious process of making internal adjustments to fit the tire to a specific car can begin.

The auto and rubber industries both conduct extensive tests for durability and performance, a practice that they cite in detail in reply to critics who charge that there is little real concern with safety.

The car manufacturers, for example, say that they carry out five or six major safety tests on each tire, evaluating its handling, stability, skid resistance, and other qualities. The tests are three times as severe as those encountered in normal motoring, the industry asserts.

$100-MILLION INVESTMENT

The rubber manufacturers report that they have invested nearly $100-million in laboratory and road-testing facilities and that they spend an additional $25-million each year to conduct different evaluations.

Critics who insist that the levels of tire safety are too low say that the industry's examinations are largely for show and that close analysis of a tire's performance capabilities is impossible for anyone outside the industry.

A number of sources in Detroit and in Akron indicated that the safety tests get only passing attention because they were a more routine aspect of tire development. The greatest debate and concentration go into a subjective factor that the engineers call "esthetics."

Good esthetics in a tire consists mainly of a soft, quiet ride. This is the characteristic that the automobile industry has always been intensely interested in. The engineers made the American car unsurpassed for its smoothness, a quite respectable achievement until the safety argument began.

The critics quickly discovered that putting engineering esthetics in often meant taking durability and stamina out, for the tire is a bundle of often conflicting capabilities.

A good example is squeal. Ten years ago almost all tires squealed when rounding a corner. Today, however, the noise has virtually been eliminated. The engineers did it by changing the rubber compounds—a change that took away some of the traction.

No one outside of the tire and auto industries knows exactly how much was dropped. But one engineer asserted recently that however much was lost has now been regained through the manipulation of other construction features.

Another illustration of Detroit's emphasis on esthetics is its long boycott of nylon fabric. A tire includes two or more layers of woven cord—usually rayon nylon—which not only supplies shape and strength but also controls flexibility or stiffness to a considerable degree.

Nylon cord is widely regarded as stronger than rayon and better at resisting heat, and it accounts for about 75 percent of the replacement tires that are sold directly to the consumer.

But nylon has one overriding disadvantage as far as the auto engineers are concerned. Tires in which it is used tend to flatten slightly on the bottom if the car stands still for a time. For the first few minutes of travel the flat spot makes a mild thumping noise, then disappears.

IT MIGHT HURT SALES

Detroit is fearful that such noise characteristics might hurt sales. The industry believes that "new car customers will not tolerate this condition," and more than 90 per cent of the current models are equipped with rayon tires.

The nylon producers have brought out new types of cord that virtually eliminate flat spotting now, however, and there are reports in Akron that the fabric may begin to improve its showing.

The American auto companies have also avoided the radial-ply tire because of esthetic problems. In conventional tires, the fabric runs diagonally across the face of the tire from one side to the other.

In radial-ply tires, the fabric runs straight across, and on top of this there is a belt of fabric or wire running around the tire beneath the tread.

The belts serve as a hoop for the tire to travel on, and this arrangement produces better gas mileage as well as greatly improved tread wear. The tire is quite popular in Europe, especially in France.

Despite some minor handling problems, the biggest difficulty with radial-ply tires is ride. The stiffer belted tire rides harsher, and American engineers have said that use of the tire would require them to change the suspension systems of their automobiles.

"Detroit says to us," a tire official wryly remarked, "We make these perfectly desirable automobiles, see. We want you to give us dancing slippers to put on them, not clodhoppers."

Some of the tire companies appear to be considering the suspension changes they believe necessary to accommodate radial-ply tires. The General Motors Corporation, which already offers 62 different makes and sizes of tires, seems the least interested. A G.M. engineer gave radial-ply tires a 50 per cent chance of becoming an original equipment item.

Despite all the attention to esthetics, there is evidence that the differences in ride are often exaggerated. A recent visitor to Goodyear headquarters in Akron asked for a test drive on supposedly "hard" tires and supposedly "soft" ones.

The visitor made the examination along with a public relations representative of the company. Neither of them knew which set of tires was which, and when it was over they were asked to evaluate which was "hard" and which "soft."

Despite the supposedly striking differences, the two men came up with opposite views on which tire was the harder. The public relations man was wrong.

The same size, grade and brand of tire have somewhat different performance characteristics on different automobiles because of the drive to suit esthetic factors to the specific cars.

Even a tire company's "100-level" or new car tire, while appearing the same on the outside, might have as many as 35 variations for as many models. Almost all of them would reflect Detroit's constant attempt at a perfect ride.

A major issue in Detroit's handling of its new car tires is how serious esthetic improvements detract from performance characteristics. The engineers insist they never go beyond "certain limits" while the critics argue that the "limits," whatever they are, appear to go too far.

The industry's viewpoint was summed up by Ross R. Ormsby, president of the Rubber Manufacturers Association.

Mr. Ormsby advocated state tire inspection laws and declared that "the major tire safety problem" is "continued use on the highways of worn out, damaged and abused tires."

Even increased care and inspection of tires by individual motorists would reduce the dangers, the industry believes.

The critics, both in and out of Congress, are pressing a bill that unanimously passed the Senate last March. That measure would allow the Government to set its own minimum standards for tire safety. In addition, it would call for a system of grading tires on quality and performance so that consumers could readily compare brands and levels of tires.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted last week to include similar tire legislation in the more comprehensive highway safety bill that is also under consideration.

Floor action is not expected in the House for another month or so. The final disposition of the measure may silence the current debate over grading, but improvements in tire reliability are sure to remain a vital concern to millions of the nation's motorists.

NOTED ARTIST TEACHES AT MARYLAND INSTITUTE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Maryland Institute, in Baltimore, has long been instrumental in training America's young, aspiring artists. Like all other educational institutions in the State of Maryland, the institute searches for faculty members who will bring to the school and its students the benefits of their education, their experience, and their skill. It is with just pride and pleasure that the Maryland Institute and the city of Baltimore have welcomed renowned American artist Grace Hartigan. Miss Hartigan brings her skill and talent to the graduate students at the institute and adds to Baltimore's cultural atmosphere by exhibiting her work.

The Baltimore Sun printed an article on Miss Hartigan's contributions to Baltimore and to the Maryland Institute. I ask unanimous consent to insert a portion of this article in the RECORD.

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

A CITY DRAWS A NOTED ARTIST

(By Gabrielle Wise)

Baltimore's working for me now," says artist Grace Hartigan of the turn her creative energies are taking. "Working for me visually, as the lower East Side was in 1956, 1957 and 1958."

Far from being bogged down in a city considered pale next to New York, this giant among American painters reflects that her move to Baltimore about five years ago "was great timing."

What was then working for both Miss Hartigan and this city was "Autumn Harvest," the painting a man bought at her one-man show in Washington. The man was Dr. Winston H. Price, epidemiologist at the Johns Hopkins Hospital, who later became Miss Hartigan's husband. "It turns out he bought the art and the artist, too," she said.

As Dr. Price's interest in her became apparent, Miss Hartigan related. "I wouldn't let him buy any more, and then I began to give him paintings."

THE RIGHT TIME

Yes, she said, "It was the right time. I was getting ready to go to Long Island anyway, I had bought a Victorian house. The pressures of New York were getting unbearable."

For a while in New York, though, "it was a close-knit young life and I was part of the avant garde—poets, musicians, painters, sculptors. But you can't go on eternally joining new avant gardes as each one scatters and you're not part of it any more.

"Baltimore is better than Long Island. Baltimore is still a city, a major city. I love it, and my work here. Although it's different from New York in its intellectual life, it's urban life in another city.

"It's a common experience with creative people in the late thirties or forties, after they've achieved their reputation, to seek a more secluded life in order to contemplate."

STUDENTS' SEMINARS

Miss Hartigan's enthusiasm about life in Baltimore includes her seminars for graduate students at the Maryland Institute. The schedule calls such sessions from 1 to 3:30 P.M. on Wednesdays, but there is no guarantee they won't go on and on as the young spirits dictate.

Her vitality as a painter spills over into activities with the people who have wound up in the institute seminars. "This is my second year," she explained. "Last year I inherited my students. This year I was choosing them myself from about 70 applicants, which were then narrowed down to 15 or 20.

"It's pretty informal and they give me a free hand. It's an exchange of ideas, guided by a person who's older and has greater experience—which is me. It's very flexible.

"What I do most often is go to the students and talk to each one privately and then they talk to each other." You can do this on the graduate level, she said, terming the informal exchange of personal experiences "very unconventional."

Not long ago, Miss Hartigan said, "I found myself with some sculpture students. The Wednesday afternoon seminars are for graduate students, and that includes sculpture students, too."

ABSORBED WITH SCULPTURE

Louise Marino, one of those absorbed with sculpture at the moment, has her B.S. from the Philadelphia College of Art, and expects to get her master's at the Maryland Institute. Then she hopes to go to Italy.

She has been working on a bust of General Pershing for the Garden of Patriots in Cape Coral, Fla., and will be competing in the National Collegiate Sculpture Awards program.

Miss Hartigan, making her rounds with the students, commented that "she's suffering every moment—but I'm having fun."

"They're all individuals, and after four years of art school have all achieved a certain amount of direction."

She said these young artists, although of course aware of the trends of the day, hadn't yet concerned themselves with either Op or Pop art.

But in the area of illusion, and experimentation with a variety of techniques, mention was made of the shaped canvases being used by some, the non-flat surfaces achieved by building skeletons which protrude as the canvas is stretched on them.

THE VISUAL WORLD

There are always new ways of expressing the visual world, Miss Hartigan said, and the student artists are never asleep at the switch. "I love them all—they're darling," Miss Hartigan enthused.

Of her being selected for the art school seminars, she commented, "They thought I could give them a situation that was mutually exciting—they think I have a good eye and therefore I'm valuable in this case.

"After they leave me they're going to go into the professional world. I benefit from their youth and enthusiasm. But I'm selfish—I wouldn't do it if I didn't get a great deal from it too."

Grace Hartigan is representing the plastic arts at Kent State University's "Festival of the Arts" this week. On this occasion she is sharing the platform with poet-critic John Ciardi, representing the literary arts, and musician Erroll Garner, the performing arts.

During the celebration she also has a one-man painting and college exhibition, and a lecture on "The Artist and His Works." Participation in a panel discussion is on the schedule there, as well as visits to the Kent State art students' classes for informal criticism.

Miss Hartigan readily acknowledges the influences of Willem de Kooning and Jackson Pollock, with emphasis on the former. Speaking of their great impact on her, she said, "Their dedication is similar, but their expression different."

During the war Grace Hartigan worked as a mechanical draftsman in Newark, N.J. and New York, and painted on weekends. She recalls that painting "sort of took over—it sneaked up on me."

She studied painting with Isaac Lane Muse in Newark, and there, in a class of about fifteen, became aware of modern art. "Isaac was not a terribly good teacher because he taught painting as though it were design," she said. And it was after her exposure to artists like de Kooning and Pollock that she realized the difference between design and art.

FIRST EFFORTS

"In all honesty," she recalls, her first efforts at painting "showed absolutely no talent, and if it had not been for my teacher Isaac Lane Muse, who valued creative imagination and feeling above skill, I might not have had the courage to persist."

It was not until 1949 that her paintings began to give her hope of eventually reaching a full expression, and it was then, after a year of painting in Mexico, that she felt she had some work that could be shown.

In New York she met a group of younger artists who attended the fiery meetings and discussions at Studio 35 on Eighth street, and they organized a painting show there. A large canvas Miss Hartigan had painted in Mexico was selected for exhibit and attracted much attention, and in January, 1951, she was the first painter to have a one-man show at the newly established Tibor de Nagy Gallery.

A visitor to the institute's gallery at the old Mount Royal Station wanted to know the name of one of Miss Hartigan's works on view there.

"That's 'Wilma'," she answered.

"What?" the visitor asked further.

"Remember Buck Rogers? That's his girl friend. But the art critics thought it was a nude," she countered with some amusement.

AN INSPIRATION

One abstraction from the visual world, in this case the city Miss Hartigan now considers abundant source material, is "Hobby Shop Human." This work, she said, had as its inspiration a do-it-yourself family kit she discovered in a shopping center.

The age of the shopping center came through also in a painting called "Reisterstown Mall." Its creator volunteered that "it's complex, it's modern life in capsule form. I wanted it to encompass as many things as life itself—it's a symbol of urban life.

"The images are metaphors. I know every single image in it," she said.

"It's not important for my students to be moved the way I am," Miss Harrigan continued. Whether the observer knows all the images in her work is not too important. "But I want him to be moved. I want him to feel involved in some way," she said.

And it is a satisfaction at this point in Miss Hartigan's career that she is involved with Baltimore.

THE HEROISM OF BOBBY GREENWELL AND CHARLES "CHICK" TAYLOR OF LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, deeds of extraordinary heroism at extreme personal risk too frequently go unnoticed in this day and age. For that reason, I wish to recognize the gallantry of two young Louisville men, 17-year-old Bobby Greenwell and Chick Taylor, 21, in rescuing a woman motorist from her blazing automobile following an accident on June 22.

I join the Louisville community in saluting their heroism, and I ask unanimous consent that a story describing the incident and an editorial commending their bravery, as published in the Louisville Courier-Journal, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, June 24, 1966]

100 WATCH BRAVE YOUTHS—TWO SAVE DRIVER FROM FIERY DEATH

About 10:30 Wednesday night Mrs. Dorothy Jones was backing out of a driveway at 1029 S. Western Parkway when her car was struck by another auto. It burst into flames.

Mrs. Jones was lying dazed and badly bruised on the front seat.

Within seconds a crowd of about 100 gathered, but no one dared to approach the flaming wreckage.

Four teen-agers driving north on the parkway heard the crash and saw the burning car. They screeched to a stop and 17-year-old Bobby Greenwell jumped from the back seat.

Amid the shouting and confusion, someone in the crowd yelled, "There's a woman in that car!"

Bobby recalled yesterday that he moved closer to the wreckage but could see no one inside.

"Yes, sir!" someone shouted. "She's in there!"

Bobby ran to the car, breaking away from the two girls in his group, who tried to hold him back.

Another youth burst from the crowd to help—21-year-old Charles (Chick) Taylor.

The car door cracked open a few inches. They knew for sure someone was inside, and they forced the door open the rest of the way.

Chick grabbed the injured woman's shoulders. Bobby took her legs. Once they were clear of the wreckage, the car's gas tank exploded, spewing flames in all directions.

The seat where Mrs. Jones had been lying only seconds before was consumed by fire.

Mrs. Jones, 43, of 3335 Greenwood, was taken to Methodist Evangelical Hospital for emergency treatment. She was later admitted to Jewish Hospital, where she is recovering from severe lacerations and a knee injury.

Neither Bobby nor Chick was injured.

"I don't know what made me do it," Bobby said yesterday with a hint of embarrassment. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. James D. Greenwell, 1703 Vivian Lane, and is a senior at Trinity High School.

Chick, an employe at General Electric's Applicance Park, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jesse B. Taylor, 1100 Plato Terrace. His father is a detective on the Louisville police force and his brother, Jesse Taylor Jr., is a fireman.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, June 24, 1966]

THERE ARE HEROES HERE IN LOUISVILLE

Some people believe that acts of heroism in civilian life are a thing of the past. They are influenced by stories of callous crowds who see a person exposed to deadly danger and do not lift a finger to help.

Some people also hold that young Americans are too selfish or too apathetic to care about the plight of a human being in deep trouble.

All such people should meet two young citizens of Louisville, 17-year-old Bobby Greenwell and 21-year-old Charles (Chick) Taylor. Bobby happens to be white, Chick a Negro.

Both youths responded with instant courage and resourcefulness when they saw a car burning on Western Parkway Wednesday night, and heard from bystanders that a woman was trapped in the front seat.

Bobby jumped out of a passing vehicle and raced to the burning automobile. Chick ran to join him. Together they pried open the car door and lifted out Mrs. Dorothy Jones, who was dazed and injured.

Seconds later the car's gas tank exploded in flames, instantly consuming the seat on which she had lain.

Praised for their actions, the boys seemed more embarrassed than proud. The pride belongs to their fellow townsmen, aware that young people live here who can behave as true heroes, no matter how much they shun the title.

EXPLOITING THE OCEAN

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on June 28, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall addressed the Marine Technology Society Conference here in Washington, D.C., on "Exploiting the Ocean," a subject that is of utmost importance to us all. His remarks reflect my own thinking very closely in regard to the importance of developing fish protein concentrate to alleviate nutrition needs of humans the world over and the need to expand our national role in oceanography and marine resource development.

In addition to discussing the work of his Department, Secretary Udall defines the very needs that prompted me to sponsor S. 2720 to authorize the construction of pilot plants for the production of fish protein concentrates; S. 2218, to establish a 12-mile restricted zone along our coasts wherein we will be free to practice conservation of fisheries resources as we deem advisable; and S. 944, the Marine Resources and Development Act of 1966, which is the most important single piece of legislation yet to expand and coordinate our national effort in marine sciences and marine resource development.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

To my knowledge this is the largest and most representative group of industrial, academic and government specialists ever to assemble for the purpose of discussing our Nation's total programs and policies on ocean resources. Your conference is timely and appropriate.

Your plans for this conference have been of great interest to me and the top officials of the Department. Your concern and interests in ocean resources strongly parallel our own and thus, I am pleased to be with you today and to have an opportunity to discuss with you some of the issues relative to a progressive nationwide program on marine resources.

The Marine Technology Society is performing a unique and necessary function in providing a good forum for discussion amongst all who would exploit the ocean. The resource situations in which we find ourselves are changing rapidly today. While we have adequate supplies of protein, and

of most minerals, chemicals and construction materials for domestic use, there are worldwide shortages of these materials.

Our Nation's self-sufficiency in supply versus consumption is not assured for many metals and minerals that are in common use. Some very important items for which we depend on imports are iron ore, zinc, lead, silver, fluorspar and bauxite. The trend is towards a decrease in self-sufficiency for these materials.

Since 1960 we have depended more and more on imported edible fishery products. In 1960 we imported 41 percent of our fish for direct human consumption. In 1963 we imported 50.2 percent.

With the rapidly advancing technology of the developing countries we will in time face increased competition for natural resources from foreign suppliers. This, combined with our position of world leadership in the aid of the lesser developed countries, requires that we look far ahead and that we take steps now that will guarantee an adequate supply of resources in the future.

The oceans are nearly a whole new continent to be explored for potential resources. For example, just the United States Continental Shelf out to a depth of 200 meters contains a land area of 850,000 square miles if all the water was removed. This is nearly one-quarter the area of the 50 States in the United States. There is reason to believe that the productive potential for petroleum, gas, minerals and chemicals from this area equals or exceeds that of the adjacent land. The water that covers the potential resources should no longer be regarded as an impenetrable barrier to their discovery and use. The rapidly advancing technology of offshore oil drilling, submarines for research and exploration, the United States Navy sea-labs and man's venture into the sea are ample proof that in time we will conquer the water barrier.

We know enough now to define the problems for research, exploration and considerable engineering development on the Continental Shelf. The time is at hand for this Nation to proceed with a well organized, and substantial program for the discovery and development of the full potential of ocean resources.

Natural resources and programs of the Department of the Interior are nearly synonymous. We are concerned with the geologic and technical framework which supports our Nation's mineral and petroleum industries, and we perform research and management functions for a wide variety of living resources. Interior is the custodian of vast public lands and administers the policies on public use of these lands including resources developments.

We are not strangers in the realm of ocean resources. Our programs in marine fisheries and biological oceanography are familiar to many here. Much of our marine geological work has aided offshore petroleum discovery. In recent years we have begun to turn the attention of marine geologists and engineers to questions of sea mining. In fact, we now regard our programs and responsibilities for ocean resources to be an extension of the same responsibilities that we have for conservation and development of land resources.

I would like to tell you of the highlights of Interior's marine resources program, and outlooks and also comment on future needs. One can easily recognize many resource uses of the oceans. Some are recreation and enjoyment of a sea-scape, fresh water, electric power or as a receptacle of wastes. But the big potential producers are fish and other protein sources, oil, gas, minerals and chemicals and construction materials.

You have heard from Dr. Chapman yesterday of the status and world outlook for fishery resources. I would like to add emphasis to his remarks by stressing the potential of fish protein concentrate as the major source of new protein to help the protein deficient populations throughout the world. Less than half the world's people have enough protein. The amount of animal protein needed by today's world population to supplement present cereal-based diets could be obtained by products from a 30 percent increase in the world fish catch. Unless other sources of equally effective, but low-cost, animal-like protein can be found, the catch will need to be doubled within the next 25 years to keep up with anticipated growth in the human population.

Although we believe marine fishery resources have this potential, such a harvest cannot be realized on a sustained basis unless we obtain far more knowledge than we now possess of the ocean, its properties and processes.

We still do not know how many fish are in the sea. Estimates of possible world increase in harvest range from two to about ten times the present production.

To determine what the increase in production can be on a sustainable basis much information and imaginative new research and engineering undertakings are required.

New tools for research are needed such as new ways of observing marine life from submarines or use of sea-lab-type facilities.

There needs to be better understanding of many factors ranging from fish physiology and genetics to the control of pollution to preserve production in coastal and estuarine waters.

Little research has been done in this country on use of sea weeds or of the small sea life in plankton as human food. And, there are many species of fish which are not now in favor although they abound in the sea. New processing techniques are needed to make these species acceptable as food. We might ask if too much of our fish catch is going into animal feeds rather than being used as food directly by humans. Is this the most efficient use of our natural protein resources?

Full utilization of the vast latent marine fishery resources will depend on engineering to bridge the gap between scientific findings and industrial application. There are needs now in underwater observation, search and detection, fish guidance, herding and attraction, catching and in all aspects of fishing ship operations. This is the fishery challenge to ocean engineering.

Except in some cases we view ocean mining as a long-range development with such a high risk that the government must help wherever possible. Yet the potential in the vast underwater shelves and in the deeps could be so great that basic geologic studies and development of a marine mining technology at least partially at government expense is entirely logical. In Interior we are undertaking this job as rapidly as we can muster the resources to do so. Even the initial rewards in terms of discovery by our programs and others are so promising that marine specialists in my Department predict a substantial mineral production from ocean-based resources within ten years.

At present we feel the most urgent need is to supply the basic geologic, structural and compositional maps of the known and expected mineable areas. Such work is equally useful for oil as well as mineral interests. This is now being done by the Geological Survey. The effort is not as large as we would like it to be but it has produced striking results. For example, there has been discovery of possible source beds of petroleum in the Atlantic, delineation of large gravel deposits off New Jersey, and descriptions of pavement-like deposits of manganese on the Blake Plateau off northern Florida and Georgia.

Through the Bureau of Mines we are helping to broaden the capabilities of industry to develop sea mining systems. Several government-industry joint ventures are now in effect and Walt Hibbard, Director of the Bureau of Mines, assures me that he would welcome new ventures in the interest of providing a greater focus on engineering developments for marine mining.

Mining in the ocean requires the same logical approach as does mining on dry land. First, a deposit has to be discovered. Then it has to be evaluated as to its probable economic significance. After it is well delineated a production and processing system could be developed for actual exploitation. Practically no experience is available to guide the marine miner, thus new concepts for recovery of sea floor minerals must be developed, particularly for deep water use. Even the processing of ores may be done, in some cases, at sea to minimize the transportation costs involved.

As the technology is being developed, now is the time to insure that the mining of marine minerals is compatible with other interests in the sea such as fisheries, recreation or navigation.

We must begin to learn what tendency mining operations will have to shift oceanic currents, increase sedimentation, create wastes, and in turn study the impact such alterations will have on local ecology, shoreline processes, and related environmental factors. This is the type of situation which will require close cooperation amongst oceanographers, industry and State and Federal programs.

At this stage of marine mineral resource development, I would encourage those of you in industry to take a strong lead wherever possible. I would hope you will tell us where government can help most appropriately with the research and engineering programs we have. You should tell us what information you will need and how we can help the various interests work together.

Recently, as a result of ratification of international law adopted at the 1958 Geneva Convention, we have been giving new attention to requirements for management of resources of the Continental Shelf. If our Nation is to realize the potential of this store of resources it will be through the combined efforts of all government agencies working in cooperation with coastal States, industry, and in appropriate cases with foreign nations. Such efforts must take place within the context of effective laws if we are to formulate a sound policy for prudent resource development and management.

The system of laws under which our public land resources are administered is sorely in need of revision and updating. It is a confusing patchwork of laws, regulations and Executive Orders, judicial pronouncements and ineffective stop-gap measures. Operating under these laws is difficult. Yet the Secretary of the Interior is charged with the responsibility to assure that the non-renewable resources are developed and used wisely and that renewable resources make their full contribution to the progress and prosperity of the country.

As we work ahead in the future I hope we will benefit from the lessons learned from administration of land resources. The development of a comprehensive and workable set of laws for the administration of resources on and beyond the Continental Shelf will not be an easy task. It is complicated by the peculiar nature of the resources and the complex network of Federal, State and international interests therein.

At this time I would recommend a study of the legislative changes needed to support a government policy to encourage industrial development of marine mineral resources that are on and underneath the seabed. We need to learn what controls the fair market value return from Outer Continental Shelf minerals and to find ways of guaranteeing

proprietary rights following appropriate expenditure of industrial funds for identification and delineation of ocean-bed minerals. You are discussing this subject at some length in this conference and I look forward to the results of your deliberations.

I believe the "Marine Resources and Development Act of 1966" which President Johnson signed on June 17 will be of great benefit to the development of new laws, outlooks and programs for all marine resources. The policy and objectives stated in this Act, which for the first time gives a national policy on marine science, are excellent goals for the Nation to seek. I look forward to serving on the "National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development"—Interior staffs will cooperate with the Council and commission to the fullest extent possible. The planning for opportunities in marine science research and development which lie ahead must concern a spectrum of organizations and interests including industry, the Congress and representatives of the Executive Branch. The broad studies to be undertaken under this new Act will give new emphasis and progress to oceanography.

These are not easy times and the demand for large Federal expenditures grows day by day. We are assisting Viet Nam defend itself from Communist aggression and the cost prudently affects the funds available for new areas of research and explorations. However, we have a substantial national program in marine sciences which is well organized and in many ways adequately equipped. Interior's expenditures for oceanography will exceed twenty million in fiscal year 1967. This is the third from the top in levels of effort in this field carried out by Federal Government agencies.

We appreciate the leadership which the U.S. Navy has given to the National Oceanographic effort. Their development of deep submergence systems and advanced man-in-the-sea capabilities will have a direct benefit to pursuit of fishery, oil and mineral resources. The National Science Foundation, in close cooperation with the Office of Naval Research and other agencies, has given excellent support to the basic marine sciences.

Progress in research over the past several years has brought us to the point where practical applications and new industrial enterprises are just around the corner.

In its role as a Department of Natural Resources, Interior has a wide range of authorities and responsibilities which apply to ocean as well as land resources. It is not our intention to draw the line at the water's edge. For years we have held a position of national and international leadership in marine fishery research, management and conservation. Now many new opportunities are on the horizon, not only for fisheries and other protein supplies but for mining and drilling for oil and chemicals—activities whch we traditionally think of as confined to the land. It is my intent that Interior will play a major role along with all who are in the national resource scene and who are looking to the future when we will know and use all that the oceans hold in store for us.

CIVIC PRIDE AND PROGRESS IN BALTIMORE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, like other large American cities, Baltimore, Md., has been plagued with the problems of shifting population, moving industry, and urban blight. Baltimore, however, is not patiently waiting for what had seemed to be its inevitable reduction to sprawling suburbs. Business leaders in the city decided to act, and to act decisively. Plans to change the face of the city were formulated and are now in the process of being implemented.

The Charles Center project calls for the rebuilding of the center city area and the relocation of private business and public offices. The inner harbor project aims at the beautification and utilization of the part of the city that borders on the now unsightly and practically useless harbor area. An article by Gerald W. Johnson, renowned political columnist in an April issue of the New Republic explains Baltimore's attempt to bring people, business, culture, and beauty back into the urban area. I am sure that Baltimore's efforts will be of interest to those in other cities confronted with the same problems, and I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Johnson's article in the RECORD.

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

BALTIMORE MIGHT MAKE IT

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

Something has happened to the city of Baltimore in the past six years. Whether what has happened presages the city's salvation or its utter, irretrievable ruin is as yet on the knees of the gods. The ultimate decision, indeed, does not rest with Baltimore. It waits upon an answer to the question of whether any large American city can resist the centrifugal forces that tend to disject and destroy it as a city and reduce it to an amorphous congeries of suburbs, such as Los Angeles.

For a hundred years Baltimore has had to endure failure after failure until it became inured to defeat. It began with the devastation of its commercial satrapy, the South, by the Civil War, followed by the collapse of the financial structure of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the collapse of the jobber as middleman between manufacturer and retailer, the collapse of fast trans-atlantic mail and passenger service, and the collapse of coastwise shipping even to the Chesapeake Bay lines. Steel, chemicals and petroleum products flourished but they were controlled from other places. In March, 1966 the last but one, locally-owned department store was sold to Nebraska interests. In any sizable undertaking Baltimore enterprise seemed to be a consistent flop.

So when a group of some 150 to 200 business leaders—most of them young or youngish, although the bellwether is a retired department-store executive already in his sixties—formulated their plans a little over a six years ago, prompt and undeniable success was the one thing with which Baltimore was utterly unprepared to deal. True, their project was a relatively modest one: wreck 211 buildings covering 22 acres in the heart of the downtown business district and replace them with something in more shapely form at a cost of a hundred millions, give or take a dozen millions.

The elapsed time was estimated at 10 years, but in the first quarter of its sixth year the project is one-fourth completed and in operation, one-half under construction, and another eighth on the drawing boards. Initially the 22 acres were divided into 17 parcels, of which three now remain in the hands of the agency. Bids have been received for all three, but rejected because it was the judgment of the holders that the bidders could not, or would not, meet the rigid requirements for building in that area.

The contribution of the federal government consists of the erection of one office building to house some of its Baltimore agencies, plus reimbursement to the city of part of its expense in rebuilding streets and relocating utilities. The contribution of the city was about $10 million, which is viewed with complacence because the increase of tax revenues from the area—assuming no increase in the present rate—will be better than $2.5 million annually. Demolition proceeded gradually, so the city did not lose all revenue from the area during the renewal, but if it had, it would still get its money back in six or eight years. The financial success of the project, therefore, is assured even if the three remaining parcels remain unsold. There is, in fact, some sentiment favoring the city's retaining the three as small downtown parks, in addition to the three open spaces in the original plan.

The visible effects of this job are already impressive, but they are as nothing compared to the psychological effect on a comatose community. It is as if one had exploded a bomb on the island of the lotus eaters. The confusion is prodigious and the alarm considerable, but there has also been a genuine awakening among groups whose influence is out of all proportion to their numbers. Certainly among the most completely wide-awake—and perhaps also among the most startled—are the members of the Greater Baltimore Committee that launched the project. They had hopes, but no hopes of such rapid and complete success, and they are correspondingly emboldened. Now that private enterprise has succeeded with the Charles Center project to house private business, they are backing a three-times-larger project that will include a number of public buildings—one for the school board, a municipal office building, a new police headquarters and an office building for the Port Authority.

But the heart of the project, the breathtaking element, is the proposal to convert the inner harbor from the colossal cesspool that it is now into an ornamental water surrounded—except for a marina—by recreational, educational and residential facilities. The inner harbor, where the Bay boats used to land passengers from Philadelphia, Norfolk and Washington in the very heart of the city, is now almost valueless commercially. It is too shallow to receive the huge tankers and ore-carriers that serve the steel mills and refineries facing the outer harbor but, cleaned up, it would be a wonderful expanse for pleasure craft. The figures for the whole project are about 300 million and 20 years.

After Charles Center, the typical Baltimorean listens to that and doesn't bat an eye. That, not the rising mountains of steel and glass, is the real miracle.

For the municipal history of Baltimore is a fascinating demonstration in miniature of Toynbee's challenge-and-response theory of the life of a civilization. Three times the very existence of Baltimore has been sternly challenged. Twice the city overcompensated and flourished; but the third challenge was too much, and it slowly sank from second to sixth city and twelfth metropolitan district. The first challenge was the climactic war of the long struggle for national independence, the clash of 1812. Baltimore met the challenge by beating off the attack, and it overcompensated by developing the Baltimore clipper, originally designed as a blockade-runner, into a commerce raider so efficient that under letters of marque and reprisal it brought in spoils that founded several great Baltimore fortunes; and after the war, enlarged and strengthened, it became the clipper ship dominating the Asian trade to such an extent that a whole section of Baltimore is known to this day as Canton.

The second challenge came when the Cumberland Road—alias the National Pike, the first successful breach of the Appalachian massif barring the way to the West—was circumvented by "Clinton's ditch," from Buffalo to Albany and connecting the Great Lakes to New York by water. Baltimore's response was the railroad, the first built as a common carrier in America. It was overcompensation. Once the rails of the Baltimore and Ohio reached Wheeling, in what is now West Virginia, Baltimore's status as one of the great American cities was unquestioned.

"What care though rival cities soar
Along the stormy coast,
Penn's town, New York, and Baltimore,
If Boston knew the most!"

is no doubt a left-handed compliment, but the obvious wistfulness in Emerson's quatrain is nevertheless a compliment.

But the third challenge, the Civil War, was too much. Not only was Baltimore's primary market, the South, destroyed, but its secondary market, the West, was largely preempted by rivals because for four years the B & O had had to be used almost exclusively for troop movement, what time it wasn't being repaired after Confederate raids. Far worse, though, was the psychological damage. The handful of great mercantile houses that did not fold, survived by grimly hanging on to such fragments as were left. The safe four percent, the banker's ideal, became the ideal of all Baltimore businessmen. Its great entrepreneurs were now investment bankers, insurance executives and bondsmen. This money-changing it mistook for finance, disdaining the calculated risk that produces the large profit. Against the challenge of the St. Lawrence Seaway it had no response at all. But in a dynamic, fiercely competitive economy the safe four percent, well enough for a bank, is suicidal for a business community. By clinging to it Baltimore has successively lost its railroad, lost its wholesale houses, lost part of its shipping, lost its corporation home offices, lost ownerships of its department stores, and is now losing its population.

This last loss is, of course, common to all big American cities. The people have not left the area. They have simply moved to the outskirts—in the case of Baltimore, 700,000 of them—to become leeches, drawing sustenance from the central city and using its facilities without paying any part of the cost of their maintenance. Baltimore is exceptionally unfortunate, however, in that it is not only bled directly by its own suburbanites, but indirectly by another 700,000 clustered around the District of Columbia and diverting part of the resources of the state of Maryland that might otherwise accrue to the benefit of Baltimore. Nor has the city escaped any of the afflictions common to other large cities—a rotten-borough system as putrid as that of New York state and almost as bad as Michigan's official corruption and political leadership that, allowing for a handful of startling exceptions, is so feeble that it makes a jellyfish seem like a fire-spitting dragon.

It is against these foes that the crusaders of the Greater Baltimore Committee have sallied out to battle. In Charles Center they have proved that the reconstruction problem can be solved, but they know that the solution merely opens the way to harder problems—mass transit, slum clearance, water and air pollution, police protection, etc., etc., etc., almost *ad infinitum*. They know that a successful attack on any of these calls first for a reorganization of the political divisions of the metropolitan area in such a way as to bring the full strength of a population of two million to bear upon the people's common problems.

Most important of all, they have at least adumbrated, if they have not clearly perceived, a truth that escapes the philosophy of the safe four percent. It is the truth that while men and women do visit the central business district to purchase ships, and shoes, and sealing wax, that is not their only, nor even their most compelling motive. They also come downtown in search of wonder and delight; and if these are not supplied, bargain sales alone cannot supply the lack. If part of the street crowds rejoice in statuary and vistas, and another part in saloons and strip-teasers, a successful city must appeal to them all, and monotony, even magnificent monotony, will not do it.

So they are placing among the office buildings in Charles Center the first legitimate theater erected outside of New York in 30 years; and they are searching ardently for a restaurant that will make Duncan Hines revise his standards upward.

ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, American wheat farmers continue to pay the price of a self-defeating U.S. trade policy with reference to the sales of American grain to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, mainland China, and other countries with similar governments.

While our Canadian friends are making enormous sales of wheat to the Chinese and the Soviets, we continue to pay our farmers to cut back on production. Why anyone would regard such policies as in the interest of the United States escapes me entirely. This point is very well made in an editorial in the July fourth issue of the Farmers Union Herald entitled "Are We Asleep at the Switch?"

I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

ARE WE ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH?

Canadians are jubilant over their record breaking sale of $800-million worth of wheat and flour to the Soviet Union during the next three years. This is the biggest single commercial grain transaction in the history of international trade. Russia will pay in cash as the wheat is put aboard ships in Canada. The entire Canadian economy will benefit.

Canada has maintained normal trade relations with Russia on agricultural commodities for 10 years. It has sold a billion dollars worth of wheat and flour to the Soviets in the past four years, exclusive of the new contract.

Except for the United States, nearly all the rest of the world now buys and sells in the international market with little ideological distinction, at least as far as Russia and the East Europe communist nations are concerned. Congress and some American labor organizations and other groups continue to prevent enlargement of U.S. trade in this area.

President Johnson recently asked Congress for discretionary authority to extend normal tariff treatment to European communist countries when it is in our national interest to do so, but he was rebuffed. Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, declared that he personally would block such action by refusing to bring up the proposal in committee.

Meanwhile, Italy's big Fiat company has entered into a $320-million deal with Russia to build an entire automobile factory in the Ukraine. French and Japanese auto manufacturers are negotiating for smaller related contracts. West Germany's Krupp is engaged in a large joint undertaking with Poland to expand industry there. Italian ship builders are constructing vessels for the Soviet. Britain is actively going after Russian contracts. There is strong feeling abroad that normal trade relations promote peaceful coexistence.

It would appear that in the matter of international trade, either all the world is out of step but the United States, or else the U.S. is the one not in normal cadence with the times.

The business daily, the New York Journal of Commerce, says it would be sensible for America to liberalize its foreign trade policies. Congressman MILLS' attitude, it feels is one of "biting off your nose to spite your face." The communist nations, whether behind the Iron, Bamboo or Sugar Cane curtains, is a small percentage of all world trade, but dollar-wise it is large and growing and there is no good reason why the United States . . . shouldn't have a more adequate share in it."

(Reprinted from the St. Paul Dispatch.)

OUR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, although public attention is usually riveted on the military phase in the struggle in Vietnam, there is another phase to that struggle which is of equal significance and in which we have been making notable progress. I refer to our efforts to bring tangible proof to the people of South Vietnam that their future will be better than their past. Our progress in this other phase of the struggle in southeast Asia will be just as decisive a factor in determining the outcome as any military success, no matter how spectacular.

President Johnson has said:

In Vietnam communism seeks to really impose its will by force of arms. But we would be deeply mistaken to think that this was the only weapon. Here, as other places in the world, they speak to restless people—people rising to shatter the old ways which have imprisoned hope—people fiercely and justly reaching for the material fruits from the tree of modern knowledge * * *. It is, therefore, our task to show that freedom from the control of other nations offers the surest road to progress * * *. But it is not enough to call upon reason or point to examples. We must show it through action and we must show it through accomplishment * * *.

It is those accomplishments in South Vietnam, of which I think the American people are too little informed, which I would like to review briefly here today.

Our economic and social assistance to Vietnam began in 1954. Since that time, we have spent more than $2 billion for nonmilitary aid to the people of South Vietnam. And despite every effort by the Vietcong and the Government in Hanoi to frustrate or destroy economic advances in the South, we have achieved great gains.

In the last few years, hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese farmers and their children have been reached through the efforts of American farm experts. They have been given improved seeds and cuttings of onions, corn, sweet potatoes,

and sugarcane, as well as fertilizer and pesticides, to increase their crop yields. Insects and rodents formerly destroyed 30 to 40 percent of the crops in South Vietnam; by bringing such pests under better control, we have already saved nearly 100,000 tons of food.

Since 1954, thanks to American assistance, the people of South Vietnam have added 250,000 hectares of irrigated land to their agriculture. Last year, Vietnamese commercial fishermen caught 368,000 tons of fish, compared with 165,000 tons in 1959.

With U.S. encouragement, the Ky government has introduced new land reform measures. Permanent land titles have been given to peasant farmers now holding only provisional claims to the land they till. Some 500,000 acres of former French lands are in the process of being sold to small farmers on terms which they can afford. Another 700,000 acres of state-owned land will soon be distributed among 180,000 landless Vietnamese, most of whom are refugees from Vietcong-controlled areas.

At the end of this past April, incidentally, there were 933,000 such refugees, of which about 500,000 were still living in temporary shelters. The others have either returned to their villages or been relocated.

U.S. direct-dollar assistance provides construction material, medical facilities, clothing, personnel costs, and nearly $8 million in food-for-peace commodities.

Progress in the fields of health and medicine has been equally impressive. Twelve thousand five hundred village and hamlet health stations have been established and stocked with medicines. Despite Vietcong harassment—and health workers are a favorite target, which speaks volumes about the sincerity of the Vietcongs' campaign to help the people of South Vietnam—the incidence of malaria has been held to 1.57 percent. More than 80 percent of the Vietnamese population living in malaria-infected areas are now protected from this disease.

New clinics and surgical facilities are now scattered throughout the nation. We are helping to build a medical school which will graduate as many doctors every year as now serve the entire civilian population of South Vietnam.

In education, we have also made great strides—again against the direct opposition of the Vietcong, who do not hesitate to destroy a new school building at the slightest opportunity.

When South Vietnam first achieved its independence, its educational system was run for the benefit of privileged classes. That is no longer true. Primary and secondary school enrollment in South Vietnam has quintupled. By early 1968, 13,000 new hamlet classrooms will have been built providing facilities for 780,000 schoolchildren. We have assisted the Government of Vietnam during the past 3 years to distribute more than 7 million text books. U.S.-supported programs in the hamlets of Vietnam are now graduating 2,500 instructors a year. Facilities are now available to provide Vietnam with 1,700 new elementary or secondary teachers every year, and more than 5,000 Vietnamese teachers have returned from health, agricultural, educational, and other studies in the United States and around the world.

Since 1962, U.S. aid has established four polytechnic schools and three vocational agricultural high schools. More than 10,000 Vietnamese students are now receiving vocational training that will have a profound effect on modernizing Vietnamese agriculture and industry.

When Vietnam was divided, the south possessed very little industrial capacity. Most of the industry was in the industrialized north. Today, there are more than 700 new or rehabilitated factories, ranging from textile mills to electronics manufacturers, which are part of a steadily expanding industrial base in South Vietnam.

Last year, alone, the United States financed 8 new industrial plants, and 51 expansions of existing facilities involving more than $7 million of imported equipment.

I believe that this is a highly creditable record—and it must be remembered that all this is going on under the tremendous handicap of a nation at war. None of it, of course, would be of any avail if the Communists were to succed in their campaign of violence and aggression. Our military effort in South Vietnam is the indispensable shield behind which our economic and social efforts and the efforts of the Vietnamese people—can be carried forward.

But we have not waited for the cessation of hostilities to begin the works of peace. We are even now attacking with all our strength the basic problems of illiteracy, poverty, and disease, which are the true breeding ground of communism and, indeed, the source of most of the violence that occurs in any society.

This second phase of the struggle in southeast Asia will continue long after the military phase has been brought to a successful conclusion. What the people of Vietnam want is peace and a better life. Neither they nor we nor any other nation can hope to secure a lasting peace if we fail to honor the just and imperative demands of millions of people on this planet for a better and brighter tomorrow.

I think it important that the American people—and the other peoples of the world—understand that the United States is today pursuing both ideals. Those twin goals are, in fact, the basis of all our foreign policies—and I believe that we are drawing steadily closer to the achievement of both.

SEVERNA PARK STUDENT DESIGNS CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have often risen on the floor to praise young Americans for their achievements. I would like to do so again. In the State of Maryland, the Anne Arundel County Community Cultural Center is being designed by a 17-year-old high school student. This young man, Gregory L. Martin, was selected to design the building as the result of a "talent hunt." He has thus been launched on an architectural career. It is gratifying to know that young men like Mr. Martin are achieving bigger and more important things at earlier ages than ever before.

I would like unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun regarding Gregory Martin and his project.

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

METRO YOUTHS IN THE NEWS: SEVERNA PARK STUDENT, 17, DESIGNING CULTURAL CENTER

(By David Runkel)

The first Anne Arundel County community cultural center is being designed by a high school student.

Gregory Lee Martin, 17, a senior at Severna Park High School, is drawing up the plans for the center, the main part of which will be a theater in the round.

The center is slated to be built within the next year on the shores of Lake Waterford near Pasadena. The county Department of Recreation and Parks will provide the funds to build the center and will partially finance a repertory theater company, which according to plans, will offer one play a month.

Young Martin, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Larry Martin, 10 Admiral road, Severna Park, was selected to design the building after a "talent hunt" in county high schools by Joseph L. Dorsey, recreation and parks department officials. The department got the idea from a florist in the county who had a student design his new store, according to Mr. Dorsey.

GIVEN FREE HAND

After selecting Martin, department officials "sat down with him and told him what we wanted." He was given a free hand from there on, Mr. Dorsey said.

Martin submitted his preliminary plans several weeks ago and the department made a few minor changes. The final plans and blueprints are now being drawn up by Martin, with the assistance of his shop instructor, Roger Willis.

The design for the building is still basically Martin's, Mr. Dorsey said.

More than half of the one-story building will be taken up by the theater. The stage will be 18 feet by 18 feet and will be 2 feet off the floor. There will be seats for 150 persons on all four sides, Mr. Dorsey said.

OTHER USES

Other parts of the building will be used for a ticket booth, lobby, rest rooms and locker rooms for persons using the athletic fields behind the center.

Beside the repertory company, Mr. Dorsey said, the center will be used for meetings, lectures, art exhibits, concerts by the county junior symphony and ballet recitals by county-sponsored ballet classes.

Start of work on the center will depend upon finances. There is some money in this year's budget for the project, but the exact construction cost has not been determined, Warren W. Kershow, department head, said.

It might be possible, he added, to use Neighborhood Youth Corps volunteers to get the building started. If everything goes according to schedule, the center could open in less than a year, Mr. Kershow said.

MALNUTRITION AS A FACTOR IN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we hear so often about lack of appreciation for our humanitarian efforts in the world that I felt special note should be taken of a dramatic "thank you" message from

17 million children of Latin America—the beneficiaries of the Operation Ninos school feeding programs sponsored by the Agency for International Development as part of the food-for-peace role in the Alliance for Progress.

The message, extending thanks to AID, the U.S. Senate, the House of Representatives, and to the American people, was sent on behalf of the 17 million children by 150 delegates from 17 countries who participated in an important meeting in Panama City from June 19 to June 25.

Another giant step has been taken in the direction of combating malnutrition among the children of the Western Hemisphere, and of increasing local government and private sector support of child feeding efforts, as a result of this Panama meeting, called "The Conference of the Americas on Malnutrition as a Vital Factor in Development."

Headed by President Marco Robles, of Panama, who keynoted the Conference with opening remarks, delegates from government, private industry, and private voluntary relief agencies and international agencies reported, debated, exchanged ideas, and collaborated in calls for new actions to be taken on behalf of the children of the hemisphere.

The Conference was held under the sponsorship of Operation Ninos, the AID-sponsored Alliance for Progress program which has helped bring about an increase of over 400 percent in the number of children being assisted in organized feeding programs in Latin America in just a little over 3 years.

Among the highlights of the Conference were the following:

A keynote address by His Excellency Marco Robles, President of the Republic of Panama in which he underscored the importance of combating malnutrition in order to promote individual health and happiness and community and national development.

An address by the Honorable GRAHAM PURCELL, of the Agricultural Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, in which he reaffirmed the pledge of the United States to work together with those nations possessing "a national will and determination to helps themselves."

A report on the nature and magnitude of the problem worldwide, demonstrating the irreversible nature of physical retardation brought about by malnutrition in the preschool years.

A report on additional research which continues to provide support to the evidence that child malnutrition may produce an irreversible mental retardation.

A paper by the Honorable Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of the Agency for International Development, and delivered by the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Material Resources of the Agency for International Development—Mr. John W. Johnston, Jr., in which he stressed the role of the private sector and called on governments to create a climate conducive to private investment in the "war on hunger."

In response to Mr. Waters' speech, a resolution by acclamation to send a message of gratitude to the American people from the 17 million children of the Americas benefiting from food-for-peace programs.

A call for greater quantities and improved quality of local food production by Dr. Moises Behar, Director of the Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama—INCAP.

A call for development of national food policies by the Latin American regional director of UNICEF, Dr. Oscar Vargas Mendez.

Presentation of a newly developed set of audiovisual aids to be used in local nutrition education programs.

A call for realistic action to achieve results "can we keep children from being used to advance the causes of politicians and instead use politicians to advance the cause of children."

Plans to establish a permanent Inter-American Secretariat in Latin America to coordinate activities, clear information, and plan future meetings.

An offer by James O'Connor, president of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation to cooperate with local communities in providing the financial support for such a secretariat.

The Conference had greater participation than ever before from private industry of North, Central, and South America.

The Conference confirmed that the conduct of research, the development and testing of new foods, the distribution of the foods by private voluntary agencies, by international agencies, and through commercial channels, are not ends in themselves—but rather means toward the end of combating malnutrition in young children and thus offering children the opportunity for healthy, happy, and productive lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the significant paper by Mr. Waters, entitled "Knowledge Gathering Dust," delivered in his behalf by his deputy when Mr. Waters canceled his personal participation in order to attend Senate hearings, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

KNOWLEDGE GATHERING DUST

(Remarks by the Honorable Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Before the Conference of the Americas on Malnutrition as a Factor in Development, Panama City, Panama, June 19–25, 1966, delivered for Mr. Waters by his deputy, John W. Johnston, Jr.)

Concern over child malnutrition is not new. Many dedicated people—many of them in this very room—have devoted much of their lives to this cause.

Under the Alliance for Progress, Operation Ninos has been an effective focal point of this concern.

This Conference of the Americas on Malnutrition as a Factor in Development reflects that concern—and reflects the new reason for a growing determination to do more about it.

Only comparatively recently have nations come to accept the fact that hunger and malnutrition can undermine and block sound economic development. The result has been a whole new degree of emphasis on tackling the problem.

Today's impressive keynote address, on the theme of national recognition of child malnutrition and its relationship to development, further emphasizes these facts:

There is growing national recognition—and growing international recognition—of the seriousness of child malnutrition problems.

And, basic to that growing national recognition, there is greater recognition of the relationship of child malnutrition to economic development.

We are making progress. Just growing concern—and growing national recognition—of the problem itself is progress. But we are moving beyond that point. There is increasing evidence of a determination, by governments and private enterprise alike to act—to make more effective use of the knowledge we already have, about how to combat the devastating toll of child malnutrition, rather than let such knowledge gather dust.

Governments of the Alliance countries in particular are showing the way to the rest of the world, by waging a more aggressive war on malnutrition.

Many youngsters have lived since last June's similar conference in Rio—many who otherwise would have died. For these, I am joyful. I know they live today because of the joint efforts of all of us.

But the war on child malnutrition is a strange war in some respects; the more vigorously we wage the war, the fewer the casualties that result. But the more that we neglect the war, the greater the casualties that result.

Despite all the progress that has been made, if we listened in the background at this very moment we could hear the cry of the casualties of this past year, the casualties of neglect. It is the most penetrating, heart-rending sound any of us have ever heard.

One knows the sound of a child crying of a momentary injury. One knows the sound of a child crying for attention and love. One knows the sound of a child crying for comfort and reassurance. But there is the sound—unmistakable for those of us who have heard it—the child's cry of frustration, of lack of understanding, and of enduring pain without hope. It is this child's cry that haunts me—for it is this child's cry that is unnecessary. He is asking us here today one question. "Why?"

As allies in this "War on Hunger", I propose we take stock of where we stand, and where we are going.

We agreed last year that two-thirds of the world is hungry or malnourished—that most are children—that disease literally stalks a child's weakened body, killing or permanently injuring him, physically or mentally.

We agreed that hordes of undernourished children become adults inadequate to meet the needs of a nation seeking economic progress and survival.

We agreed that too many people of the world have a diet based on a single grain—a diet of rice or corn or wheat or cassava or potatoes. One crop economies rarely produce an adequate, nourished population. People living in communities with a variety of grains and meats available—and with the income to buy them—blend their food in their stomachs. But there is no way a child can eat the variety necessary for normal growth when it is unavailable in his region, and his parents cannot afford the expensive supplement of meat, milk or fish for protein.

We agreed that the factors of limited agricultural productivity, multiplying populations, and malnourishment means time is running out.

We agreed that all nations have a moral and a practical stake in the outcome.

And, finally, we agreed that the answers do exist—that, technically, there is no reason for anyone to be hungry again. We have the knowledge to wipe out hunger forever—but too often that knowledge is gathering dust.

The search for added knowledge and know-how must never end, in this field or in other fields. But the challenge now is to act—and to make better use of the knowledge already available.

My own country is endeavoring to do this. Even as we earmark more research funds to seek new knowledge in this field, we are planning action programs to make better use of the knowledge we already have.

Our call to action comes from our Chief Executive, President Lyndon Johnson. In messages to our Congress earlier this year, he has asked that the highest priority be given efforts to wipe out hunger, disease and illiteracy throughout the world. He has called for new initiatives in agriculture, health and education in our own international economic assistance efforts, and he has urged other donor countries to join us.

He has also made clear, however, the need for self-help efforts by developing countries themselves in agriculture, health and education—and our Congress backed him up by making such self-help a condition to the economic assistance and food aid our country is willing to provide.

We often hear about so-called "strings" tied to foreign aid. In effect, our "strings", are really only that the receiving nation show enough concern for its own people—and particularly, its own young people—to take necessary self-help efforts toward assuring them more to eat, protecting their health, and giving them a better chance for an education.

Improved agricultural productivity, improved health care, and improved education—these are the three new action thrusts of the U.S. economic assistance program.

All three, as I am sure you will agree, are concerned with the subject of this Conference—child malnutrition.

From the standpoint of agricultural productivity, the quality of what is available for children to eat is directly related to the quantity of food available. As a result the war on child malnutrition is an essential part of the overall war on hunger itself.

From the standpoint of health, certainly we have long since passed the stage where any government would embark on an expanded health program without first looking at the plight of its children who are now victims of malnutrition.

From the standpoint of education, we are not going to make much progress unless we provide healthy bodies in which we can help develop healthy minds.

My Government, therefore, recognizes the interlocking relationship of our three new initiatives in foreign aid. We hope your governments also recognize this relationship.

Our foremost concern has been and still is feeding the world's hungry. We think we know something about the problem, for we have shared some $14 billion worth of our agricultural production with food-deficit countries over the past 13 years, either by donation or concessional food aid terms.

Our Food for Peace program under which this food aid was provided reflects the democratic, humanitarian and ingenious character of our American people. The world was hungry and the United States agricultural technology had produced food abundance. We felt a moral obligation to share that abundance. In the course of the past 13 years, great human suffering has been relieved; millions of adults have been saved from starvation, millions of children have been kept from useless death or permanent damage; the destitute have been helped in periods of emergency and, I am certain, the crisis of hunger with which the world is still confronted has at least been softened.

However, we have done some soul-searching ourselves. We are still willing to share our abundance, but we do not want to become the crutch on which others lean to the detriment of their own agricultural development. We are convinced that food aid is only one part of the war on hunger. The main objective is and must be helping others produce more for themselves.

That was the gist of President Johnson's Foreign Aid and Food for Freedom messages to our Congress this year.

In proposing changes in our Public Law 480 program through a new Food for Freedom bill emphasizing incentives for self-help, President Johnson said:

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

Already, our own food stocks are dwindling. Our new Food for Freedom bill is no longer predicated on surpluses; instead, it is based upon deliberately planning our production to assure enough food to share with others who are taking the necessary steps to eventually make themselves less dependent on external food aid.

We have already had to call some idle acres back into production for this purpose. We probably will have to call more acres back into production. We are convinced, however, that neither we nor the other developed countries alone can adequately feed the world. Our real hope for conquering hunger is in greatly stimulating agricultural production in the developing areas of the world, where the greatest food need now exists, and using our food aid temporarily as a means of filling the gap until more countries can become more self sufficient.

That new legislation is now moving through our Congress. You heard about it yesterday from a distinguished member of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable GRAHAM PURCELL, who was active in getting approval for many improvements in the legislation.

The new Food for Freedom bill singles out child malnutrition as one of the top priority programs in international assistance. This same emphasis runs through other legislation before our Congress. For the first time, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 spells out our objective of combatting child malnutrition. Also, the International Health and Education Bill of 1966 highlights steps to educate mothers in the basics of nutrition and the combatting of malnutrition in their children, to fend off childhood diseases.

President Johnson has called on our Science Advisory Board for more research in the problems of child malnutrition. His deep concern is reflected domestically, as well as internationally, in the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, which is aimed at eliminating malnutrition still existing within areas of the United States.

In the Agency for International Development, we are tripling our allocation of foreign assistance in support of increasing agricultural productivity. We are increasing technical assistance and capital aid. We are also calling on the expertise of our private agribusiness community to join us in this world conquest of hunger. We are seeking greater investment around the world in fertilizer production, in agricultural credit, in food processing and distribution.

In the past year the Agency for International Development has established a special nutrition branch, to strengthen our cooperative efforts to combat child malnutrition throughout the world. A number of activities have been designed to help improve nutritional levels in developing countries:

Development of formulations and processing technologies for economical grain-based, protein—supplemented foods.

Research programs to genetically up-grade the nutritive value of food and feed grains.

Improvement of animal protein production.

Food processing studies to improve food uses of the oil seed protein, abundant in many tropical countries.

Up-grading genetically of peas, beans, pulses, which are traditional and accepted protein foods of many countries.

Improvement of wheat foods by supplementing with commercially available amino acids.

A.I.D. is engaged in training people to run feeding programs in Latin America. We were pleased with the sharp increase in the number of workshops held this past year and the number of people trained. A.I.D. is contracting with Columbia University to create a curriculum for the training of non-technical people at mid-level—a practical course in nutrition for those who run programs in the villages and cities.

We have signed an agreement with the American School Food Services Association which has 48,000 members who will be available for technical assistance in any program in Latin America. One team is already to go out. Another arrangement has been made with the Institute of Food Technology to consult on special assignments.

In grass root education, new audio-visual aids have been developed for Operation Ninos. They will be shown here on Friday.

Now, I have talked primarily on new approaches, new emphasis, and new attitudes of our government.

What is even more encouraging to me, however, is the greatly increased interest being shown by the agri-business community in our country in the entire broad range of the war on hunger—and more particularly, in the specific field of combatting child malnutrition by stimulating development of food-processing industries in food-deficit countries.

Governments cannot lick this problem alone. We need the initiative and ingenuity and years of experience of the private sector and the entire food production, food processing and food distribution field.

It is gratifying to note the interest of the fertilizer, pesticide and farm equipment industries in the United States, as well as worldwide, in actively supporting the war on hunger.

It is also gratifying to note the keen interest and active support of our country's great food-processing industry in meeting the challenge of combatting child malnutrition worldwide. They agree that the challenge can only be effectively met by establishing a viable food-processing industry in developing countries themselves—a food industry dedicated to the development of formulated foods geared to local taste preference and acceptance, and based at least in part on locally available food ingredients.

Formulated foods, such as Incaparina and Peruvita, have made great headway in the last year. Not only foods developed by U.S. firms, but South Africa's Pro-nutra, Hong Kong's Vita soy and Nestle's Fortifex, have emerged as major new products.

Yet only the surface of the potential market has been scrapped.

Just a few weeks ago, top executives of many of the major U.S. food processing firms met at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration to discuss this very issue—what further steps they could take to combat malnutrition, by expanding private enterprise in the food processing field to the many areas of the world most urgently needing such industries. They expressed great interest in expanding investment in this field. They recognize their responsibility to help transfer their experience and know-how to other countries. On the other hand, they also emphasized, quite rightly, the necessity for developing countries to establish the

right climate of encouragement to private investment in the agricultural business complex—from fertilizer production through food processing to food retailing.

We have offered these food firms our cooperation in financing feasibility studies and in providing investment guaranties. We have also outlined to them a new proposal that could make available, through cooperating countries, donated U.S. food ingredients to private enterprise to assist in the production of formulated foods, for both commercial market and welfare distribution programs. Such a program can be developed. But to achieve success, it will require the cooperation of governments of developing countries with private enterprise food processing firms.

There are many ways in which private enterprise can help advance our war on hunger. One U.S. company has outlined in detail a suggestion for encouraging establishment of a network of community canning centers that could go a long way toward upgrading local diets. Such centers could be an excellent self help effort of the local community to preserve more of its own food production, rather than allow any of it to go to waste.

All such ideas need exploration and encouragement. The task is so big that no stone must be left unturned.

We are pleased that this growing interest is not confined just to U.S. firms. It is rapidly becoming international. We are gratified, for example, that Nestle International, one of the world's largest food firms, has just announced in Switzerland an investment of $4.6 million in a new foundation dedicated "to improve the food situation in nations where malnutrition and hunger still exist."

Many international concerns are also cooperating with industry advisory committees of FAO. Both the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization of the United Nations are taking a more vigorous interest in combatting child malnutrition. We also welcome the fact that a special panel on the problems of how to get nutritious food to the pre-school child will be held in advance of the 6th International Nutrition Conference scheduled for Germany this summer.

Certainly you in Latin America are helping to show the way.

We should all be proud of what you have done in your own countries under Operation Ninos. Our reports indicate an additional one million pre-school children were reached under this program in the past year. This is a 50 percent increase to 3¼ million pre-school children now being reached by your program. The gain is all the more significant because it is a difficult group to reach. When added to the additional millions of school age young people getting some supplemental feeding each day in Latin America, it is an impressive record. Operation Ninos has shown the world it can be done.

We all hope that new steps forward will cope out of this conference. We must put our knowledge to work.

This is your conference, and it is your decisions and recommendations that are really important. However, let me just suggest five points of emphasis that I feel would make a significant contribution to advancing the war on malnutrition. Here they are:

1. Make sure your own governments are giving the attention they should to your own agriculture—attention that includes incentive, technical and credit help to the producer, as well as creating a favorable climate to development of private sector agribusiness support so necessary for effective development.

2. Make sure your own governments are giving the support health and education ministries need to expand programs combatting child malnutrition.

3. Make sure your own private enterprise groups are aware of the seriousness of the challenge of child malnutrition, and are applying *their* own initiative and ingenuity to making the right kind of food products readily available to mothers in the commercial channels of your country.

4. Make sure that the door to investment opportunities is kept open to food processing firms of developed countries, who are willing to share with you the task of upgrading the quality and availability of formulated foods for children in your country, thereby lessening your dependence on food from outside sources.

5. Make sure that adequate methods are devised for coordinating public and private efforts toward your common goal of combatting malnutrition, so the maximum resources can be mobilized and brought to bear on this problem. This includes, of course, working closely with the great humanitarian-motivated voluntary agencies.

There is no simple, single answer. There is no *one* answer that meets every problem—every need. But there are multiple answers, and the task is of such magnitude as to require multiple efforts. Our knowledge and awareness cannot nourish our children, if it is allowed to gather dust. It must be put to work. There is no shame in need; the only shame is in turning an official back or dead ear on need.

The important thing is to move forward.

The late President Kennedy said, "Let us begin." We have begun—in Operation Ninos.

But as President Johnson said, in picking up the torch of leadership when Kennedy was taken from us, "Let us continue."

Let us continue—together—for the sake of our children, for the sake of our countries, for the sake of all humanity.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as evidence of the impression that talk made, I would like unanimous consent to have printed at this point the text of the telegram sent to Mr. Waters on behalf of 17 million Central and South American "Ninos."

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., *June 24, 1966.*

Hon. HERBERT J. WATERS,
Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.:

Your speech at the Conference of the Americas on Malnutrition as a vital factor in development provided an acute stimulus to all of the delegates assembled in Panama City. Through them, our representatives, we the 17 million children of the Americas participating in program made possible through the food-for-peace program wish to extend thanks from our heart to you your colleagues in the Agency for International Development in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives and to the American people for this assistance. We hope that your Government in a renewed expression of its wisdom will see fit to promulgate a law which will permit expanded programs to assist us and our needy brothers and sisters who want only a chance in life to survive the early difficult years so that with strength education spirit and hope we can grow into adults and work for the betterment of ourselves and our nations. With gratitude and love from 17 million Ninos of Central and South America.

CHALLENGES OF THE SPACE AGE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, delivered a very illuminating address before the Churchmen's Club in Baltimore last month on "The Meaning of the Space Age."

In his talk, Dr. Welsh goes beyond the idea of "If we don't do it then the Russians will" to treat the broader challenges and possibilities of the discovery and exploration of space. Space is clearly our newest frontier, not only in terms of the physical phenomena of space but also the technological revolution wrought by its conquest. The implications of the new age, not only for transportation and communication but for human values, the social order and a peaceful world are examined in Dr. Welsh's talk.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of this address at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE MEANING OF THE SPACE AGE

(Address by Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive secretary, National Aeronautices and Space Council)

It is a pleasure and a privilege to talk with such a distinguished group this evening. I am aware of your intelligent interest in the major forces which mold and influence the course of our society. The national space program fits that characterization and will continue to be such a factor far into the future. Hence, I hope to engage your attention for a sensible period of time, to speak about the significance of this technological revolution and to suggest its benefits and its challenges.

A NATIONAL COMMITMENT

The national space commitment is the largest concerted effort undertaken by any nation to advance the frontiers of human knowledge. Combining as it does industrial, academic, and governmental resources, it has given us an advanced technology second to none. Currenty, the only other nation with comparable technological creativity is the U.S.S.R., which seems to be devoting a bigger percentage of its smaller gross national product to space than we are. Such application on their part gives added weight to the thesis that vigorous space activity is beneficial, since the Soviets pride themselves on being a practical people.

In all, our space commitment is a multidimensioned national mission whose scientific, technological, spiritual, and political connotations go to the very core of our national character. Its impact permeates all aspects of our society. Its energizing force is felt throughout our economy, our educational structure, and in our relations with other nations. It is a seedbed of invention, a spur to our productivity, a source of insurance for our national security, a stimulus to learning, and a worldwide ambassador for peace.

Because of it, our chances of improving medical research and finding a cure for cancer or for heart disease are greater—not less. Because of it, our chances of improving our educational system and solving a vast range of social problems are greater—not less. The truth is that the issue is not space progress instead of progress in some other worthy field, because the space program contributes importantly to advances in practically all other lines of endeavor, and its stimulates the national economy at the same time. We are wealthier, not poorer, because of the space effort.

When the challenge of the space age was posed, we had a choice whether to accept it or to reject it. We delayed a bit and then we chose to accept it, and that decision was indeed wise.

A society cannot remain great and strong if it ignores the major challenges with which it is faced, particularly when so much of the dynamics of our modern economy is associated with technological advance. Already

new knowledge which we have obtained from space has revolutionized communications, energy conversion, power generation, transportation, geodesy, navigation, and weather prediction, to mention but a few of the many areas of application.

PROCESS OF DISCOVERY

All told, the United States has successfully launched nearly 400 satellites, including in that number a few lunar and interplanetary probes. Each day the Goddard Space Flight Center in nearly Greenbelt tracks some 33 active satellites. Each day, nearly 200 miles of data tape pour in from these space orbiters to the Operations Center. From this great fund of knowledge, scientists have discovered the radiation belt which surrounds the Earth at a height ranging from roughly 400 to 40,000 miles. Beyond it are the great solar winds that blow through space at 200 to 500 miles per second. Huge plasma clouds have been detected which, periodically rising from the Sun, stir this wind into magnetic storms which in turn penetrate all interplanetary space and sometimes disrupt radio communications and affect weather conditions here on Earth.

The very fact that we are doing and learning so many marvelous things in space constitutes a great adventure of the mind and spirit. In a sense, the space program may be likened to the building of a cathedral. It calls upon the skills, talents, contributions, as well as the prayers of so many throughout the length and breadth of our land.

Our nearest neighbor in space is the Moon—about 240,000 miles distance. The nearest planet is Venus—26 million miles, next nearest Mars—49 million miles. The farthest in our solar system is Pluto, about 3680 million miles from the Sun. Beyond that the nearest star, other than our Sun, is 25 million million miles away.

Such is man's special endowment to grapple with the unknown, to penetrate what have long been mysteries of nature and to absorb them into a system of human understanding, that his drive to span such vast distance is both inevitable and inexorable.

Thus far, our manned space efforts have been restricted to fairly close Earth orbits. And the wonders of space travel experienced by our astronauts have been but a foretaste of things to come. There is little doubt that the increasing flow of knowledge and sense impressions, new experiences and new emotions which will come from deep space travel will have a profoundly sitmulating effect on the human spirit. In fact, it is hopefully possible that the opening of the space frontier will help sweep away much of the neurotic, sick decadence of our times, which to a degree stems from lack of new challenges.

Furthermore, if we do not go out into outer space, our entire culture would suffer a real deprivation. For here are materials for the imagination and the nourishment of new and exciting art forms which are desperately needed if we are to experience any significant renaissance of man's creativity.

Glorious as such an era promises to be, one should expect challenging and possibly disturbing reexaminations of established beliefs, including some long-cherished philosophical and religious tenets.

SEARCH FOR LIFE

One of the many exciting goals of space exploration is that of determining whether life exists on other planets. Such a search illuminates an aspect of space exploration which has profound meaning both for science and theology. It takes courage to search for the truth and even more courage to accept it once it has been found.

Sooner rather than later, space exploration will be presenting us with stubborn and disconcerting facts. Among these may be confrontation with life forms, certainly different and possibly more intelligent and gifted than our own. I do not say such life forms do exist, but I suggest that we need be prepared for the possibility. Incidentally, I am not referring to the flights of imagination stimulated by so-called sightings of unidentified flying objects.

It does not weaken my faith to question whether man is either unique or central in the scheme of things. If planetary systems like our own are common in the great reaches of space, and there are millions of star systems in the universe, then life may be quite common in the universe as a whole. I do not say that is the case, but I do propose that it may be. And if conditions favorable to life have prevailed longer elsewhere, other civilizations could be much further advanced than ours. This scientific question of the highest magnitude has profound implications for the way in which people think about themselves and their destiny. In the face of such an immense opportunity, what would be the moral and spiritual worth of a society which, having achieved the technical capacity to obtain such an answer, shrank from pursuing it?

Certainly religion and science can complement each other in discerning the infinite wonders of an infinite universe. As the eminent scientist, Albert Einstein, once philosophized: "Science without religion is lame; religion without science is blind."

THE FRONTIER OF SPACE

After all, space is not the terrifying vacuum we once assumed. Rather, it is a frontier with unlimited possibility. What new forces, powers, and discoveries will be disclosed to us when we reach the other planets or set up space laboratories cannot be predicted with confidence because they are far beyond our vision today. We cannot afford the intellectual arrogance of pretending that we know all that there is to know and that the exploration of the space frontier will bring us no surprises.

As we strive toward the complex objective of a manned lunar landing in this decade, we are accelerating the development of space competence on the widest possible front, motivating the managers, the scientists, and the engineers to move forward urgently in a way which could not be accomplished by a lesser goal. The major benefit is not having man set foot on the Moon, as important as that may be. Rather, it is the development of the capability to explore space combined with the will to do so. This stimulates the mind of man, while at the same time improving his material well-being.

The billions of dollars required in this effort are not spent on the Moon—they are spent in the factories, laboratories, universities, and offices right here on Earth. Space spending stimulates the economy with a multiplier effect. It is felt in the retail stores as well as the steel mills and aerospace plants. To become both parochial and practical—it is important to know that it has a major impact on the economy of those assembled here this evening.

SPACE APPLICATIONS

In communications we are rapidly developing Earth satellites to beam television programs, radio broadcasts, and phone conversations to every spot on Earth that is equipped to receive them.

In not too many years, live television shows will be beamed into our homes from all points of the globe. We will be able to see important news when it happens. Likewise, the same news may be printed simultaneously in Berlin, Dallas, and Hong Kong. Businessmen in various parts of the world may hold special television conferences, looking at the same charts, pictures, or demonstrations; giant business machines and computers may be tied together across oceans, allowing a scientist in India to solve a mathematical problem on a computer in this country.

Our weather satellites are amazing devices which provide our specialists with a 450-mile-high view of clouds over large sections of the world. These weather pictures already have helped find storms that would not have been discovered for many days, thereby producing early warnings which save countless lives and hundreds of millions of dollars in property. The value of future weather satellites cannot even be estimated, since they will provide early storm warnings against floods, tornadoes, hurricanes, and even invasions of insect armies such as locusts and grasshoppers.

In addition to both short and long-range weather forecasting, there are other benefits from these miracles of outer space. For example, we will be able to obtain early detection of forest fires, locate distressed ships and aircraft, track icebergs and estimate the extent of snow coverage for conservation and water management purposes. There is also the real possibility that information and understanding given to us by weather satellites may some day help us to modify and control weather.

At sea, the ancient method of observing the height of the stars and planets above the horizon is still used to calculate position. When heavy weather hides celestial bodies, as it will do for days at a time in the wintry North Atlantic, ship navigators cannot accurately state where they are. We have now in operation a series of navigation satellites which correct this deficiency. In addition to its value to our Navy, this competence can become a boon to commercial shipping, as a matter of both safety and economy.

Research designed to maintain the health of man in space is aiding his medical care on Earth. The output of the Space Age is revolutionizing the electronic and other essential equipment used in our hospitals. The condition of the sick can be monitored constantly by use of the same sensors that keep tabs on the physical well-being of astronauts in flight.

THIS CHANGING WORLD

No one can predict with assurance what the total practical benefits of space research will be. As has been the case in the past, so will future generations note that we were much too conservative and short-sighted in our predictions.

Applications from basic scientific discovery are coming with increasing rapidity. Who would have imagined just ten years ago that the marvels of the space age would have developed to the extent they have today. Then there was no space program, no space performance—and now look how far we have come.

So rapid is the pace of change that we must look ahead just to keep abreast of the current that leads us. Given the atom's almost limitless energy and the computer's almost limitless ability to remember and to organize, the future beckons to us as an era of almost limitless attainment. Within the next several decades one can confidently predict such developments as space ships ferrying tourists as well as scientists and explorers to space stations and to nearby planets; and aerospace planes spanning oceans and continents in tens of minutes.

But far more important than those technological miracles is the possibility that the space era may usher in a substitute for war—a permanent peace. Space activities can be a substitute for aggression, a bridge to understanding and identification of mutual interests, and a major tool of arms control and disarmament. In exploring the great universe around us, we may become free from the terrifying grip of parochial hatred and fears. It is this unquenchable thirst for knowledge that sets man apart from other creatures. Compared to the business of coercing and killing his own kind, the challenge raised by crossing old frontiers into outer space is infinitely to be preferred. Moreover, not only will man's mind and emotions be directed from greed and brutality to exploration and discovery, but man's

material resources, his laboratories, his shops, his skilled talents will move from producing weapons of war to instruments of space. I am indeed an optimist as is everyone who has faith!

The impact of the space age will pose challenges to thinking people everywhere to bring our technology and our ethics into wholesome relationship so that we will handle wisely the fast developing new power to control both the performance and the characteristics of man. If we are wise, for the first time in history we will be able to use this new found knowledge productively and not follow the fates of ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome where technology grew and morals deteriorated. Not only have new discoveries enlarged and ennobled man's spirit, but already the new knowledge acquired in space exceeds by far the value of the funds so far expended. New knowledge, far more than more guns, is the true test of the worth of a modern state.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

As concluding observations concerning the matters I have been discussing, I suggest the following for your contemplation.

First, the material advantages of the space program are now substantial and in the future will become manifold. In addition to the many direct benefits, I also include the indirect contributions which can help solve social problems such as urban transportation, air and water pollution, and similar cancerous features of our so-called highly developed society.

Second, our increasingly automated society, including its educational system, will continue to improve in supplying facts and making available on a timely basis the relevant portions of accumulated knowledge as well as the citations of recorded thoughts and intelligent sayings.

But, third, such technology and such automation cannot raise our social, educational, moral, or religious values. Such factors depend to a great degree upon the individual—his faith, his understanding, and his regard for the welfare of others. However, while science and technology are unable to direct such improvements, we should not overlook that science and technology do increase the opportunity to make improvements. Where there is more leisure, more accumulated knowledge, and greater understanding, there is also increased opportunity to improve character and raise human values. Certainly, the opportunity which such progress gives toward the elimination of war is an impressive justification for the entire space program.

The only real choice which remains is whether we act in harmony with, and in appreciation for, meaningful aesthetic and social values, or whether we deny such values and thereby encourage chaos and moral decay. We have the means. How we apply them depends in the last analysis on the ethical and moral guidelines of leaders such as yourselves.

CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK IN UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in case some of my colleagues missed, during the recess, the excellent article on the new Canyonlands National Park in Utah which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, July 3, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article was written by Merlo J. Pusey, a former Utahan, who is on the editorial staff of the Washington Post. Because of the region's inaccessibility, Mr. Pusey hardly knew it existed when he was growing up in Utah. Now he has found in it indescribable beauty and wonder, which he has gotten down in words almost better than anyone else who has seen it. He has also discussed the areas which I hope to add to the park through the introduction of legislation to extend the park's boundaries. I commend to you very highly the splendid article on a "New National Park Is for the Hardy" written by Merlo J. Pusey.

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

NEW NATIONAL PARK IS FOR THE HARDY

(By Merlo J. Pusey, Washington Post Staff Writer)

SQUAW FLAT, CANYONLANDS.—The land was good for nothing—nothing but a playground for the winds and a studio for nature's greatest sculptress: water. For eons, its wild chasm terrain welcomed the eagle, the bighorn sheep and the lizard but repelled civilized man. Now at last it is yielding in some minor degree to the insatiable curiosity of man, and a new national park is born.

"Canyonlands" it is called for want of a word to express the inexpressible. On the map, you will find it at the confluence of the Colorado and Green Rivers in southeastern Utah. But that is only a vague clue to the nature of this maze of bewildering shapes, fantastic vistas and inhospitable canyons. Here nature truly exhibits some of her most extravagant aberrations.

The area had no part in the winning of the West, although some of its seemingly impenetrable jungles in stone were hideouts for outlaws in the days of six-shooter justice. The westward flow of civilization passed it by for the simple reason that man could not cope with its precipitous gorges within gorges.

DECEPTIVE DISTANCES

Now, however, the qualities that made it a no-man's land are drawing thousands of wonder-seekers into this wilderness of broken globe crust. Congress created a national park here in 1964. Today, the National Park Service is struggling with relatively meager resources to accommodate an increasing number of visitors to the Island of the Sky, the unique Needles district and some of the fabulous grabens or sunken valleys. This mystery land of red sandstone and unlimited surprises may in time become one of the best-loved national parks.

You will not find here the breathtaking beauty of Yosemite Falls or the colorful magic of Yellowstone Canyon. This is rugged country. Its distances are vast. Sometimes it is necessary to travel several hundred miles to reach a fascinating butte that may seem to be within easy walking distance. It is the unpredictability of the terrain and its stubborn resistance to man that give it much of its charm.

Yet nothing that can be said about it will characterize Canyonlands as a whole. Its skyline plateau between the Colorado and the Green is almost a different world from its fantasy of pillars, towers, statues and picturesque amphitheaters in the southern part of the park.

Its upper-level views into the depths of the river gorges from an elevation of about 6,000 feet above sea level are very different from the scenes on the White Rim or median level in the park. This in turn is very different from the river level at 3,950 feet. Wherever you go in Canyonlands, you will need to be alert for unexpected manifestations of nature's whimsy.

IMAGINATION RUNS WILD

Arches are counted by the dozens. Endless numbers of rocks of weird shape are balanced in precarious positions on neatly sculptured pillars. Some statutes strikingly resembling human shapes seem to be balancing rocks on their heads. An imaginative visitor can see giant organs, cathedrals, ornamented gardens and castles in addition to the Needles, the Wooden Shoe in stone, the Doll House and the arches to which names have been given.

Some visitors are so overwhelmed by the plethora of striking views that they are said to be "red-sandstoned out." Others experience a kind of shock resulting from a new sense of the insignificance of man and his works against the earthshaping forces in evidence here.

This is quite possible even for those who stay on the dirt roads that an ordinary automobile can traverse.

Really to see Canyonlands, however, one must go on foot or horseback or hire a jeep that can climb a roadless mountainside or follow the dry bed of a stream.

In the northern end of the park, approached from Moab, you can reach the Island in the Sky, Upheaval Dome and Grandview Point by car. This high country affords spectacular views into both the Colorado River and Green River gorges. At The Neck, 40 feet of fence controls cattle grazing on some 40,000 acres because the canyon walls on all sides are too precipitous for the cattle to escape.

Grandview Point offers a panoramic view of the White Rim below and of the wild area where the two rivers meet, although the confluence itself is not visible. A jeep trail on the White Rim overlooks the lower gorges at many points, but this is a two-day trip of 80 miles which attracts only the hardiest visitors.

WIND-SCULPTURED ARCH

In the southern part of the park, approached from Monticello, you can drive your car as far as Squaw Flat, where there is a public camping ground. Here again it is necessary to resort to jeeps or specially built trucks to see the most spectacular features.

You may, for example, ride a four-wheeled leaping lizard up the bed of Salt Creek to Angel Arch. Water and wind have shaped a magnificent arch of stone as if it had been clay in a master hand. Only a few thousand people have seen this remarkable piece of sculpture. Indeed, it was known only to Indians and local cowboys until its discovery as a scenic treasure in 1955.

A side trip into Horse Canyon brings into view additional arches (including Paul Bunyan's Potty) and some well-preserved Indian ruins in a cave. Relics of an ancient culture are found in many parts of the park. The prehistoric Pueblos left innumerable pictographs and rock carvings in caves and under overhanging rocks.

From Squaw Flat, another jeep trail leads to picturesque Elephant Canyon and Devil's Lane, a type of box canyon with a stream bed bottom and vertical walls known here as a graben. Devil's Lane gives access to Chesler Park in the heart of the Needles country. Chesler gives the impression of a Roman ruin, but on a scale that miniaturizes any work of man.

"MISSING" PIECES

Although the park covers 257,640 acres and baffles the visitor who tries to see it all, many newcomers are shocked to learn what has been left out of Canyonlands. One of our first visits was to Dead Horse Point, in many respects the most spectacular "sky island" overlooking this part of the Colorado River, yet it is not a part of the park.

For some years it has been a state park, but Utah appears willing to give it to the Nation as a part of Canyonlands. It lies adjacent to the northeastern corner of the National Park and is an integral part of the scenery.

The Shafer Trail from The Neck and the new state scenic highway to Moab follow a ledge on a sheer cliff about 1000 feet high

and then wind down an almost vertical wall with switchbacks so sharp and grades so steep that drivers with little experience in the mountains turn pale. The views are spectacular, but most of them are outside the park.

On the west side of the park, the boundary was squeezed in the center so that not much more than the confluence of the two rivers is included. For convenience's sake in drawing a legal boundary, Congress followed section lines, resulting in the exclusion of even some of the White Rim. Excluded also are the Maze (a wilderness of chasms unlike anything else in the world) and such interesting phenomena as the Doll House (about 20 acres of almost solid stone) and the Four Things.

REDUCED BY COMPROMISE

The original concept was to create a Canyonlands National Park of about a million acres between La Sal Mountains on the east and the Henrys on the west. Local pressures from miners and cattlemen forced a series of compromises. There is now no thought of going back to the original proposal, but Sen. FRANK E. MOSS (D-Utah), the chief sponsor of the park in Congress, is trying to secure amendments that would bring in Dead Horse Point, the Maze, and other features.

Much concern is also expressed here about preservation of the Indian murals in Barrier Canyon near the western boundary of the park. These are some of the finest pictographs of the Fremont culture to be found anywhere.

More urgent than extension of the boundaries, however, is development of the area already in the park. Funds are in hand for construction of an approach road into the Needles section and for improvement of a bad stretch of road on The Neck. Plans call for the extension of a usable road to the confluence of the rivers next year and into Chesler Park by 1969.

Another major undertaking is the drilling of wells to provide water for visitors. This is semiarid country. For the most part, visitors have to take water as well as food with them. There will be no motels in the park, but ample accommodations may be found at Moab and Monticello. Others will be built closer to the park boundaries if satisfactory water supplies can be found.

In its present state of development, Canyonlands has a special lure for "jeepers." Commercial jeep tours are also available. The most extensive tours involve overnight camping, and unless one is prepared to rough it, he is likely to be disappointed. Canyonland's rewards are for the hardy.

Jeeping in such rough country sometimes results in ripped tires and stalled motors, but such accidents are no tragedy. Visitors are required to register as they venture on trips into the remote sections, and if they do not return on schedule, park rangers hasten to the rescue.

Indeed, the rangers add much to the pleasures of visiting Canyonlands. Our party observed Chief Ranger James A. Randall, District Ranger Robert Donnegan in the northern section of the park, Ranger Jerry Boggs at the Needles headquarters and several others in extraordinary acts of courtesy.

Canyonlands has become a new center of a much larger scenic region. Nearby is the Arches National Monument with its weird pinnacles, spires, towers, red stone statuary and balanced rocks. Farther south is the Natural Bridges National Park, which is poorly served by roads.

Dozens of other scenic spots lure the motorist as he approaches the area where Utah, Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico meet. It is a strange land whose deserts are repelling to many, but the lure of the unknown is powerful here. You come to the Land of Standing Rocks not so much for relaxation as to satisfy an inner urge for acquaintance with what this old globe has produced.

THE LONELINESS OF THE PRESIDENCY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the agonizing loneliness of the Presidency is well known to few men now living. One of these men, of course, is President Lyndon B. Johnson.

One of the loneliest moments came recently when the President made his decision on the bombing of oil storage depots in Hanoi and Haiphong.

Writing in the July 8 issue of Life magazine, Mr. Hugh Sidey outlines the background of historical events, coupled with the President's personal experiences, which led to the ultimate decision to order the oil strikes.

Mr. Sidey's article points up the extreme care and caution which goes into the final execution of such an attack. If there are no objections, I respectfully request that the article be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

THE PRESIDENCY—DECISION OF MIND AND EXPERIENCE, NOT OF HEART AND HOPE

(By Hugh Sidey)

The President was the loneliest man in town when the news of the oil-dump bombings at Hanoi and Haiphong came out. His old friend Prime Minister Harold Wilson walked away from him. His Senate enemies redoubled their criticism. The pundits fulminated. It was no wonder that when stocky, cocky Harold Holt, Australia's prime minister, came by and declared himself—Vietnam and all—"an admiring friend, a staunch friend, that will be all the way with L.B.J." that the President looked as if he might reach down and hug the tough little Aussie.

The inner anguish of raising the ante in the Vietnam war was deep and genuine in Lyndon Johnson. He would rather sit and talk about running rural electrification lines down the Mekong valley than plan a military campaign. He is inextricably bound up with those human schemes Franklin Roosevelt introduced and just about all the others that have come along since. He is, in his soul, a dove.

But in running the Vietnam war, Johnson places mind over heart, experience over hope. In 35 Washington years he has been with the great men who made the major decisions of the day or—as congressman, senator, Vice President and now President—has participated in them. He is without doubt the most experienced head of state in power. It is from this experience that his decisions flow.

He is no history buff who has studied the great forces of civilization or even bothered to read much about military campaigns or the political miscalculations of kings and courts. He feeds on contemporary experience, men and events he has seen and heard. Few historical heroes grace his walls. In his small private study just off the Oval Office are the pictures of Sam Rayburn, Herbert Hoover, Dwight Eisenhower, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy. They were and are flesh and blood to Johnson. He knows their mistakes almost better than he knows their triumphs and that is what guides him. He recalls the atmosphere in the House just before Pearl Harbor when renewal of the draft was saved by one vote. He remembers the hasty disarmament after World War II. And lately he has gone around talking about those "men with umbrellas," meaning of course the Neville Chamberlain types, who were failures at keeping the peace in their time. The Bay of Pigs disaster perhaps made the deepest impression on Johnson because he was then inside the White House. The theme of course, which was played out before Johnson through all these years was how weakness invited aggression, how hesitation brought miscalculation, how failure to take action one month made action doubly hard the next. All of this experience Johnson has stored away. It is his own encyclopedia which he can delve into and produce an amazing array of facts and figures, verbal color and biographies.

For months now Johnson has held firm in his conduct of the war under a mounting barrage of criticism and plummeting public support. What others tell him has not changed his mind. The debate over bombing the oil supplies went on for weeks in his innermost circle. One day, McNamara would come in with a convincing list of reasons for bombing. The next day he might be back with an equally cogent list of reasons against it. Dean Rusk, for the most part, was not for the bombing unless the military necessity was clear. In the end, he agreed that it was.

That the action was coming has been plain for some time. Johnson does not reach one decision in these things but an entire sequence of decisions. He starts first with a gut feeling, then reaches a state of mind which for all practical purposes decides the issue. But then he reviews and re-reviews. When he puts his order in the works, it is still contingent on last-minute approval. One night with time running out, Johnson paused to reflect: "There are a lot of people who can recommend—a hell of a lot of people who can recommend," he said, "But there's just one man who can act on the recommendation."

Although it appears certain that a news leak altered the attack schedule some, there was never a doubt that anything short of peace feelers from Hanoi could hold it up. As the time for the strike approached, Johnson—as he does when most major decisions are involved—grew intensely busy physically, but almost serene mentally. He charged through the White House the day before the bombers went, sneaking cookies from one of Lady Bird's receptions, prodding his aides to faster pace, churning the appointments, giving speeches on Medicare and the status of women.

Underlying his decision is the fact that the President feels this could be the crucial time in the war. The bombing is just a bit more pressure—almost as much political as military—applied to the Communists when they are already being terribly mauled. It might be that extra measure which would tilt the balance for peace, the extra measure which Lyndon Johnson has seen lacking so many times in his public career.

The President was awake in his bedroom until 3 a.m. the day of the strike, on the phone to the situation room in the White House basement. He checked the bombers as they came back. The Navy planes got back to their carriers safely, all of them. And all the Air Force planes got back to their bases except one. At the end of the long, wearying night the President said: "It's incredible. It's really incredible that this could happen and only one plane lost."

BIRTH CONTROL GAINS IN RURAL SOUTH

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the major obstacles to family planning among rural Americans has been the difficulty of effectively channeling modern birth control information to them.

Recent experiments conducted in southern Alabama and eastern Kentucky show, among other things, that

informed local residents, spreading information by word of mouth, are generally more effective than polished professionals.

The experiments have broad implications for the whole question of population control. I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion of a New York Times article, "Birth Control Gains in the Rural South" by Roy Reed, at this point in the RECORD.

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

BIRTH CONTROL GAINS IN THE RURAL SOUTH

(By Roy Reed)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., March 25.—Experiments being conducted in two Southern states indicate that rural Americans, both white and Negro, can be induced to adopt modern birth control if information and materials are taken to them systematically and rationally.

The experiments are in 13 Black Belt (named for rich, black, limestone-derived soils) counties of southern Alabama, heavily populated by rural Negroes, and eight Appalachian Mountain counties of eastern Kentucky, inhabited largely by rural whites.

The experiments have implications for the worldwide effort to harness population growth since a preponderant majority in the "population explosion" areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are rural.

The studies have uncovered no magic formula for reaching stand-offish country people. Success apparently depends on a variety of factors. However, one key seems to be the use of local residents, instead of polished, professional outsiders, to spread information by word of mouth.

It is too early to measure the results precisely, but researchers hope to do that in a final report by the end of this year.

Dr. Thomas J. Bogue, who is directing the studies, is director of the Community and Family Study Center of the University of Chicago.

"I am confident," Dr. Bogue said, "there will be a substantial effect on the birth rate."

The experiments are being financed by the Population Council, of New York, and are being conducted with the cooperation of the Planned Parenthood League of Alabama, the Alabama Department of Public Health, the University of Kentucky School of Medicine and several private physicians.

PERCEPTIBLE PROGRESS

They are being conducted through public health clinics in Alabama and through private physicians' offices and clinics in eastern Kentucky.

A preliminary report showed that in the 13 Alabama counties, the number of new "family planning patients" had risen from 407 in the first quarter of 1963—before the experiment began—to 1,903 in the first quarter of 1965, after the experiment had been in effect for a year.

The experiment attracted 978 women in Kentucky, and at least 771 stayed with it.

Dr. Bogue said that to his knowledge the Alabama and Kentucky experiments were the first efforts to influence rural birth rates in this nation in a short time, even though the rural birth rate is 15 to 20 per cent higher than that in urban areas. The Planned Parenthood Association of America concentrates almost exclusively on urban populations, he said.

Old wives' tales seem to be one of the main obstacles to acceptance of birth control in rural areas.

Mrs. Sinolia Mike, a Negro family planning social worker, with the Birmingham Planned Parenthood program, said that in her travels in Alabama she often encountered Negro women who believed that they should "breed again" to cure some physical ailment.

OLD WIVES TALES

"You'll hear a woman say, 'I think maybe I should have another child and then I won't have this pain under my heart,'" Mrs. Mike said. "Or they'll say, 'The Lord put me here to have babies.'"

To spread information effectively, the experimenters have hired a "family planning educator" in each Black Belt county. The educator is a Negro woman who is widely known, liked and respected in the community, a person able to talk informally with the women visiting the health clinics.

CHILD NUTRITION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to add my endorsement to Senate bill 3467, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act by expanding the food service programs that are offered to schoolchildren in the country. The bill incorporates a measure which I was happy to cosponsor to make the school milk program permanent and to maintain its authorization at a high level. It also contains many of the fine features of the Child Nutrition Act which was proposed earlier this year.

Coming from the State of West Virginia, which shouldered what may go down in history as the greatest employment hardship anywhere resulting from technological progress, I know the value of these school food service programs.

I cannot emphasize too fully the effect which the Federal school milk program has had upon youngsters—not only in West Virginia—but also in all other States. By offering these children milk at prices within the allowances of their families, we have contributed, perhaps, the most important element of their physical growth. It has given them nutrition which they may never have received had it not been for the program.

In West Virginia alone, 250,169 students are enrolled in primary and secondary schools participating in the program. The estimated $102 million that will be spent nationally on the program during fiscal year 1966 has meant a contribution of $586,000 to West Virginia.

Currently, West Virginia receives about $2.4 million for the school lunch program. It is also anticipated that West Virginia will share in breakfast funds, as they are to be allocated on the basis of average family income in each State, compared to the national average.

Under the milk program, the youngsters have been able to buy milk—when they can afford it—for as little as 2 or 3 cents a half pint. Without this Federal aid, the cost will jump, perhaps, from 7 to 10 cents for the same half pint.

I would like to note a statement made by the president of one parent-teacher association at Huntington, W. Va. He said:

> Many of our children depend upon this milk for the nourishment that is needed to keep them in chool. Without proper nourishment our children lose interest in school and these children are our potential dropouts.

I believe we are making great strides in the economic recovery of Appalachia. We are planning new roads and airports to open the area to tourists and businessmen. We are seeking new industries for our unemployed. This program of offering low-cost food to our youngsters represents a major factor in preparing the people of Appalachia for the future. Our youngsters are the future. To help them meet the challenges, we must offer the proper foods for their good health.

MOST WELFARE RECIPIENTS EARN THEIR KEEP

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I find that one of the most persistent misconceptions existing in my State of Utah is that welfare payments are handed out to individuals who refuse to work in order to qualify for assistance. When I was at home recently over the 4th of July recess, several citizens in their discussions with me expressed their dissatisfaction with the "handout of money" to people who refuse to work. Some were quite vehement in their insistence that there were many, many people who simply sat down and refused to work while drawing welfare.

Consequently, I was pleased to see an article written by Arnold Irvine, which appeared in the Deseret News on Thursday, July 7, 1966, discussing this problem. He points out that in Utah there is a requirement that those people seeking welfare, work to the extent that they are able. And it is pointed out that in Salt Lake County, which is the largest county in our State, populationwise, 100 percent of the employables on welfare assistance are participating in work projects. Moreover, Mr. Campanaro is quoted as saying:

> People like to work. They don't like to be taken off the projects.

This has been my observation from personal experience. I believe that people do indeed, like to work. They would much prefer some activity and the feeling of importance that comes from giving services for support received.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MOST WELFARE CASES EARN THEIR KEEP

(By Arnold Irvine)

"Why don't they make these people on the welfare rolls work for what they get?"

This is a question that employes and officials of county and state welfare departments hear almost daily.

The answer they give is most able-bodied persons receiving welfare assistance ARE working to pay their keep. Only three counties, Beaver, Daggett and Rich, had no welfare work projects in 1965.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT

"We have 100 per cent of the employables on welfare assistance participating in work projects," Jeano Campanaro said of the situation in Salt Lake County. He has had charge of work projects in the county and has just been appointed director of volunteer services.

He explained that those not considered employable include invalids, persons who are mentally incompetent and mothers with children to care for.

HIS PHILOSOPHY

"Any person who walks and talks and has two hands is capable of some kind of work," is the way Mr. Campanaro sums up his philosophy about welfare work projects.

The projects are all connected with governmental or other public agencies and include many types of work—janitorial, groundskeeping, street cleaning, construction labor, food handling, clerical, personal services, etc. The "etc." is limited only by the imagination of the caseworkers and the abilities of the clients.

SIDE BY SIDE

No regular paid employes of a department may be replaced with welfare clients. The welfare clients are supplemental workers that are employed where there is need for them but no funds to pay them. Yet the welfare people work alongside paid employes from whom they are indistinguishable, and make a worthwhile contribution.

In some instances, the projects are designed to benefit the welfare clients themselves.

For instance, many Indians on the welfare rolls in San Juan County are making cement blocks and building their own homes to replace primitive hogans. The Indians also are working on road crews and installing water systems.

Salt Lake County inaugurated a project of having women on welfare assistance make periodic visits to the homes of elderly welfare clients who needed special care and attention.

Sixteen women were given two weeks' training for this project in January. They were taught food preparation, shopping, budgeting, grooming, household cleanliness and other appropriate subjects.

ALL GAIN

Everyone involved has benefitted from the project—the visitors, the visitees and the taxpayers. Through the experience they gained and the contacts they made, half of the 16 women involved in the project have found gainful employment in nursing homes or private homes.

The women doing the visiting get satisfaction from helping others and the persons visited are greatly benefitted as well. For one thing, they do not have to be placed in rest homes so soon. This has saved the state thousands of dollars as well.

CREATES JOB

"If I don't have a project for a person who wants to work, I'll go out and create one," Mr. Campanaro said.

He told of placing a woman in the cafeteria of one of the public agencies. He had seriously considered committing her to the State Mental Hospital, but the people at the cafeteria were willing to try to help.

She responded surprisingly well to the work "therapy" and was hired as a regular staff member.

Another woman has become an assistant librarian after having learned the job on a welfare project.

LIKE WORK

"People like to work. They don't like to be taken off the projects," Mr. Campanaro said.

One project worker expressed herself this way: "It's the only thing I have that keeps me going. It makes me feel important in life."

The welfare clients' pay rate is figured at a dollar an hour so that an individual receiving $86 per month welfare assistance is expected to work 86 hours. Couples receiving $138 a month work 138 hours and so on.

THIRTY-DAY AID

Persons who refuse to work or fail to perform in a satisfactory manner may be discharged from the project. They become ineligible to receive aid for a period of 30 days. After this period, they may reapply for welfare aid provided they are willing to conform to the work requirements.

This situation seldom arises, Mr. Campanaro said.

No one seems to remember exactly when the concept of welfare work projects first was developed in Utah. They seem to go back to the forties. There are now about 150 projects in operation throughout the state involving over 900 workers.

So, Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer, your welfare dollar in Utah is buying an hour of useful work in many instances and is helping some welfare clients become self-sustaining.

CANADIAN LEGISLATION PARALLELS PROPOSED "CONSCIENCE CLAUSE" AMENDMENT TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on April 6, 1966, I introduced a bill, S. 3203, which would amend the National Labor Relations Act to insure that anyone whose objection to joining or paying dues to a union is based on religious belief would not be forced to violate such religious belief. This measure is identical to the amendment unanimously adopted by the Senate Labor Committee, with the concurrence of the AFL–CIO, during the committee's consideration last year of H.R. 77, the bill to repeal section 14(b).

It has come to my attention that the Parliament of the Province of Saskatchewan, Canada, has recently enacted section 5(1) of the Saskatchewan Trade Union Act, which contains provisions substantially the same as those in my bill. The Saskatchewan provision reads as follows:

(1) excluding from an appropriate unit of employees an employee where the board finds, in its absolute discretion, that the employee objects:

(i) to joining or belonging to a trade union; or

(ii) to paying dues and assessments to a trade union; as a matter of conscience based on religious training or belief during such period that the employee pays:

(iii) to a charity mutually agreed upon by the employee and the trade union that represents a majority of employees in the appropriate unit; or

(iv) where agreement cannot be reached by these parties, to a charity designated by the board; an amount at least equal to the amount of dues and assessments that a member of that trade union is required to pay to the trade union during such period.

Mr. President, there now seems to be a growing consensus that this sort of amendment is appropriate and will not interfere with the legitimate rights of labor, and I would urge, once again, that the National Labor Relations Act be amended along the lines I have suggested.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

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

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

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1966

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14122) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966".

TITLE I—EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1966".

Employees subject to Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 102. (a) Section 603(b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (79 Stat. 1111; 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

"Grade	Per annum rates and steps									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
GS-1	$3,609	$3,731	$3,853	$3,975	$4,097	$4,219	$4,341	$4,463	$4,585	$4,707
GS-2	3,925	4,058	4,191	4,324	4,457	4,590	4,723	4,856	4,989	5,122
GS-3	4,269	4,413	4,557	4,701	4,845	4,989	5,133	5,277	5,421	5,565
GS-4	4,776	4,936	5,096	5,256	5,416	5,576	5,736	5,896	6,056	6,216
GS-5	5,331	5,507	5,683	5,859	6,035	6,211	6,387	6,563	6,739	6,915
GS-6	5,867	6,065	6,263	6,461	6,659	6,857	7,055	7,253	7,451	7,649
GS-7	6,451	6,664	6,877	7,090	7,303	7,516	7,729	7,942	8,155	8,368
GS-8	7,068	7,303	7,538	7,773	8,008	8,243	8,478	8,713	8,948	9,183
GS-9	7,696	7,957	8,218	8,479	8,740	9,001	9,262	9,523	9,784	10,045
GS-10	8,421	8,709	8,997	9,285	9,573	9,861	10,149	10,437	10,725	11,013
GS-11	9,221	9,536	9,851	10,166	10,481	10,796	11,111	11,426	11,741	12,056
GS-12	10,927	11,306	11,685	12,064	12,443	12,822	13,201	13,580	13,959	14,338
GS-13	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561	16,009	16,457	16,905
GS-14	15,106	15,629	16,152	16,675	17,198	17,721	18,244	18,767	19,290	19,813
GS-15	17,550	18,157	18,764	19,371	19,978	20,585	21,192	21,799	22,406	23,013
GS-16	20,075	20,745	21,415	22,085	22,755	23,425	24,095	24,765	25,435	-------
GS-17	22,760	23,520	24,280	25,040	25,800	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
GS-18	25,890	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------- ,"

(b) Except as provided in section 504(d) of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (78 Stat. 412; 5 U.S.C. 1173(d)), the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom the compensation schedule set forth in subsection (a) of this section applies shall be initially adjusted as of the effective date of this section, as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date.

(3) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the maximum rate for his grade, he shall receive (A) the maximum rate for his grade in the new schedule, or (B) his existing rate of basic compensation if such existing rate is higher.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to section 2(b)(4) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111), plus subsequent increases authorized by law, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of his existing aggregate rate of compensation, on the day preceding the effective date of this section, plus the amount of increase made by this section in the maximum rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this Act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208(b) of the Act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing rate of compensation of the employee.

New appointments under Classification Act of 1949

SEC. 103. Section 801 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (78 Stat. 401; 5 U.S.C. 1131), relating to new appointments, is amended by striking out "grade 13" and inserting in lieu thereof "grade 11".

Postal Field Service employees

SEC. 104. (a) Section 3542(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'PFS'. Except as provided in sections 3543 and 3544 of this title, basic compensation shall be paid to all employees in accordance with such schedule.

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"PFS	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	$4,204	$4,343	$4,482	$4,621	$4,760	$4,899	$5,038	$5,177	$5,316	$5,455	$5,594	$5,733
2	4,552	4,701	4,850	4,999	5,148	5,297	5,446	5,595	5,744	5,893	6,042	6,191
3	4,919	5,085	5,251	5,417	5,583	5,749	5,915	6,081	6,247	6,413	6,579	6,745
4	5,331	5,507	5,683	5,859	6,035	6,211	6,387	6,563	6,739	6,915	7,091	7,267
5	5,697	5,888	6,079	6,270	6,461	6,652	6,843	7,034	7,225	7,416	7,607	7,798
6	6,113	6,316	6,519	6,722	6,925	7,128	7,331	7,534	7,737	7,940	8,143	8,346
7	6,545	6,763	6,981	7,199	7,417	7,635	7,853	8,071	8,289	8,507	8,725	------
8	7,088	7,323	7,558	7,793	8,028	8,263	8,498	8,733	8,968	9,203	------	------
9	7,665	7,920	8,175	8,430	8,685	8,940	9,195	9,450	9,705	9,960	------	------
10	8,345	8,628	8,911	9,194	9,477	9,760	10,043	10,326	10,609	10,892	------	------
11	9,221	9,536	9,851	10,166	10,481	10,796	11,111	11,426	11,741	12,056	------	------
12	10,202	10,549	10,896	11,243	11,590	11,937	12,284	12,631	12,978	13,325	------	------
13	11,274	11,663	12,052	12,441	12,830	13,219	13,608	13,997	14,386	14,775	------	------
14	12,427	12,859	13,291	13,723	14,155	14,587	15,019	15,451	15,883	16,315	------	------
15	13,736	14,210	14,684	15,158	15,632	16,106	16,580	17,054	17,528	18,002	------	------
16	15,179	15,707	16,235	16,763	17,291	17,819	18,347	18,875	19,403	19,931	------	------
17	16,793	17,380	17,967	18,554	19,141	19,728	20,315	20,902	21,489	22,076	------	------
18	18,530	19,145	19,760	20,375	20,990	21,605	22,220	22,835	23,450	24,065	------	------
19	20,525	21,210	21,895	22,580	23,265	23,950	24,635	25,320	------	------	------	------
20	22,760	23,520	24,280	25,040	25,800	------	------	------	------	------	------	------"

(b) Section 3543(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS'. Compensation shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Carrier in rural delivery service:												
Fixed compensation per annum	$2,391	$2,507	$2,623	$2,739	$2,855	$2,971	$3,087	$3,203	$3,319	$3,435	$3,551	$3,667
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	88	90	92	94	96	98	100	102	104	106	108	110
For each mile of route over 30 miles	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25".

(c) Section 3544(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) There is established a basic compensation schedule, which shall be known as the Fourth Class Office Schedule and for which the symbol shall be 'FOS', for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class, which is based on the revenue units of the post office for the preceding fiscal year. Basic compensation shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule.

"FOURTH CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"Revenue units	Per annum rates and steps											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
30 but fewer than 36	$4,019	$4,152	$4,285	$4,418	$4,551	$4,684	$4,817	$4,950	$5,083	$5,216	$5,349	$5,482
24 but fewer than 30	3,715	3,837	3,959	4,081	4,203	4,325	4,447	4,569	4,691	4,813	4,935	5,057
18 but fewer than 24	3,064	3,168	3,272	3,376	3,480	3,584	3,688	3,792	3,896	4,000	4,104	4,208
12 but fewer than 18	2,407	2,485	2,563	2,641	2,719	2,797	2,875	2,953	3,031	3,109	3,187	3,265
6 but fewer than 12	1,736	1,791	1,846	1,901	1,956	2,011	2,066	2,121	2,176	2,231	2,286	2,341
Fewer than 6	1,398	1,443	1,488	1,533	1,578	1,623	1,668	1,713	1,758	1,803	1,848	1,893".

(d) The basic compensation of each employee subject to the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or the Fourth Class Office Schedule immediately prior to the effective date of this section shall be determined as follows:

(1) Each employee shall be assigned to the same numerical step for his position which he had attained immediately prior to such effective date. If changes in levels or steps would otherwise occur on such effective date without regard to enactment of this Act, such changes shall be deemed to have occurred prior to conversion.

(2) If the existing basic compensation is greater than the rate to which the employee is converted under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the employee shall be placed in the lowest step which exceeds his basic compensation. If the existing basic compensation exceeds the maximum step of his position, his existing basic compensation shall be established as his basic compensation.

Employee in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration

SEC. 105. Section 4107 of title 38, United States Code, relating to grades and pay scales for certain positions within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4107. Grades and pay scales

"(a) The per annum full-pay scale or ranges for positions provided in section 4103 of this title, other than Chief Medical Director and Deputy Chief Medical Director, shall be as follows:

"Section 4103 schedule

"Assistant Chief Medical Director, $25,890.

"Medical Director, $22,760 maximum to $25,800 maximum.

"Director of Nursing Service, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"Chief Pharmacist, $17,550 minimum to $23,013, maximum.

"Chief Dietitian, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"(b)(1) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 4104 of this title shall be as follows:

"Physician and dentist schedule

"Director grade, $20,075 minimum to $25,435 maximum.

"Executive grade, $18,730 minimum to $24,355 maximum.

"Chief grade, $17,550 minimum to $23,013 maximum.

"Senior grade, $15,106 minimum to $19,-813 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $12,873 minimum to $16,905 maximum.

"Full grade, $10,927 minimum to $14,338 maximum.

"Associate grade, $9,221 minimum to $12,-056 maximum.

"Nurse schedule

"Assistant Director grade, $15,106 minimum to $19,813 maximum.

"Chief grade, $12,873 minimum to $16,905 maximum.

"Senior grade, $10,927 minimum to $14,338 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, $9,221 minimum to $12,056 maximum.

"Full grade, $7,696 minimum to $10,045 maximum.

"Associate grade, $6,730 minimum to $8,-749 maximum.

"Junior grade, $5,867 minimum to $7,649 maximum.

"(2) No person may hold the director grade unless he is serving as a director of a hospital, domiciliary, center, or outpatient clinic (independent). No person may hold the executive grade unless he holds the position of chief of staff at a hospital, center, or outpatient clinic (independent), or the position of clinic director at an outpatient clinic, or comparable position."

Foreign Service officers; staff officers and employees

SEC. 106. (a) The fourth sentence of section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 867) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$23,935	$24,770	$25,890				
Class 2	19,333	20,004	20,675	$21,347	$22,018	$22,689	$23,360
Class 3	15,841	16,391	16,941	17,491	18,041	18,591	19,141
Class 4	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561
Class 5	10,062	10,970	11,338	11,706	12,074	12,442	12,810
Class 6	8,843	9,147	9,451	9,755	10,059	10,363	10,667
Class 7	7,473	7,724	7,975	8,226	8,477	8,728	8,979
Class 8	6,451	6,664	6,877	7,090	7,303	7,516	7,729"

(b) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 415 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 870(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The per annum salaries of such staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1	$15,841	$16,391	$16,941	$17,491	$18,041	$18,591	$19,141	$19,691	$20,241	$20,791
Class 2	12,873	13,321	13,769	14,217	14,665	15,113	15,561	16,009	16,457	16,905
Class 3	10,602	10,970	11,338	11,706	12,074	12,442	12,810	13,178	13,546	13,914
Class 4	8,843	9,147	9,451	9,755	10,059	10,363	10,667	10,971	11,275	11,579
Class 5	7,974	8,246	8,518	8,790	9,062	9,334	9,606	9,878	10,150	10,422
Class 6	7,201	7,441	7,681	7,921	8,161	8,401	8,641	8,881	9,121	9,361
Class 7	6,614	6,832	7,050	7,268	7,486	7,704	7,922	8,140	8,358	8,576
Class 8	5,853	6,051	6,249	6,447	6,645	6,843	7,041	7,239	7,437	7,635
Class 9	5,341	5,517	5,693	5,869	6,045	6,221	6,397	6,573	6,749	6,925
Class 10	4,776	4,936	5,096	5,256	5,416	5,576	5,736	5,896	6,056	6,216".

(c) Foreign Service officers, Reserve officers, and Foreign Service staff officers and employees who are entitled to receive basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the rates provided by section 412 or 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 shall receive basic compensation, on and after such effective date, at the rate of their class determined to be appropriate by the Secretary of State.

Agricultural stabilization and conservation county committee employees

SEC. 107. The rates of compensation of persons employed by the county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590h(b)) shall be increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102(a) of this title for corresponding rates of compensation.

Salary rates fixed by administration action

SEC. 108. (a) The rates of basic compensation of assistant United States attorneys whose basic salaries are fixed pursuant to section 508 of title 28, United States Code, shall be increased, effective on the effective date of section 102 of this title, by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by section 102(a) of this title for corresponding rates of compensation.

(b) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this Act are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on the effective date of section 102 of this title, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this title for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be held or considered to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the authority contained in any law pursuant to which rates of compensation may be fixed by administrative action.

Effective dates

SEC. 109. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 101, 103, and 108 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Sections 102, 104, 105, 106, and 107, shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE II—JUDICIAL BRANCH

Short title

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1966".

Judicial branch employees

SEC. 202. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed by or pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 102(a)(2)), section 3650 of title 18, United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, sections 671 to 675, inclusive, or section 604(a)(5), of title 28, United States Code, insofar as the latter section applies to graded positions, are hereby increased by amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees holding ungraded positions and whose salaries are fixed pursuant to such section 604(a)(5) may be increased by the amounts reflecting the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges are hereby increased by amounts which reflect the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) Section 753(e) of title 28, United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts), is amended by striking out the existing salary limitation contained therein and inserting a new limitation which reflects the respective applicable increases provided by section 102(a) of title I of this Act in corresponding rates of compensation for officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

Effective dates

SEC. 203. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and section 201 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Section 202 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE III—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Short title

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1966".

Legislative branch employees

SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, each officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government, whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 2.9 per centum of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The total annual compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each officer or employee of the House of Representatives, whose compensation is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and is not increased by reason of any other provision of this section, shall be increased by 2.9 per centum. Notwithstanding section 303 of this title or any other provision of this section, the total annual compensation of the

Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be an amount which is equal to the total annual compensation of the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, respectively.

(c) The rates of compensation of employees of the House of Representatives whose compensation is fixed by the House Employees Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act (78 Stat. 1079–1084; Public Law 88–652; 2 U.S.C. 291–303), including each employee subject to such Act whose compensation is fixed at a saved rate, are hereby increased by amounts equal, as nearly as may be practicable, to the increases provided by subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The additional compensation provided by this section shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251 and following).

(e) This section shall not apply with respect to the compensation of student congressional interns authorized by House Resolution 416, Eighty-ninth Congress, and the compensation of employees whose compensation is fixed by the House Wage Schedule under the House Employees Position Classification Act.

(f) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the effective date of this section, to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act, the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish such provisions to apply to such employee. In any case in which, at the expiration of the time within which a Senator may give notice under this subsection, such Senator is deceased, such notice shall be deemed to have been given.

(g) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (h), the rates of gross compensation of the Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, the Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, the Chief Reporter of Debates of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Senior Counsel in the Office of the Legislatve Counsel of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the Senate, the Chaplain of the Senate, and the Postmaster and Assistant Postmaster of the Senate are hereby increased by 2.9 per centum.

(h) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Appropriations Act, 1956, as amended (74 Stat. 304; Public Law 86–568), is amended by striking out "$23,770" and inserting in lieu thereof "$24,460".

(i) The limitation on gross rate per hour per person provided by applicable law on the effective date of this section with respect to the folding of speeches and pamphlets for the Senate is hereby increased by 2.9 per centum. The amount of such increase shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent. The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to employees whose compensation is subject to such limitation.

Salary increase limitation

SEC. 303. No rate of compensation shall be increased, by reason of the enactment of this title, to an amount in excess of the salary rate now or hereafter in effect for level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

Effective dates

SEC. 304. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and section 301 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Sections 302 and 303 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Salary steps for certain employees transferred to postal field service

SEC. 401. Section 3551 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The Postmaster General may appoint or advance any Federal employee who, together with his function, is transferred, prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this subsection, to a post office or other postal installation at or to (1) the minimum rate for his position, or (2) any higher rate for his position which is less than one full step above the highest rate of compensation received by him immediately prior to such transfer.".

Postal seniority adjustments

SEC. 402. (a) The Postmaster General shall advance any employee in the postal field service

(1) who was promoted to a higher level between July 9, 1960, and October 13, 1962;

(2) who is senior with respect to total postal service to an employee in the same post office promoted to the same level on or after October 13, 1962, and is on the effective date of this section in a step in the same level below the step of the junior employee; and

(3) whom the Postmaster General determines is in the same craft and same branch of the Post Office Service as such junior employee.

Such advancement by the Postmaster General shall be to the highest step which is held by any such junior employee. Any increase under the provisions of this subsection shall not constitute an equivalent increase and credit earned prior to adjustment under this subsection for advancement to the next step shall be retained.

(b) Section 3552 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting subsection (d).

Special delivery messengers

SEC. 403. Section 3542(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "7 cents per mile or major fraction thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 cents per mile or major fraction thereof"; and

(2) by striking out "90 cents per hour" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1.25 per hour".

Overtime

SEC. 404. (a) Section 201 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended (5 U.S.C. 911), is amended—

(1) by inserting "or, with the exception of employees engaged in professional or technical engineering or scientific activities for whom the first forty hours of duty in an administrative workweek is the basic workweek and employees whose basic compensation exceeds the minimum rate of grade GS–10 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for whom the first forty hours of duty in an administrative workweek is the basic workweek, in excess of eight hours in a day" immediately following "in excess of forty hours in any administrative workweek"; and

(2) by striking out "grade GS–9" wherever it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof "grade GS–10".

(b) Section 202 of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 912), is amended by striking out "grade GS–9" and inserting in lieu thereof "grade GS–10".

(c) Section 401 of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926), is amended by striking out "grade GS–9" wherever it occurs therein and inserting in lieu thereof "grade GS–10".

(d) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 3573 of title 39, United States Code, are amended by striking out "level PFS–7" and "level PFS–8", wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "level PFS–10" and "level PFS–11", respectively.

Sunday premium pay

SEC. 405. (a) The heading of title III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—COMPENSATION FOR NIGHT, SUNDAY, AND HOLIDAY WORK"

(b) (1) Section 302 of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 922), is redesignated as section 303 of such Act.

(2) Any reference in any provision of law to section 302 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, which is redesignated as section 303 of such Act by paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall be held and considered to refer to section 303 of such Act, as so redesignated.

(c) Title III of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 921 and following), is amended by inserting immediately following section 301 thereof the following:

"Compensation for Sunday work

"SEC. 302. Any regularly scheduled eight-hour period of service which is not overtime work as defined in section 201 of this Act any part of which is performed within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be compensated for the entire period of service at the rate of basic compensation of the officer or employee performing such work plus premium compensation at a rate equal to 25 per centum of his rate of basic compensation."

(d) Section 401(1) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926(1)), is amended by inserting ", Sunday," immediately following the word "night".

(e) Section 401(2) of such Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 926(2)), is amended—

(1) by inserting in the first sentence thereof ", on Sundays," immediately following the words "duty at night"; and

(2) by inserting in the second sentence thereof "Sunday," immediately following night,".

(f) The first paragraph of section 23 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935, as amended (5 U.S.C. 673c), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided further*, That employees subject to this section whose regular work schedule includes an eight-hour period of service any part of which is within the period commencing at midnight Saturday and ending at midnight Sunday shall be paid extra compensation at the rate of 25 per centum of his hourly rate of basic compensation for each hour of work performed during that eight-hour period of service".

Health and insurance coverage for certain employees on leave without pay

SEC. 406. (a) Section 6 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2095), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding the foregoing, an officer or employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, elect to continue his insurance and arrange

to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency, both employee and agency contributions from the beginning of leave without pay. If he does not so elect, his insurance will continue during nonpay status and terminate as provided in subsection (a) of this section. The employing agency shall forward the premium payments to the fund established by section 5 of this Act."

(b) Section 7(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3006(b)), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) An employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, file with his employing agency an election to continue his health benefits coverage and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency from the beginning of leave without pay, both employee and agency contributions. If he does not so elect, his coverage will terminate as specified in paragraph (1) and implementing regulations. The employing agency shall forward the enrollment charges so paid to the fund."

(c) An officer or employee who is on approved leave without pay and serving as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 2 of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091), or section 2 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001), as the case may be, may, within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act, file with his employing agency an election (1) to continue any insurance status or health benefits enrollment, or both, that he has on the date of enactment of this Act, (2) to reacquire any insurance status or health benefits enrollment, or both, which he may have lost while on leave without pay, or (3) to acquire an insured status or enroll in a health benefits plan, or both, if he was never previously eligible to do so, by arranging to pay currently and continuously into the employees' life insurance fund and the employees' health benefits fund, as appropriate, through his employing agency, both employee and agency contributions. The employing agency shall forward such payments to the employees' life insurance fund and the employees' health benefits fund, as appropriate. If he does not so elect, his insurance status and health benefits enrollment will continue and terminate as for other employees in nonpay status, or he will remain ineligible for insurance and health benefits, as the case may be, as though this paragraph had not been enacted. The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the purposes of this paragraph.

Increase in uniform allowances

SEC. 407. (a) Section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131–2133), is amended by inserting immediately following the second sentence thereof the following new sentence: "In those instances where the agency makes reimbursement direct to the uniform vendor, the head of the agency may deduct a service charge not to exceed 4 per centum."

(b) Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 405. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, each of the respective maximum uniform allowances in effect on April 1, 1966, for the respective categories of employees to whom uniform allowances are paid under this title are hereby increased, subject to the maximum allowance authorized by this title, as follows:

"(1) If the maximum uniform allowance is $100 or more, such allowance shall be increased by 25 per centum.

"(2) If the maximum uniform allowance is $75 or more but less than $100, such allowance shall be increased by 30 per centum.

"(3) If the maximum uniform allowance is $50 or more but less than $75, such allowance shall be increased by 35 per centum.

"(4) If the maximum uniform allowance is less than $50, such allowance shall be increased by 40 per centum.

Such maximum uniform allowances, as in effect on April 1, 1966, and as increased by this section, shall not be reduced.".

SEC. 408. (a) Section 303(c) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 416; Public Law 88–426) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(47) Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service."

(b) Paragraph (30) of section 303(d) of such Act is hereby repealed.

Effective dates

SEC. 409. This title shall become effective as follows:

(1) This section and sections 401, 406, and 407 shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Sections 403, 404, and 405 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966.

(3) Sections 402 and 408 shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period after the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Short title

SEC. 501. This title may be cited as the "Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1966".

Definitions

SEC. 502. Section 1(j) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2251(j)) is amended by inserting the letter "(d)" after the words "for purposes of section 10"; by striking out the words "received more than one-half of his support from and"; and by striking out the words "twenty-one" and "twenty-first" wherever they occur and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twenty-two" and "twenty-second", respectively.

Retirement coverage for certain employees on leave without pay

SEC. 503. Section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k)(1) An employee who enters on approved leave without pay to serve as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 1(a) of this Act, may, within sixty days after entering on such leave without pay, file with his employing agency an election to receive full retirement credit for his periods of such leave without pay and arrange to pay currently into the fund, through his employing agency, amounts equal to the retirement deductions and agency contributions which would be applicable if he were in pay status. An employee who is on approved leave without pay and serving as a full-time officer or employee of such an organization on the date of enactment of this subsection may similarly elect within sixty days after such date of enactment. If the election and all payments provided by this paragraph are not made, the employee shall receive no credit for such periods of leave without pay occurring on or after date of enactment of this subsection, notwithstanding the provisions of the second sentence of section 3(c) of this Act.

"(2) An employee may deposit with interest an amount equal to retirement deductions representing any period or periods of approved leave without pay while serving, prior to the date of enactment of this subsection, as a full-time officer or employee of an organization composed primarily of employees, as defined in section 1(a) of this Act, and may receive full retirement credit for such period or periods of leave without pay. In the event of his death, a survivor as defined in section 1(o) of this Act may make such deposit. If the deposit described in this paragraph is not made in full, retirement credit shall be allowed in accordance with the second sentence of section 3(c) of this Act."

Immediate retirement

SEC. 504. (a) Section 6(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2256 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Any employee who attains the age of fifty-five years and completes thirty years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9."

(b) Section 6(b) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2256(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any employee who attains the age of sixty years and completes twenty years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9."

Annuity computation

SEC. 505. Section 9(d) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2259(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for an employee retiring under section 6(d), shall be reduced by one-sixth of 1 per centum for each full month such employee is under the age of fifty-five years at date of separation. The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for a Member retiring under the second or third sentence of section 6(f) or the third sentence of section 8(b), shall be reduced by one-twelfth of 1 per centum for each full month not in excess of sixty, and one-sixth of 1 per centum or each full month in excess of sixty, such Member is under the age of sixty years at date of separation."

Survivor annuities

SEC. 506. (a) Section 10(a)(2) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) An annuity computed under this subsection shall commence on the day after the retired employee dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (A) in the case of the survivor of a retired employee, the survivor's remarriage prior to attaining age sixty, or death or (B) in the case of the survivor of a Member, the survivor's death or remarriage."

(b) The last sentence of section 10(c) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(c)) is amended to read as follow: "The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the day after the employee of Member dies, and an annuity under this subsection or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) the death of the widow or widower, (2) remarriage of the widow or widower of an employee prior to attaining age sixty, (3) remarriage of the widow or widower of a Member regardless of age, or (4) the widower's becoming capable of self-support."

(c) Section 10(d) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) If an employee or a Member dies after completing at least five years of civilian service, or an employee or a Member dies after having retired under any provision of this Act, and is survived by a wife or by a husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 40 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children,

(2) $600, or (3) $1,800 divided by the number of children, subject to the provisions of section 18. If such employee or Member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 50 per centum of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) $720, or (3) $2,160 divided by the number of children, subject to the provisions of section 18. The commencing date of a child's annuity under this Act or the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended from and after February 28, 1948, shall be deemed to be the day after the employee or Member dies, with payment beginning on that day or beginning or resuming on the first day of the month in which the child later becomes or again becomes a student as described in section 1(j), provided the lump-sum credit, if paid, is returned to the fund. Such annuity shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) the child's attaining age eighteen unless he is then a student as described or incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after attaining age eighteen unless he is then such a student, (3) his attaining age twenty-two if he is then such a student and not incapable of self-support, (4) his ceasing to be such a student after attaining age eighteen unless he is then incapable of self-support, (5) his marriage, or (6) his death, whichever first occurs. Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband or termination of the child's annuity, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as through such wife, husband, or child had not survived the employee or Member."

(d) Section 10 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2260) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(f) In the case of a surviving spouse whose annuity under this section is hereafter terminated because of remarriage before attaining age sixty, annuity at the same rate shall be restored commencing on the day such remarriage is dissolved by death, annulment, or divorce: *Provided*, That (1) said surviving spouse elects to receive such annuity in lieu of any survivor benefit to which he or she may be entitled, under this or any other retirement system established for employees of the Government, by reason of the remarriage, and (2) any lump sum paid upon termination of the annuity is returned to the fund."

Increases in certain annuities

SEC. 507. Section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2268) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(g) Effective on (1) the first day of the second month after the enactment of this Act, or (2) the commencing date of annuity, whichever is later, the annuity of each surviving spouse whose entitlement to annuity payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund resulted from the death of:

"(A) an employee or Member prior to October 11, 1962, or

"(B) a retired employee or Member whose retirement was based on a separation from service prior to October 11, 1962, shall be increased by 10 per centum."

Effective dates

SEC. 508. (a) This section, section 509, and subsections 1(j), 3(k), 6(a), 6(b), 9(d), 10(a)(2), 10(c), 10(d), and 10(f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as enacted or amended by this title, shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) Except as provided in section 507 and in subsection (c) of this section, the amendments made by this title to the Civil Service Retirement Act shall not apply in the cases of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to these respective effective dates, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if this title had not been enacted.

(c) The amendments made by this title to sections 1(j) and 10(d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to payment, continuance, resumption, and termination of annuity to a child who is a student shall apply with respect to children of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this title, except that no child's annuity shall be paid by reason of these amendments for any period prior to such date of enactment.

Miscellaneous

SEC. 509. The provisions under the heading "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (72 Stat. 1064; Public Law 85-844), shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' HEALTH BENEFITS

SEC. 601. Section 2(d) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 709; 5 U.S.C. 3001(d)) is amended by striking out "twenty-one" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-two".

SEC. 602. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7(a) of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the biweekly Government contributions for health benefits for employees or annuitants enrolled in health benefits plans under this Act, in addition to the contributions required by paragraph (3), shall be $1.62 if the enrollment is for self alone or $3.94 if the enrollment is for self and family, commencing with the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966.

"(2) For an employee or annuitant enrolled in a plan for which the biweekly subscription charge is less than twice the Government contribution established under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Government contribution shall be 50 per centum of the subscription charge, commencing with the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk several amendments to the committee amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with, but that the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendments ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

On page 38, after line 2, insert the following:

"(5) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the General Schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the General Schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this Act) at the time of such promotion."

On page 50, line 24, and page 51, line 1, strike out "effective date of this section" and substitute "first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act".

On page 51, line 9, after the period insert the following: "No employee whose basic compensation is adjusted under this subsection shall receive any additional compensation under subsection (a) for any period prior to the effective date of such adjustment during which such employee was employed in the office of the Senator by whom he is employed on the first day of the month following the enactment of this Act. No additional compensation shall be paid to any person under subsection (a) for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act during which such person was employed in the office of a Senator (other than a Senator by whom he is employed on such day) unless on or before the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of this Act such Senator notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he wishes such employee to receive such additional compensation for such period."

On page 62, line 14, strike out the entire paragraph.

On page 62, line 17, strike out "(3) Sections 402 and 408" and insert in lieu thereof "(2) Sections 402, 403, 404, 405, and 408".

On page 69, line 9, strike out "Act" and substitute "subsection".

On page 71, line 9, beginning with the comma, strike out all through "July 1, 1966" in line 10.

On page 71, line 15, beginning with the comma, strike out all through "July 1, 1966" in line 16.

On page 71, after line 16, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 603. The amendments made by sections 601 and 602 of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act."

On page 71, after line 16, add the following:

"TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 701. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this Act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this Act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 61f-61k), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after July 1, 1966, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. Such retroactive compensation or salary shall not be considered as basic salary for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act in the case of any such retired or deceased officer or employee.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes

in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this Act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendments are technical in nature, and I ask that they be considered en bloc.

The amendments are designed to authorize retroactive pay for those Federal employees who otherwise will not be paid for the time between the effective date of this legislation—July 1—and the date it is enacted. It is the same language which Congress always uses to achieve this purpose.

When the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reported H.R. 14122 to the Senate on May 26, it was thought that adequate time existed to pass the bill before the effective date. That has not proved to be the case. To make sure that all employees get the pay which the bill is designed to give them, these amendments should be adopted by the Senate.

There are minor changes in the effective dates of some provisions in the bill. To avoid a very complex administrative problem which has very little financial effect upon the employees, the effective dates for the Government's increased health insurance contribution, increased special delivery allowance, overtime pay, and premium pay have been moved back from the pay period beginning immediately after July 1 to the pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment.

These few cases will affect the amount received by only a few employees, and only to a very minor extent. Otherwise, these amendments will make no change in the bill as unanimously approved by our committee.

I recommend the adoption of the amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, H.R. 14122, the Federal employees' pay bill for 1966, combines prudent economic and budgetary policy, at a time when reductions and limitations in domestic spending are necessary, with several key reforms and progressive liberalizations in the policies governing Federal employment.

H.R. 14122 provides an across-the-board increase averaging 2.9 percent for all levels of the four statutory pay systems—postal, classified, foreign service, and the medical division of the Veterans' Administration. The adoption of an across-the-board increase this year, however, does not indicate any sentiment on the part of the committee to return to the methods of pay increases which generally prevailed prior to the Salary Reform Act. It does indicate that we recognize the needs of employees in the lower salary levels who are most directly affected when food prices, clothing prices, medical expenses, and all other aspects of the cost of living rapidly increase. Those in the upper levels of pay are no less deserving, but the economic pinch on them is not as severe as it is on the man who earns $5,000 or $6,000 a year.

The take-home pay of a postal letter carrier or of a GS–5 employee in the classified service in the first few years of employment averages less than $375 a month. For a man with a family, living in a big city, as most of our employees are these days, that is an extremely limited income. The need is obviously greatest at these lower salary levels.

I believe that comparability must be achieved to recruit and retain the quality of personnel the Government must have. But in 1966, the needs of our country in fulfilling other commitments require a limitation upon domestic spending. This pay bill is designed accordingly.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a section-by-section analysis of the bill as reported, and an itemization of the cost of the bill.

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

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF H.R. 14122

Title I provides an average increase of 2.9 percent in the basic compensation of employees subject to the four statutory schedules—the general schedule of the Classification Act, the Postal Field Service schedule, and the schedules for employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration and the Foreign Service. Employees in county offices of the Agriculture Soil Conservation Service and United States assistant attorneys are also given the 2.9 percent increase. Employees of other agencies of the Executive Branch whose salaries are adjusted by administrative action are authorized to be increased in amounts similar to the increases applying to the schedules. All salary increases shall be retroactively effective to the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1966. This retroactive payment includes those outside the four statutory schedules.

Section 103 permits the appointment of new employees at a rate above the entrance rate of the grade in GS–11 and above when the Civil Service Commission approves such appointments. Present law, enacted in 1964, permits such appointments in GS–13 and above.

Title II increases or authorizes increases for employees in the judicial branch of the Government.

Title III increases or authorizes increases for employees of the Congress and employees of Members of Congress.

The effective date for all salary increases is the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1966.

Title IV provides several improvements in law governing Federal employment.

Section 401 will permit the Postmaster General to appoint or advance any employee transferred, with his function, into the postal service to a step in the level of the postal field service schedule or system. The general rule in the postal service is to enter at the first step, regardless of previous salary or experience. This occasionally results in an employee losing money because the postal service has taken over a function previously administered by another agency. With respect to employees previously transferred, the provisions of Section 401 will permit redetermination of the employee's pay step, by reconstructing advancement through the Postal salary schedules as if the new provision had been in effect at the time of transfer. If such reconstruction places the employee in a step above the step attained, as of the effective date of Section 401, a pay adjustment will be made, placing the employee in the reconstructed step, as of July 2, 1966. Since an adjustment of this kind would result in an equivalent increase, the employee will begin a new waiting period for his next step increase on July 2.

Section 402 permits the adjustment of salary for certain postal supervisors who are senior to certain other supervisors promoted after October 13, 1962. This provision will require that senior employees in the same postal occupation will be elevated to the same step of the PFS level as is held by a junior employee promoted after the Salary Reform Act of 1962.

Section 403 increases the mileage and hour allowance for special delivery messengers who use their own vehicle. This payment is usually confined to Christmas time when Government vehicles are not easily available to special delivery messengers.

Section 404 authorizes overtime payment for work in excess of 8 hours in 1 day for classified employees with the exception of certain engineering and scientific employees. Classified Federal employees get overtime pay for work in excess of 40 hours in a week, but heretofore the law has not required pay for work in excess of 8 hours in a day.

Section 404 also raises the grade level for overtime pay from the rate paid GS–9, step 1, to the same step of GS–10. Employees above that level can be paid or given compensatory time off, at the discretion of management.

Section 404 also raises the level for mandatory overtime pay for postal employees from PFS–7 to PFS–10. The 1965 Salary Act abolished compensatory time below level 8 and permitted payment above level 7 at the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Section 405 requires a premium of 25 percent of base pay for any employee whose regularly scheduled 5-day workweek includes Sunday. The premium will be paid for the entire 8-hour period of service regardless of the numbers of hours which actually occur on Sunday. This is identical to the provisions for regular postal employees enacted last year.

Section 406 permits full-time officers and employees of Federal employee unions to carry Federal life and health insurance while serving as union officers provided that the total cost of such insurance is paid by the employee and his union. The officer will receive the benefit of the group rate at his own expense. The Government will pay nothing.

Section 407 requires the 25-percent increase in uniform allowance authorized in the 1965 Salary Act. The House-approved provision has been amended to permit the Federal agency to make payment direct to the uniform vendor and deduct a service discount of 4 percent from the amount paid to the vendor.

Section 408 equalizes the salary of the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service with the salary of the Chairman of the Federal Mediation Board at level III of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule ($28,500).

Title V includes several significant amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act to improve the retirement benefits of Federal employees.

Section 502 eliminates the requirement that a child be dependent upon a Federal-employee parent in order to receive a survivor annuity. This will permit the children of a working mother to receive a survivor annuity in the event of her death. The section also raises from 21 to 22 the maximum age for student survivors to receive annuity payment.

Section 503 permits credit for leave without pay for Federal employee union officers for the purposes of retirement. Under current law, these officers have received a half-year's credit for each full year on leave without pay without contribution. The Retirement Act was not designed to permit this credit. Section 503 requires, after the enactment of this act, that any such union officer shall receive credit for time served as

a union officer only if he pays the full amount of employee and agency contributions. There will be no cost to the Government.

Section 504 enacts a long-sought goal of Federal employees—retirement of a full annuity at age 55 after 30 years' service. Retirement on a full annuity will also be permitted at age 60 after 20 years' service.

Section 505 prohibts a Member of Congress from retiring at age 55 on an unreduced annuity. The provisions of present law, reducing the full annuity by 1 percent for each full year below 60, will continue to be applicable to Members of Congress.

Section 506 permits the widow of a Federal employee to continue receiving her survivor annuity if she remarries after attaining age 60, or to have her annuity reinstated in the event a remarriage prior to age 60 is terminated. If such a widow has an election of survivor annuities under any Federal employee retirement program, she may elect which she wishes to receive, but cannot receive more than one.

Section 507 increases the annuities of widows and widowers of Federal employees who died or retired prior to October 11, 1962, by 10 percent. Spouses of Federal employees who retired prior to that date shall receive the 10-percent increase when their annuity commences.

Section 508 establishes the effective dates of the retirement amendments. Except for the amendments affecting the student survivor annuity of children of Federal employees, the amendments are entirely prospective and shall have no effect upon the annuities or entitlement to annuity of any person who died or was separated or retired prior to the effective date of this act. In the cases of surviving student children, however, the amendments shall apply to any such child who is otherwise eligible under the conditions of these amendments.

Section 601 increases the maximum age limit for health insurance coverage for the children of employees from 21 to 22. This is in line with the age increase for survivor children receiving civil service annuities while in college.

Section 602 increases the Government's contribution to the cost of high-option health insurance by approximately 10 percent. Employees have paid the full cost of each insurance premium increase since the program was commenced in 1960.

Estimated cost of the bill, as reported

	Millions
Salary increase	$416.7
Classified service	273.1
Postal service	131.5
Veterans' Administration	6.7
Foreign Service	5.4
Additional health insurance	34.0
Postal supervisors adjustment	2.0
Uniform allowance increase [1]	------
Special delivery allowance	.3
Postal supervisors overtime	14.3
Classified overtime	5.5
Sunday premium	32.0
Retirement benefits:	
55/30—60/20	19.7
Widow's remarriage	12.0
Child's annuity	.3
Annuity increase	7.0
Additional interest on the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement and disability fund	30.3
Equivalent offset [2]	(68.3)
Total cost	505.8

[1] This cost is not included because it was charged against the cost of the 1965 Salary Act and is not properly attributable to this bill.

[2] This offset against the total cost of the bill is derived from the additional cost of retirement benefits under present law plus new benefits created by the enactment of the retirement provisions of this bill, approximately 0.5 percent of present payroll.

In the Economic Report, 1965, the Council of Economic Advisers stated the following: "On Jan. 1, employer payroll taxes to finance social security and Medicare rose substantially, raising labor costs per hour by an average of two-thirds of a percent. These taxes are not included in the definition of employee compensation for purposes of the guideposts, since the rates and benefits are determined by law rather than by collective bargaining. Nonetheless, recognition has to be taken of the extraordinary increases in taxes at this time, which will raise both unit labor costs and yield future benefits to employees."

Because the principle of the guideposts is to permit all to participate in the general increase in productivity and prosperity, the executive branch agrees that an equivalent offset should be included in determining the increase in compensation for Federal employees.

Mr. MONRONEY. This pay bill is quite similar to the measure passed by the House and referred to our committee. We have proposed three amendments which, in my opinion, improve the bill and reduce its costs. These amendments resulted from testimony taken in hearings over many days, in which most of the members participated.

Our most important amendment is the deletion of section 507 of the bill, as referred, which would have provided for a recomputation of annuities and survivor annuities based on the death or retirement of an employee occurring between April 1948 and October 1962. The amount which an employee paid to provide his widow with a survivor annuity varied during that 15-year period, and their percentage which the widow received also varied. In October 1962, Congress established the present survivor annuity formula of a 2.5-percent reduction in the first $3,600 of salary, and 10 percent of any excess, in order to provide a 55-percent remainder to the widow. Employees who retired before the 1962 amendment paid more, and their spouses received 5 percent less. Section 507 would have put all under the 1962 formula.

The executive branch vigorously opposed this provision. The committee gave this matter its most careful and thoughtful consideration. The principle of recomputing past civil service retirement benefits on the basis of laws enacted after an employee's retirement has not been followed by Congress since prior to the major civil service retirement amendments of 1948. The Armed Services Committees have also refrained from recomputations in recent years. Although the cost of this particular provision was not great, the total actuarial cost—a cost which continues as long as the retirement system exists—was estimated to be $355 million. Enactment of the recomputation would have opened the door to further recomputations, and the total cost to the retirement fund or the Treasury could amount to many billions of dollars.

To avoid this very significant problem, the committee deleted section 507 as passed by the House and substituted in its place a 10-percent increase in the annuities of surviving spouses whose annuities are or will be based on retirement prior to the 1962 amendment. The result insofar as widows and widowers are concerned will be the same. A 10-percent increase in the spouse's annuity is identical in result to a recomputation increasing the percentage of annuity from 50 to 55 percent. But the long-range cost and the implications for future congressional policy are tempered. In addition, the 10-percent increase will apply to widows and widowers prior to 1948. This is the group in greatest need who receive the smallest civil service annuities.

I am sure that this change in the bill will not satisfy all, but it aims at helping those who need help most. Annuitants themselves, who received either a 6- or 11-percent increase last December, are probably going to receive a 3-percent cost-of-living increase before the end of this year. Our efforts to improve the economic well-being of all retired employees and their families shall continue.

Two other amendments concern overtime pay for work exceeding 8 hours in 1 day, and postal seniority adjustments.

As referred, the bill would have required time-and-a-half for any work in excess of 8 hours a day for all classified employees GS–10 and below. The committee has retained the substance of this amendment, but has excluded certain employees engaged in scientific and research work whose schedule, while not exceeding 40 hours in a week, does occasionally exceed 8 hours in a day. The nature of their work requires it. This amendment will reduce the cost of the House provision by two-thirds. The committee has elevated the rate of overtime pay for firefighters, investigators, and certain other employees from GS–9 to GS–10. Thus a level of the general schedule employees will enjoy this benefit.

The postal seniority adjustment, as referred, would have given step increases to supervisors senior to any junior employee in their same salary level. The committee has revised this provision to divide these employees into postal service occupational groups, so that a supervisor in the motor vehicle division will not get an increase simply because a foreman of the mails, who is junior in total service, happens to make more money.

I believe both of these amendments are acceptable and suitable refinements to the bill. The cost of the bill is reduced by $13.8 million thereby.

Other than these three amendments and certain technical changes in language, the bill is identical to the referred bill.

One important provision increases the Government's contribution to health insurance costs by $34 million, a 10-percent increase in the policies carried by most employees. When the Federal employees' health program was enacted in 1959, it was assumed that most employees would choose the low-cost, low-option program, for which the Government contribution was fixed at 50 percent, regardless of actual dollar cost. But experience has shown that almost 90

percent of our employees chose the high-option program, offering greater protection and costing much more.

In 1960, when the program began, the Government paid nearly 40 percent of the high-option premium. Since then, the employees have paid the full cost of all premium increases, and the Government's dollar-amount contribution has declined as a percentage of total cost. H.R. 14122 will remedy this by restoring the original ratio. It is not a complete remedy, but it will add to the employee's take-home pay, and it will demonstrate Congress intention to continue a major role in paying the costs of fringe benefit programs.

The bill requires that the increased authorization for uniform allowances included in last year's bill be given to the employees. In 1965, Congress increased the maximum amount from $100 to $125, but action to implement this increase has been slow in coming. To avoid further delay, the language has been made mandatory. The committee has amended this provision to provide authority for the various agencies to make reimbursements direct to the uniform vendors rather than reimbursing the employee. If such direct reimbursement is made, the agency may discount the amount paid the vendor by 4 percent.

The Civil Service Retirement Act has been amended to provide several long-sought reforms. Hereafter, employees shall be permitted to retire at age 55 after 30 years' service without reduction in their annuity. This has been a goal of employees for more than 40 years. Authority to permit agencies to retire employees in GS–13 and above at such age and service has not been adopted.

Hereafter, when the widow of a deceased Federal employee remarries after attaining age 60, she shall continue to receive her annuity. This amendment is much needed. It is most difficult for the widow of a former employee to give up her small annuity upon remarriage and then, through her second husband's death, be left with virtually nothing—and sometimes nothing at all. Should a widow remarry prior to attaining age 60, her annuity will cease, but it may be resumed if the marriage is terminated.

Under present law, the children of deceased employees must be dependent upon their parent in order to receive a survivor annuity. In the case of the father, this is usually true, but in the case of a working mother, it is not usually true, and if it is, it must be proven. This bill eliminates the requirement of dependency. From now on, the children of a working mother shall be eligible to receive the survivor annuity. The maximum age limit for children-survivors who are students has been increased from 21 to 22, to permit them to finish the normal term of a college education.

The committee has also extended the maximum age limit for family coverage under the health insurance program from 21 to 22.

Provisions in the bill which would have permitted Members of Congress to receive credit at the Member rate for service in the executive branch, and to compute their annuity on an average salary other than their congressional salary have been deleted from the reported bill.

The bill reported from the committee cost $505.8 million annually, based on the wage-price guideposts which cover the statutory salary systems. There is about $46 million in cost for other salary systems—wage board employees and employees of the legislative and judicial branches—which are outside the guideposts.

This cost figure is about $20 million above the 3.2 guidepost measurement. The committee is fully aware of this. But we believe we have done as much cutting as we can. The salaries recommended in this bill are largely based on rates prevailing in private enterprise more than a year ago. The real increase in salaries is the money added to the employee's purchasing power. The increase in the Consumer Price Index since the enactment of Public Law 89–301 is 1.9 percent. If we subtract that net purchasing power loss—and if we take any account whatsoever of the effect of State and local taxes, retirement deductions, and increased life insurance premiums and health insurance premiums in some plans last year, the increase is quite moderate. To do less than we have done in this bill would be to do practically nothing at all.

I urge the Senate to take favorable and speedy action on this measure.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the ranking minority member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I appreciate his strong assistance in reporting a bill which will give the Federal employees the maximum allowable increase within the lines of the noninflationary guideposts which the President has urged upon private industry. It was felt that the Government should also respond to that request.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for his dedicated and active interest in securing the introduction of the bill today and in urging its passage.

I think the RECORD should reflect that the minority members of the committee endorsed the bill and voted to report the bill.

I should like to say, however, that Congress clearly wrote into the Federal Salary Act of 1962 what the policy of comparability pay should be for all Federal employees. I sincerely regret that the pending bill lacks a great deal of reaching that optimum hope that Congress had in passing the legislation in 1962.

I realize the difficulty which confronts the President of the United States when trying to hold the pay increases to 3.2 percent.

The bill as reported by the committee calls for a 2.9-percent increase in basic pay. That does not mean, however, as small as that is, that there are not many benefits contained in the bill.

I am pleased to support the bill fully because the bill provides additional benefits in health insurance, provisions for better pay for some of the widows. Changes were written into the bill to benefit survivors and to provide for Sunday pay, for postal overtime, and for classified overtime. Several other features in the bill are really important.

I should not like to let this particular debate go by without mentioning that we fall far short of comparability. The bill was passed at a level of March 1, 1965, and the compensation of the Federal employees is considerably behind that of those people in private industry at the present time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation entitled "High Rise: A Sampling of 1966 Construction Contract Settlements." The tabulation was published in the Business Week magazine of June 18, 1966, and deals with some of the construction contract settlements in private industry, showing that many of them, instead of 3.2 percent, have been settled on the basis of 6.5 percent, 7.5 percent, 10 percent, and 16 percent.

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

High rise—A sampling of 1966 construction contract settlements

Craft	Contract term (years)	Hourly pay in dollars		Percent annual rise
		From—	To—	
Bricklayers, Detroit	2	$5.30	$6.15	7.5
Carpenters:				
Miami	3	4.04	5.30	10.3
Memphis	4	4.00	4.65	4.0
Buffalo	3	5.10	6.15	7.0
Cement masons, Seattle	2	4.54	5.22	7.5
Laborers:				
West Palm Beach	3	1.75	2.60	16.0
Los Angeles	3	4.01	4.96	8.0
Idaho-Oregon	5	3.27	4.24½	6.0
Hod carriers, Chicago	3	3.83	4.55½	6.0
Ironworkers, New Orleans	2	4.40	5.05	7.5
Operating engineers:				
Washington	3	4.83½	5.58½	5.0
Chicago	4	4.70	6.00	7.0
Painters, Kansas City	3	4.48	5.03	4.0
Plasterers:				
Marin, Calif	3½	5.90	7.40	5.5
Buffalo	3	5.01	6.51	7.0
Plumbers:				
Philadelphia	3	5.46	6.51	6.3
Nashville	2	4.41	4.91	5.5
Sheet metal workers, North Dakota	3	3.25	3.95	7.4

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have submitted that tabulation for the RECORD to show that Congress has been very careful in trying to comply with the President's request by keeping the increase at 2.9 percent.

I hope that we will pass this legislation, meager as it is, this afternoon in behalf of the interest of the Federal employees.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Affairs, who has been of great assistance in helping the committee with this legislation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the kind words from the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. His diligent attention to the work of that committee has enabled the pending bill to be brought before the Senate today.

It is a bill that embraces, encompasses, and includes a pay raise for 1,800,000 classified civil service Federal employees and postal employees.

The skillful and sensitive handling of the pending bill by the Senator from Oklahoma enabled the bill to be brought to the floor with little controversy and with almost universal approbation.

The Senator from Oklahoma has been tireless and patient in working out a bill with all members of the committee. He has worked diligently and tirelessly and has reported a bill that will aid many people.

Mr. President, I am pleased to add my support to the Federal Salary and Fringe Benefits Act of 1966. This is a realistic, noninflationary measure which provides for much needed increases for our Federal employees, and at the same time, takes into account this year's budgetary limitations.

I also commend the patriotic representatives of the various employee groups who, after presenting testimony justifying much greater increases, were willing because of the war in Vietnam to accept part of the proven, needful increase at this time.

It is a very patriotic attitude for the employees to take.

I concur in what the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas has said. The employees are entitled under the Comparability Act to greater pay increases. Their work entitles them to it. However, they accepted the pending bill.

I hope that next year the situation will be such that we can provide the full increases the Federal work force deserves.

The late President Kennedy recognized that the complex programs of the greatest Nation on earth require the finest and most imaginative talent available. He also realized that in order to attract and retain this caliber of employee, the Government has to pay salaries comparable with private industry. In 1962, he proposed the principle of Federal salary comparability with private enterprise which was embodied in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962.

We have attempted to carry this out, but, due to the cost of the war in Vietnam, the pending bill does not reach full comparability for the Federal employees.

We have made much progress since 1962, but there is still catching up to be accomplished. Some progress has been made in H.R. 14122, of which the Senate can be proud. The bill would virtually eliminate unpaid overtime work for all classified employees—the only group heretofore left out of overtime pay for work over 8 hours a day. Mandatory overtime pay for postal supervisors would be extended through PFS-10, which would do much to improve morale among these higher level employees whose services are so vital to an efficient postal service.

I am happy to see that retirement at age 55 on a full annuity after 30 years' service is included in the bill. This has been a major aim of employees and employee unions for many years, and in former sessions of Congress I have introduced bills intended to accomplish this. Benefits for the survivors of Federal employees would be liberalized under the proposed legislation. Children of deceased employees would have an opportunity to finish their college education while still receiving their civil service annuity. Widows past the age of 60 would be able to retain their annuity when they remarried. I am glad to see these progressive improvements enacted.

I regret our failure to achieve full comparability with private enterprise, particularly for those employees in the middle and lower levels where rising prices and costs of living hurt most.

In connection with the fringe benefits, I believe this is an outstanding Federal pay bill. The pay increases are not high, but employees had been seeking many of these fringe benefits before I came to the Senate 9 years ago. We have been fighting for these fringe benefits the last 9 years, and now they are written into the pending bill.

This is a landmark bill in the so-called fringe benefit area.

I commend the senior Senator from Oklahoma, whose leadership has brought the bill to this point, where it is near passage.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his remarks and for his efforts in bringing the bill to the floor by unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I submitted a couple of amendments that dealt with the House bill and they were referred to the committee. The purpose of the amendments was to delete from the House bill two sections, each of which proposed to increase the benefits for a former Member of Congress. As I recall, one section provided for increasing benefits by about 100 percent for one former Member of Congress, and the other section provided for about a 60-percent increase.

I shall put two letters in the RECORD outlining the special benefits proposed in the House bill for these two Members of Congress.

It was my understanding that the committee accepted both amendments and that those special benefit provisions are not part of the bill now before us.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Delaware is absolutely correct. The committee believed that these amendments did not belong in the bill. They were in the nature of private legislation, and were deleted from the House-passed bill by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two letters dealing with the need for these amendments to prevent the special retirement benefits for these two former Members of Congress be printed in the RECORD.

I congratulate the committee on its acceptance of these amendments which deleted the special benefits for these two former Members of Congress.

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

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your telephone request of April 7, 1966 for information concerning the number of Federal employees who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act in November and December of 1965, and the amount by which their annuities were increased by the provisions of Public Law 89-205 enacted September 27, 1965. We will not have precise data on these items until we have completed our statistical tabulations next fall, but we are able to provide estimates at this time.

About 37,000 Federal employees retired in November and December of 1965, compared with about 12,000 in the same months of 1964. The annuities which would have been payable to the 37,000 retirees in the absence of increase legislation are estimated to total about $131,285,000 a year. These annuities, however, were first increased under the terms of Public Law 87-793, enacted October 11, 1962, which provided a 2% increase for all persons retiring in 1965. They were further increased by 6.1% under the terms of Public Law 89-205.

The 2% increase is estimated to total $2,626,000 a year, and the 6.1% increase $8,169,000 a year, making the annuities actually payable to the 37,000 retirees $142,080,000 a year.

If these 37,000 had deferred their retirements until the end of January, 1966, the annuities without increase are estimated to total $132,270,000, reflecting an additional month of service and a slightly higher average salary in each case. They would have been increased by 1% as provided by Public Law 87-793 for persons retiring in 1966, to an estimated total of $133,593,000.

In summary, the annuities of the 37,000 November and December 1965 retirees are higher by $8,487,000 a year than if they had

postponed retirement until the end of January 1966.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 7 inquiring about the effect of certain provisions of H.R. 14122 on the retirement rights of former Congressman Frank E. Smith and Paul J. Kilday. The information in this letter is in response to your specific request and is for your official use as a Member of Congress.

The proposed amendment to section 6(f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act would have the effect of conferring title to an immediate annuity computed under the Member of Congress formula on the Honorable Frank E. Smith upon expiration of his term of office as Director of TVA. Current law limits his eligibility to a deferred annuity benefit commencing at age 60. Under current law he will receive about $1306 a month commencing February 21, 1978. The proposed amendment would provide him with a monthly benefit of about $1312 commencing May 19, 1972 (the day following expiration of his term of office).

Present law limits Judge Kilday's annuity benefit to 80% of the $22,500 yearly salary in effect when he left Congress. Section 505(a) of H.R. 14122 amends the law to limit the basic annuity benefit to 80% of final pay received (now $33,000) for his service performed after leaving Congress, as a Judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

If Judge Kilday completes his term which expires on May 1, 1976, his rate of annuity under present law will be about $1601 a month. Section 505(a) of H.R. 14122 would provide him an annuity of about $2304 a month.

Both amendments will also apply to any other former Members of Congress meeting the requirements provided therein.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have one other question. The bill as reported by the committee provides for substantial liberalization of the retirement system. The chairman of the committee has already outlined the various increased benefits. The Civil Service Commission has advised that the adoption of the committee's amendments will increase the unfunded liability of the retirement system by $1,698,700,000.

What provisions has the committee made to pay for the increased benefits in the retirement system that are provided under the bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. As the distinguished Senator from Delaware knows, any pay bill that increases the salaries of Federal employees, increases the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement system. This is because the employees who have been in the retirement system in previous years are allowed, under the system which has long been in force, to base their retirement benefits upon the 5 highest years of their earnings. Therefore, an increase of a very small amount—even the 2.9 percent included in the bill will increase the liability of the civil service fund.

Since 1929 the Federal Government made annual payments into the fund for its share of retirement costs. Unfortunately, this was not always kept up. In 1956 annual payments by the Government into the fund were resumed, and the agencies and employees are each paying the 6½ percent necessary to make the revenues of the fund nearly equal to the normal costs.

As I recall the figures—and I believe I am correct—the money required by the fund to pay the costs is 13.22 percent of payroll.

We are behind twenty-two one-hundredths of 1 percent in the requirements of the fund in order to pay retirement benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The letter that I have from Mr. Ruddock cites the same reasons for the increased cost that the Senator from Oklahoma has just outlined. But only one-half of the $1.698 billion increase in the liability can be attributed to the salary increase—$880 million, to be exact—and the other $800-and-some-odd million increase is as a result of the liberalization of the benefits under the system as provided for under the pending bill. In any event, they all must be paid for.

Mr. MONRONEY. How much does the distinguished Senator say was in Mr. Ruddock's letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. $1,698,700,000—that is the total cost of H.R. 14122. Of that amount, salary increases constitute $880 million. That leaves about $818 million attributable to the provisions of the pending bill.

The reason I ask this question is that the policy has been in effect over a number of years, both in the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Finance, that whenever social security benefits are liberalized, included as part of the same bill is the increased tax required to pay for those increased benefits.

I believe that is a wonderful system. Each time the Members of Congress vote for an increase in benefits they vote for the payment of the increase. Since that method is not being followed in this instance I wonder what plans the committee has to finance this unfunded liability.

I know that the President, in his message to Congress earlier this year, recommended a liberalization of the civil service retirement program with the understanding that a method of payment be devised.

I understand that in the pending bill there is no method to pay for these increased benefits.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that the administration made no request of the committee that it undertake to meet this amount at this time. The total cost that the Senator is giving is not the annual cost.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. This is the unfunded liability.

Mr. MONRONEY. The retirement matters that the Senator referred to have a total cost of $500 million. These are what I consider to be long overdue liberalizations of some retirement benefits.

The balance of the amount—$1 billion—is due to the total cost of raising the level of salaries of our Government employees, upon which their subsequent retirement benefits will be based.

The Senator is very wise, I believe, in mentioning the social security feature. The reason the administration and the Government people did not support an increase in contributions this year was because of the plan we hope will be resubmitted to Congress to blend the civil service retirement system with the social security retirement system.

As the distinguished Senator now knows, under social security employees in private industry for their first 5 years, and a good many more years of their employment, and in part their surviving wives and children, will receive greater benefits than under the civil service retirement system with a great deal less paid in than is required by the 6.5 percent contribution by the Federal Government and the 6.5 percent contribution by the department.

The original administration pay proposal would have allowed Federal employees to have the benefits of the social security system where benefits would be greater, such as in the early years of employment. I would like then to have it. But to do so now, when we are on the threshold of this advance, and raise the required contribution of the Federal employee and the required contribution of the department, would be anticipating a new system of which we do not know its eventual cost, or what it is going to require of the employee. Certainly the Federal Government will be expected, and I am sure will meet its requirement of advancing its one-half of the amount required to pay into the social security system that is used by our Federal employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I fail to see how the expansion of the social security system to Federal employees will affect one iota the financial position of the civil service retirement fund.

If social security is extended to Federal employees there will be deductions from the employees' pay, matched by the contribution of the Government; then all will be made into the trust fund of the social security and they will not be a part of this fund. Therefore, I fail to understand the Senator's argument.

In recent years it has been the custom of Congress in connection with the retirement system to pass these liberalizations in an election year and to say that we will come back next year and change the formula, but we do not get around to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator knows that since 1956 we have met the amounts required by the departments——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, and I was a cosponsor——

Mr. MONRONEY. To put up their share of the funds, and we have done so.

I agree with the Senator that if the fund were liquidated tomorrow there would be a deficit of considerable size.

We certainly intend, and I am sure we will adjust that upward, as we have.

One of the great faults, primarily, was the fact that until 1929 the Congress did not make its Federal contribution for its share. From 1929 onward, it was not regularly met or met in an amount which was realistic. Only since 1956 have the agencies directly been putting up their required share so that the fund is not falling behind, although it is falling behind in the ultimate liability, which is due partly to the prior years and partly to the years that we know we will find increasing salaries being required for the payment of Government workers, as is true in all businesses, such as the insurance business, or anything of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am familiar with the action of the Congress in 1956. I not only supported that action but also was a cosponsor of the proposal, and a few years prior to its adoption I advocated that the Government automatically match the employees' contributions as it should have been doing before.

The unfunded liability of this fund before this bill is enacted is $43.6 billion. Today we are adding $1,698,700 which brings up to $45.3 billion the unfunded liability accrued as a result of increased benefits that Congress voted over the past 20 years for which they have not provided any method of payment.

Mr. MONRONEY. The liability occurred because of a long period in which the Government did not meet its requirement for putting money into the fund for its share of the contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Partly, but if the Government went back and met all of its contributions—and I would be in favor of its doing that for it should have been done before—it would correct but a small part of this liability and there would still be a multibillion-dollar unfunded liability.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, dated May 5, 1966, outlining the extent of this liability be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The following information is furnished in answer to specific questions raised in your letter of April 29.

ANALYSIS OF SECTION 503 OF H.R. 14122

Since its beginning in 1920, the Civil Service Retirement Act has granted covered employees credit, without contribution, for all time on an agency's rolls in a nonpay status (leave without pay, suspension, furlough, and absence without leave) which does not exceed six months in the aggregate in any calendar year. Thus, covered employees carried in nonpay status by their Federal agencies while serving as full-time officials of employee organizations and unions accrue six-months' free service credit for each full calendar year in nonpay or leave without pay status.

Effective upon enactment, section 503 of H.R. 14122 would afford the employee union official 60 days from date of entry on leave without pay to elect with his agency to receive full retirement credit for his time in nonpay status by currently paying retirement deductions (now 6½%) on his Federal salary rate as if in pay status. Otherwise the usual credit of up to six months per calendar year would be allowed for the leave without pay.

Also, section 503 would afford any present or former union official with Retirement Act coverage on or after enactment date the option of depositing employee deductions (at rates then in force), with interest, to cover his prior periods of leave without pay granted to allow him to serve as a full-time union official. In case of death before retirement, the former union officer's survivor could exercise this option. In the absence of deposit in full for this purpose, only the leave without pay not exceeding six months in a calendar year could be credited.

BASIS ON WHICH THIS PROVISION WAS INCLUDED

Section 503 was not recommended by the Administration. Chairman Macy, in testimony before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on April 20, 1966 stated, however, that the Administration would not offer objection to this provision.

COST OF THIS PROVISION

Because we do not know how many union officers are now or may in the future be on leave without pay from their Federal positions, or the duration of such leave, we cannot estimate either the normal cost or the amount of the unfunded liability which this provision would create. Let us assume, however, an over-simplified hypothetical case of a union officer with a level annual Federal salary of $10,000. For each year he is on leave without pay, he receives under present law annuity and time credit of six months, or $100 in annuity rate, at no cost to him. Under the proposed amendment he would receive a full year's credit, or $200 in annuity rate, for each such year, at a cost to him of 6½% of $10,000 or $650.

Unfunded liability under H.R. 14122

[In thousands]

A. From report of the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems, H. Doc. No. 402, p. 25:	
55/30–60/20	$283,000
Widow's remarriage	174,000
Child to age 22	6,000
B. Salary increases	880,000
C. Recomputation of annuities	355,700
Total, H.R. 14122	1,698,700
Unfunded liability present law (Estimated as of June 30, 1966)	43,637,602
Total after enactment of H.R. 14122	45,336,302

I hope this gives you the information you need.

Sincerely yours,
ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has again stressed the concern of all of us who are interested in the soundness of the Federal servants' civil service retirement fund.

This problem concerns many of us and it is of vital concern to the Federal employees of this Nation. I know that there is not a Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives who is not interested in the fund.

We should keep in mind the situation that the fund is in, so that the Federal employees can be assured that the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government is behind the fund.

There has been some discussion here about earlier payments into the fund and it is true that from 1921 until 1928 the Federal Government did not make any contribution to the fund.

We find that in the Civil Service Commission's Annual Report of 1963, page 39, table C-1. It is true that although from 1921 to 1928 Congress made no appropriations to the fund, during that time there were total receipts of $155,940,643, while disbursements were only $72,955,384. This left a balance of over $82 million-plus at the end of 1928.

In addition, no survivor annuitant payments were made until 1949, when such payments began, and recipients began to receive this money. It should also be mentioned that in 1948 the 80th Congress appropriated a fund of $245,530,000, and that in 1949 the 81st Congress cut that amount to $226,032,000.

It is interesting to note that since Public Law 854 was passed, of which the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was a cosponsor, and signed by President Eisenhower in 1956, according to the Civil Service Commission that fund is sound financially with the exception of the deficit which occurred previous to Public Law 854.

I repeat, the Senator from Delaware is entitled to much credit for keeping a watchful eye on this fund. We all should do so because we want to be sure that it is preserved and kept for Federal employees and their survivors in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I join him in emphasizing that there is concern on the part of those who are retired. There is no question in my mind that the Federal Government will stand back of the fund and that the Members of Congress will also; but, on the other hand, we have a responsibility to see that the fund itself is solvent. Why let it go bankrupt first? It would be wise for the Senate at this time to adopt as a part of this bill a provision which would provide for financing the increased benefits as provided in the bill.

There is another additional cost which may very well develop in the retirement system within the next few months. About a year or so ago Congress passed a proposal that in the event of inflation and a rise in the cost of living of 3 percent which held for, I believe it is 3 months, this 3-percent increase would automatically be reflected in retirement benefits.

I do not have before me the exact formula as to how this increase goes into effect, but I do know that according to the Department a few weeks ago we are close to the point of that 3-percent increase in the cost of living and again there is no method to finance it.

It is time for Congress to decide that if it is going to provide the benefits it should be willing to pay for them.

At an appropriate time I shall propose an amendment to increase deductions by one-half of 1 percent on the part of both employees and the Government to finance the benefits under this particular bill.

I would be a strong supporter of the benefits under this particular bill.

I would be a strong supporter of the benefits of the bill if we can properly finance it. If it does not have enough merit to justify the cost let us face it. We should not increase the benefits this year on the eve of the election, and then next year come back and increase the deductions from the employees. This is what Congress does far too often. The benefits and the deductions to pay for them should both be included as part of the same bill.

I have one other proposal which I should like to discuss with the chairman. I noticed, when the President sent his message to Congress promoting clean elections that he stated he was studying the problem as it related to the soliciting and pressuring of political contributions from Federal employees. This is something which has concerned all of us over the years, and I think it is time we did something about it rather than just talking. I have had the legislative counsel check the records, and I find that there is a very tight law as it relates to the solicitation of political contributions by officers of the Government. I quote the law:

. . . any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the United States, or person receiving any salary or compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States who directly or indirectly solicits, receives, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever from any other such officer, employee, or person shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Therefore, the law does clearly prohibit, subject to fine, any Member of Congress or salaried official of the U.S. Government from soliciting or pressuring a civil service employee into making a political contribution. The law takes care of that, but there's a loophole, because a representative of a candidate or a political committee can solicit or shake down a civil service employee and not violate the law.

The amendment which I am proposing would add a new subsection to the present law which I have just outlined and would prescribe the same criminal penalty to any person acting on behalf of any political committee, including any State or local committee of a political party, who directly or indirectly solicits or in any manner is concerned with soliciting any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of any such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any other such officer, employee, or person.

This proposal is to amend the existing law which already prohibits a Member of Congress or a salaried public official from soliciting or pressuring civil service employees by prohibiting the national committees, State committees, and representatives of a public officials from doing the same thing.

Mr. CARLSON. I am not familiar with the amendment the Senator has just read—the section dealing with the proposed law, but I ask him, would this in any way interfere with voluntary contributions made by Federal workers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not at all. I would object to it if it did, because an employee of the Government has a right to support the political party of his choice on a voluntary basis just as he has the right to vote for the party of his choice. That is, of course, his right. He can make contributions, but it would prohibit employees from being shaken down by any political committee.

I should like to read a letter from an employee emphasizing the need for this proposal. I will delete the names of the employees; they are afraid of retaliation.

[Personal and confidential]

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senator from Delaware,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: On May 27 *The New York Times* reported your resolution calling on the Attorney General to investigate charges that federal employees were being solicited for political funds in violation of the Hatch Act. The article implied but did not state that the resolution was carried.

I am a federal employee, whose recent appointment to a non-supervisory Grade 11 was entirely non-political. Every employee (above clerical) of my office was solicited to contribute for the impending Johnson affairs in New York City. Amounts of the expected "gift" were recommended. When I declined to give, my pay and my advancement were, it was suggested, in danger.

I do not intend to make any charges under the Hatch Act, and am not seeking any relief for myself or punishment of others. However, I completely support your resolution, and urge you to do everything within your power to see that a meaningful inquiry is made. The kind of sophisticated extortion that can be involved in these violations is humiliating to those who yield and to those who don't, to say nothing of the officials who condone it.

Sincerely,

———.

Mr. President, I have had many such letters from employees who feel they may not get well-deserved promotions if they are known to have complained of these shakedowns. Congress is familiar with the situation. The President has said he wants something done about promoting clean elections. All right, let us do something instead of just talking about it.

All the amendment would do would be to add to the existing law the provision that representatives of political committees cannot shake down Federal employees for political contributions.

This closes the loophole.

Let me repeat that these employees can still contribute on a voluntary basis. They can make contributions to the political party of their choice provided this is done voluntarily and not shakedown.

Of course, such a shakedown is done rather cleverly. Employees are not told they will be fired or that they will not get a promotion. They are not told that they have got to contribute; but a list is published of contributors where everyone can see it, and an employee therefore knows that his boss is going to be looking at this list. The Senator knows and I know that it is in effect a shakedown.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have been concerned about this situation for some time. Regardless of the party that is in power, I think the practice has been followed by both parties.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It has.

Mr. CARLSON. I have been opposed to the practice. We ought to take action to correct it. It is unfair to employees. Say what we will, it is done under duress. The employees feel that they are forced to contribute. I hope we can do something in this field that will prohibit the solicitation of Federal employees by heads of agencies, by supervisors, or by other persons concerned. If the Senator's amendment is designed to do that, I can find nothing wrong with it, and I shall support it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment does not go further than that. I had the amendment prepared by the Legislative Counsel. I shall read again a paragraph from their analysis of the amendment. The intent of the amendment is clear. I asked the Legislative Counsel to draft the amendment so that there would be no misunderstanding about the intent. I shall incorporate the entire statement prepared by the Legislative Counsel in the RECORD, but first I shall read a paragraph from the memorandum:

The proposed amendment would add a new subsection to this section which would prescribe the same criminal penalty to any person acting on behalf of any political committee (including any State or local committee of a political party) who directly or indirectly solicits, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any officer or employee of the United States (other than from an elected officer).

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As I heard the reading of the paragraph, it occurred to me that the amendment would be well received by every Federal employee. I sincerely believe the Senate ought to take action on it today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Kansas for his support. This bill deals with Government employees. Certainly they have felt over the years that they were being pressured. I have received several letters that I could place in the RECORD. I shall put some of them in the RECORD, and naturally I shall not give the names of the senders. I have received letters from throughout the Government from Federal employees who have complained about this practice.

I have discussed this subject over the years, both in this administration and in preceding ones, so the issue is not a

partisan one. It is a practice which, as the Senator from Kansas said before, has been carried on to some extent, by both political parties. We may have different opinions as to which party has carried the practice further, but we would not get anywhere by discussing that.

I hope the amendment will be accepted by the chairman of the committee. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"TITLE VII—PROHIBITION UPON SOLICITATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BY POLITICAL COMMITTEES

"SEC. 701. Section 602 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

"(1) by inserting '(a)' before 'Whoever'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) Whoever, acting on behalf of any political committee (including any State or local committee of a political party), directly or indirectly solicits, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any officer or employee of the United States (other than an elected officer) shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.'"

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the amendment as prepared by the Legislative Counsel.

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

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

The attached amendment to H.R. 14122 adds a new subsection to section 602 of title 18 of the United States Code (crimes and criminal procedure) so as to prescribe a criminal penalty for the solicitation of contributions from Federal employees by political committees.

The present section 602 of title 18 provides, in general, that any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the United States, or person receiving any salary or compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States who directly or indirectly solicits, receives, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever from any other such officer, employee, or person shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

The proposed amendment would add a new subsection to this section which would prescribe the same criminal penalty to any person acting on behalf of any political committee (including any State or local committee of a political party) who directly or indirectly solicits, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any officer or employee of the United States (other than from an elected officer).

The term "political committee" is defined, for purposes of section 602 and certain related sections of title 18, in section 591 of title 18. The term, as so defined, includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential and vice presidential electors in two or more States. The term, as so defined, also includes any committee, association, or organization (other than a duly organized State or local committee of a political party) which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential and vice presidential electors, whether or not in more than one State, if such committee, association, or organization is a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, association, or organization. (Section 591 of title 18 also defines the term "candidate" to mean an individual whose name is presented for election as Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected).

This definition of "political committee" contained in section 591 of title 18 will apply to the use of that term in the new subsection which this amendment would add to section 602. However, for purposes of this new subsection, a political committee specifically includes any State or local committee of a political party.

Respectfully,

HARRY B. LITTELL,
Senior Counsel.

JUNE 15, 1966.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the memorandum was prepared by Mr. Harry B. Littell, Senior Counsel of the Office of the Legislative Counsel, under date of June 15, 1966. It clearly establishes that the amendment is not intended to deal with any subject other than that which I have just outlined.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Delaware when the amendment was first submitted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment is now submitted. The subject has been discussed several times previously. The President recommended that Congress do something to correct the shakedown of these employees. I regret to say that I was unable to have the amendment prepared in time to submit it to the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. It could probably not have been accepted by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because it appears, from my reading of it, that it would have been subject to a point of order, because that committee does not have jurisdiction of election laws.

Perhaps it might be offered as an amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act. It might come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which traditionally and historically has handled election legislation, or within the jursdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, because the amendment involves criminal penalties under the Corrupt Practices Act.

As the Senator from Delaware knows, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held hearings extending over many days and covering many items dealing with Federal salaries and fringe benefits.

At this late date, much as I favor the passage of legislation to strengthen the regulation of reporting and fundraising systems throughout the political structure, both Federal and State, I am at a loss to know how provisions of this kind could be enforced, particularly since they deal with State and local committees, which generally have tenuous relationships with the national committees. The national committees concern themselves with the Senate and the House and handle the national fundraising efforts, while the local committees deal with local affairs.

I have strongly favored the prohibitions now in the law—and they are strong—which the distinguished Senator from Delaware says have been violated by the solicitation of donations from Federal employees upon Federal premises or during Federal working hours. That subject is a matter of Federal law today, is it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is a matter of Federal law.

Mr. MONRONEY. Are not Federal employees prohibited by law from soliciting any contribution from any other Federal employee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Salaried employees of the Federal Government are prohibited from soliciting political contributions from other civil service employees, but representatives of salaried officials or political committees are not prohibited from doing so. Both the Senator from Oklahoma and I know that Federal employees are being solicited at the present time. The President has suggested that legislation be enacted to prevent it. Very well. The Senator from Oklahoma says he is in favor of such legislation. Then let us pass it. There is no time like the present to do so.

So far as the germaneness of my amendment is concerned we are dealing today with a bill which affects the salaries of 2,500,000 Federal employees. What could be a more appropriate vehicle for providing that the salary increase that is to be given to the Federal employees cannot be taken away from them as a shakedown or a contribution to be made to a political party?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have always felt that hearings on bills were a rather important part of the process of sound legislation. This proposal has been before the Senate for some 5 minutes; yet we are asked to incorporate it into a Federal pay bill without knowing exactly how it will apply. I do not know how any of the Post Office officials or any of the vast number of employees of the Military Establishment or other Government departments would be under any pressure to make a donation, and certainly not to a State political committee or local committee or party representative. I do not know how such a situation could be policed. I seriously doubt whether many of them would be impressed by a telephone call from a representative of either of the great, historic, national political parties.

Certainly I have a sufficiently high regard for the courage and the integrity of the people who are employed by the Federal Government to believe that if anyone tried to use coercion or threats, tried to threaten them in any way, they would resent it, and their resentment,

with the sanctity of a secret ballot which they are guaranteed, would result in an extreme loss of political support rather than any gain of political support.

I do know that many employees buy tickets to fundraising banquets; and certainly that is one of the ways that contributions for State funds are solicited. But my observation at almost all such banquets that I have attended has been that they have been attended by a wide variety of men from all walks of life, that the number attending who could be identified as Federal employees would be small indeed, and that such employees would be almost totally absent when you reach the State or county level.

I do feel that the importance of a clean elections bill, many facets of which have already been outlined by the President in his message, is such that it should be taken up, I hope this year, by Congress; and, after hearings that would develop all the facts necessary, we would then be able to legislate intelligently, and not be asked, after a bill has come to the floor, to vote on such a matter as the Senator suggests.

I do not know how we could identify and distinguish between the prohibitions against State and Federal members of local political parties. I wish the Senator would enlarge on that. What is the direct or indirect offering of a $10 banquet ticket? Those things are prohibited, with criminal penalties, in the Senator's amendment. I think the language could have been vastly improved on and become much more effective had the amendment had the advantage of hearings before a congressional committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I first wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma for giving such enthusiastic endorsement to the proposition that all bills and amendments should have committee hearings before being acted upon by the Senate. I only wish he had been of that same mind 2 or 3 weeks ago when we had the cotton bill before us, a bill which had had no committee hearings in either the House or the Senate. I moved to send the bill back to the committee for that reason, but the Senator did not support me. That bill involved about a $400 million authorization and had had no hearings whatsoever. Apparently this argument of the desirability of committee hearings is something to be used when it is desired to postpone action. It is a delaying tactic.

As to who is for the bill and whether the departments would be for it I would venture to say that if representatives of the departments testified they would testify for it. If representatives of this Great Society were to talk to Senators privately I expect they would say they hoped it would not pass; they raise a lot of money out of the present system. If the Senator were to talk to civil service employees, however, he would find they are for it, because civil service employees are tired of being shaken down by political parties.

The existing law provides—and I shall read it again—"any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the United States, or person receiving any salary or compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States," and it goes on and states that any of these salaried employees who are on the Federal payroll if they solicit political contributions from civil service employees shall be subject to the penalty.

But under the existing law there is no penalty if a representative of a political committee, such as the Republican or Democratic State or National Committees, makes such solicitations. There is no law against this type of solicitation as the law stands. My amendment merely proposes to add a new subsection which would apply the same criminal penalties to any person acting on behalf of a political committee. It would simply close that loophole by providing that the same penalties shall be applicable to such persons as are now applicable to salaried officials if they solicit.

Certainly there should be no objection to that. Employees are not prohibited from having the right to make such contributions voluntarily if they wish.

The Senator raised the question as to the broad definition of the word "committee" as it is used in the amendment. This is the same definition of a political committee that was used in the amendment which was passed by the Senate unanimously about 3 months ago which prohibited both political parties or their committees or subcommittees from selling advertising in brochures on campaign functions. It is the same definition of "committee" which has been approved by Congress before.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware 2 or 3 months ago on the so-called brochure matter. I voted for it because I thought that was a tax problem. It involved the question of the Federal Government not receiving the proper taxes as a result of a deduction which perhaps should not be granted; and I thought that was a proper amendment.

But I, too, am somewhat confused about this amendment—and I am not making that statement because I happen to be the chairman of the Senate Democratic campaign committee. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], if he were here, would speak as I speak.

What does the Senator mean by a political committee? Out in my State, there are often bond issues for schools or recreation facilities or other local issues for which committees are formed—political committees for a referendum or against a referendum, or for or against an issue. These committees openly go to Federal employees who might be concerned and ask, "Would you help us on this committee?" It seems to me that the Senator's amendment would prohibit them from seeking any such help. They would probably be quite seriously disturbed about giving $2 or $3 or $4 or $5 to such committees in local communities for local issues. The matter involved could be a sewer district to serve the homes of many Federal employees, who would wish to go out and help. I am afraid that the Senator's amendment, if agreed to, would stifle that sort of thing unless the term "political committee" were more clearly defined.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator will yield, I can answer that very easily. My amendment would amend section 602 of title 18 of existing law which already defines political committees. This has nothing to do with a proposal for a sewer going in front of a man's home or a school bond election.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wanted that point cleared up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right; I am glad the Senator asked the question. The section of the Corrupt Practices Act to which I referred deals entirely with political contributions, as defined for the purpose of electing candidates for national office.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would that include local officials, too?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Only as defined under the Corrupt Practices Act; it would follow the same definition as the present law. I am sure the Senator would not wish to change that definition as now stated in the act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I merely wished to clarify the matter. It is somewhat unusual to present a matter of such broad scope at this stage, without some discussion. I would like to have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I do not believe it affects our respective committees because the employees of both the Senate Republican and Democratic campaign committees are few in number. We have three on my committee, and I do not think Senator MORTON has more than three or four who actively work for the Republican committee. They do the administrative work. And when we have a dinner, such as the Senator from Kentucky has downtown about 2 months ago, at $1,000 a ticket—and had a full house—lots of people bought those tickets and contributed. I do not know how many Federal employees were there; there might not have been as many as the Democrats had at their $100 dinner about 6 weeks ago.

But we form outside committees. In my case, Gen. Jess Larson was the chairman of the downtown committee. I know there were a number of Federal employees who came to that dinner. They were not solicited in any way out of any of these campaign offices, and no one intended that they should be. When the Senator speaks about any political committee, I can understand it as referring to a sort of semiofficial committee, such as the Democratic campaign committee, the Republican National Committee, Senator MORTON's committee, and others.

I think we should have a much better clarification and understanding of the subject matter when dealing with any political committee.

The Senator from Delaware knows that campaigns are not run without money. It does not cost as much to run for office in Delaware as it costs to run for office in Illinois. There is not as

large a geographic territory to cover in Delaware. Also, the cost would be based on so much per voter.

We have read in the newspapers about someone having raised $100,000 or $200,000 at a dinner. That sounds like a big amount. However, there are 1,500,000 voters in the State of Washington. If a man were to run for the office of Governor or U.S. Senator from Washington, he would perhaps have a campaign fund of $200,000, which sounds very large to the average individual. However, when we break the amount down, it amounts to perhaps 20 cents a voter. One can barely send a letter to a constituent for 20 cents, let alone do anything else.

We should look at this matter in that perspective.

I have not heard the argument of the Senator from Oklahoma concerning the germaneness of the amendment. However, I hope that the Senator from Delaware will consider the request of the Senator from Kentucky and myself. We are personally interested since we have been designated as delegates by our respective parties. We hope that we can talk to the Senator from Delaware about this and see what the definitions mean and go into the matter in the depth it deserves.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should be delighted to have the Senator talk to the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator from Kentucky is here, and I am sure he will support this amendment. I saw him 10 minutes ago.

Mr. MAGNUSON. He had no notice of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have just talked to the Senator from Kentucky about the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator did not notify the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Washington is here now, and he has a copy of the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was in my office all morning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Washington says he is interested in this matter. Then let us approve the amendment.

In reply to the question concerning the germaneness of the amendment, the pending measure is the most germane proposal that could be offered. We are dealing with a salary increase for 2.5 million employees.

All that the amendment would do in the example outlined by the Senator would be to provide that his senatorial campaign committee or the committee headed by the Senator from Kentucky could not have a person acting on their behalf and solicit contributions or sell tickets.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct, and we do not do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am certain of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know what the committee may or may not do. However, I do know that every time the committee's action is correctly questioned—and that has happened on occasion respecting the sending of letters and so forth—the questioned practice is stopped rather quickly. The story appears on the front page of the newspaper.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The present law does not prohibit or provide penalties for an employee of one of the committees or of one of the downtown committees who makes such solicitations. There is no law against such action.

This amendment merely states that representatives of these political committees who solicit funds would be subject to the same penalties now applicable to salaried officials.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That provision would apply to an employee in Dover, Del., raising money for the election of a sheriff.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would if that employee were shaking down the civil service or Government employees and if the sheriff's name were on a national ballot.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No one is shaking anybody down.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They cannot be pressured into contributing. The employees can buy tickets if they wish. However, we do not elect a sheriff in Dover unless he is running on the same ticket as the other candidates. When they are on the same ticket as national candidates they would be covered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have candidates on all tickets.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. However, they do not run nationally on all tickets.

The amendment merely states that representatives of these public officials or political committees cannot go out and do what the principals are barred from doing under the existing law. If we do not close this loophole, Congress might just as well stamp our approval on such action. Personally I think it is wrong.

I read a letter from another employee. It is as follows:

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS:

I am a career employee with many years of service. I have never been high-pressured for the $100 fund raising like I have been this year. This is the first time I know of that employees were solicited at work, right at their desks. A list was maintained of givers and nongivers in the Commerce Department. Lack of faith and integrity in the Civil Service System prohibits me from revealing my name. Fellow employees know that promotions are denied to the nongivers.

We should enact legislation protecting these employees from forced contributions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think this involves an interpretation by an employee of what a solicitation is.

I could read all kinds of letters written during the Eisenhower administration, during the Harding administration, and perhaps during the Lincoln administration—letters written in an effort to solicit funds.

It depends on how the man himself interprets solicitation.

I would like to have the amendment define the meaning of solicitation with more care and precision.

Would the term "solicitation" cover a fellow employee who would say, "Did you buy a $10 ticket to the dinner for our old friend, the sheriff of Dover?" The other fellow might say, "No, but perhaps I had better do so because you never know when you will see the sheriff."

It is a matter of advice and not solicitation. The definition of solicitation is not that of the fellow himself. He perhaps did not want to buy the ticket and perhaps would not have bought one. He did not have to. He would perhaps instead say something similar to what has been stated in the letter from which the Senator just read.

I think we are getting into a field in which we ought to have a little more definitive discussion of what we mean by political committees all over the United States. There would be thousands of such committees, perhaps more than that.

What is solicitation? If someone comes in and says, "If you don't do this, I will do something to you," that would be solicitation. No one could say that to him but a superior.

However, if the matter arises in another more subtle way he might still say that he was solicited. He did not have to do anything about it. That is what bothers me about the amendment. I am sure that I also speak for the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that the Senator from Illinois seeks recognition, and I shall yield. However, I must state again that the amendment does not in any way attempt to redefine solicitation or contributions as presently defined under the existing law.

All that the amendment would do would be to impose the same penalties against an employee of a senatorial campaign committee or other political committee who was soliciting political contribution from Government employees. All that this amendment would do would be to add "employees of these committees" so that a man cannot designate someone to do this soliciting in an effort to get around the existing law.

This is a loophole that has been recognized by the President and by many others.

Everyone says that he is against this practice and that he wants to do something about it. This is the chance to do something. Vote for this amendment here today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are going to have hearings on the recommendations. Most of the committee members say that we will have hearings on this. The Senator from Kentucky and I have an amendment that we want to offer in order to help clarify some of this matter.

I was hoping that this sort of thing could be put in at the proper place and time so that we could have a really definitive look at what the amendment means.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This proposal was not a part of the bill as introduced in either the House or the Senate. Why delay action?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there has been discussion as to the meaning of the word "solicitation." I listened to what was said by the Senator from Delaware. If I am correct, his statement was that he is not at all changing the meaning of the word "solicitation."

He is using that word in the exact connotation that it carries in the present law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All that the Senator is doing is asking that the senatorial or congressional employees be covered under the general existing law pertaining to solicitation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

I shall read from the existing law, section 602 of title 18:

§602. Solicitation of political contributions.

Whoever, being a Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, or a candidate for Congress, or individual elected, as Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, or a person receiving any salary or compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States, directly or indirectly solicits, receives, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever, from any other such officer, employee, or person, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, Stat. 722.)

That is the present law. The proposed amendment would merely add a new subsection to this section which would prescribe the same criminal penalties for any person acting on behalf of any public official or political committee.

The definition of a political committee is the same as defined in the amendment that was approved about 3 months ago prohibiting political committees from selling ads in their bulletins.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I understand correctly that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware would not affect the present meaning of the words "soliciting," "receiving," or other language used in the existing law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The proposed amendment is not intended to change one iota the definitions it merely provides similar penalties for representatives of the committees. The restrictions would be no different from those presently applicable to the Senator from Ohio and myself.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A question was asked as to what is meant by "solicitation." I say this in a spirit of lightness. Regardless of how tender and how innocent the request might be, the fact is that Congressmen intimidate and coerce employees in the contribution of money for political campaigns.

I can go to an employee of mine and by a mere look, by a mere tender suggestion, suggest that he give money. It might be said that that is innocent solicitation. The fact is that it is evil and flagrant intimidation.

I am glad to say that I have never taken a nickel as contribution from any of my employees, in the entire time that I have been in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his support. I am sure the same statement can be made by other Senators.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio might raise the implication that, while he has not done it, someone else has.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are talking about prohibiting this practice, and I suppose we are talking about prohibiting this practice because we fear that it is being done.

I repeat that nothing in all these circumstances justifies the argument of the Senator from Washington for special hearings to find out what is meant by the word "solicitation."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not say that at all. If we are going to have a confessional here——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I stated before to the Senator from Ohio that I was certain that what he said was equally applicable to all other Members of Congress, because I have not heard of a single instance during the time I have been in the Senate in which a Member of Congress was shaking down his employees. I am not intimating that.

Some of the letters I read were written under the preceding administration. This problem does not relate only to this administration. I emphasized that before, and I do so again. I have heard complaints about both administrations. I have discussed this problem many times.

Only recently, after considerable research, I found that the employees—not employees of Congress, but employees or representatives acting on behalf of political committees—are not prohibited from soliciting contributions. Under the proposed amendment, an employee of a political committee or representative of a public official or candidate would be subject to the same penalties to which the members of that committee are now subject. The definition of "solicitation" or "contribution" would not be changed one iota from that which is applicable today, under existing law.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Delaware has clarified part of the problem for me. However, in the part of the country from which I come, an argument often recurs as to whether we should have a city sewer district or a metropolitan sewer district. Three people running for the sewer commission will say that if they are elected, they will do it one way, and another three say they will do it the other way. The subject affects Federal employees and other people who live in that area, and they form committees to elect three people on one side as against three on the other side. When we reach down to these local committees, I think we are going very far in this situation. It could affect a candidate for a nonsalaried position. Most of these positions are nonsalaried.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I can say this: The definition of a committee is not changed from that contained in the Corrupt Practices Act. I believe the Senator from Washington will find that that act does not prevent civil service employees from participating in purely local matters.

For example, it is my understanding that a civil service employee can run for a member of the commission in his town or for a member of the school board, et cetera.

The Corrupt Practices Act defines a candidate as one whose name is presented for election in one or more States.

Those cases which the Senator from Washington has mentioned are purely local affairs. It is my understanding that as a local citizen he can hold office and solicit office the same as anyone else. But if he is on a ticket in which a national officer is involved that is when the problem arises.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Delaware says "any political committee." As I read the amendment, it contains the phrase "any political committee."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is the same as the definition in the existing law. That is where it is taken from.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This illustrates how confusing amendments can be when they are not discussed. I do not say special hearings should be conducted. No one has said that. However, the committees having jurisdiction in such matters should at least be able to discuss such important legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment was to be offered on Friday, July 1; however, fortunately or unfortunately, the Senate adjourned on Thursday, and the amendment could not be printed.

(At this point, Mr. BAYH took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to intrude myself into this discussion, with respect to some general considerations that look toward the bill but have no particular bearing on the pending measure.

I have some misgivings about the bill. I intend to vote for it. But that does not entirely assuage a sense of apprehension that I have entertained about the constant effort to load the Federal budget to a point where it must be giving serious concern to nearly every responsible person in the Federal Government.

Now, this is going to cost, I figure, $471 million. If, of course, it had been made effective next January instead of being dated back to this month, July, it would probably be in the neighborhood of $300 million, or something less than that. But it would be at least that much of an extra charge upon the Federal Government. The House of Representatives made it effective July 1, 1966. The President, in his state of the Union message, asked to make it effective January 1, 1967.

The distinguished majority leader and I had a discussion of the matter to see whether or not a compromise date of October 1 probably could be developed, but it fell by the wayside because I presented it to our policy committee and they did not show any particular sympathy for it. So, here is another charge on the 1967 budget.

I am afraid that all of this obscures what I think is the largest consideration involved here. Frankly, all of our fiscal situation is most disturbing. The money supply is increasing in this country at an incredible rate. If any one has

any doubt about it, let him make some comparisons over the last 10, 15, or 20 years to see how we have hiked the disposable money supply in this country; and obviously it becomes one of the features in this whole feverish business of inflation.

The credit demands that seem to exist at the present time are completely unprecedented. Frankly, I have never seen anything like it. Letters that reach me from day to day insist that the Government has to do something to loosen up credit and to make possible additional spending in order to keep this overheated condition in our economy, which is aggravated by the fact that we load it up by constantly hiking nearly everything that goes through the Appropriations Committee, with only a few exceptions.

This search for funds is astonishing but has a very natural impact upon interest rates. I see now in the Federal Reserve States, the central reserve cities and elsewhere, the 5.5 percent interest rate is becoming quite common, and they are beginning to bid for money at 5.5 percent. It will go to 6 percent. I see that in Great Britain they are toying with an interest rate of 7 percent. If that is going to be the bellwether for what happens in this country, I begin to dread a little what may be around the corner.

But certainly there is fierce competition for funds today. That goes for banks, that goes for mutual savings banks; it goes for the savings and loan associations, it goes for the insurance companies, and it goes for nearly every thrift institution with which I am familiar.

At one time I served on the board of directors of a savings and loan association that was in the $500 million bracket. I know how these shuttlings of demand for credit operate in an institution of that kind.

It is no wonder that European financiers become rather dubious about the fact that we will not face up to our fiscal problems and really come to grips with what is right here before us.

I had quite a session the other day with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and I had several sessions with the Secretary of the Treasury. Perhaps I should not say that they have some concern, but you could not talk to them without detecting that there was concern, and they would like to see Congress do a little more realistically by the President's budget and give a little more cooperation to the Chief Executive.

The gold raid continues. The imbalance of payments is still there. It is far from a solution. No one knows when the gold raiding is going to quit. The inflation fires burn brightly everywhere in the land.

If you have any doubt, you can go into any grocery store. It was my pleasure three or four times during the last week to hobble around on crutches or in a wheelchair and look at prices.

Once upon a time I was in the grocery business. I think that everybody in our family was at some time. I have an idea of the comparisons that one can make.

It is incredible, to say the least, but then, you do not have to guess at the situation. All you have to do is look at the prices and take time to look at the cash register when you get your bill at the counter.

All of this has an impact on fixed income. It has an impact on the incomes of pensioners. It has an impact on wage demands that is absolutely unmistakable. Obviously, as far as trying to meet this situation by taxes is concerned, I presume everybody wants to shun another tax bill in an election year, because politically it is not quite the palatable thing to trot forth.

If this situation continues, what will be the ultimate end? If history is any teacher at all, there will undoubtedly have to be additional taxes, or there will have to be controls. There will have to be a deeper intrusion of the Federal Government into the entire field of economic decisionmaking. That has always been the domain of private enterprise. If those three are not the ultimate result, then maybe it will be boom and bust, as it was in October 1929.

I think that most Senators must still remember that there were people who jumped out of 20th story windows because they could not take the gaff when the economy began to collapse.

I said that Congress is not completely cooperating with the President in this field. I am prepared to prove it. Congress is the keeper of the purse. It is the constitutional guardian of the purse. Not a dollar can come from the Federal Treasury except in pursuance of an appropriation made in law. If that is not the Constitution, I am not familiar with that document. If that does not make Congress the keeper of the purse, then, frankly, I never really understood any constitutional history.

I learned long ago that the sword was committed to the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief, and that the purse was committed to Congress, and that we had the responsibility for it. Now, we cannot ignore that responsibility, but I wonder if we are not doing so.

I think that these figures are probably correct. I got them from the best source in the Appropriations Committee.

The agricultural appropriation bill is above the budget by $48 million, and will be by another $145 million if there is added the rural electrification programs. I presume that includes the telephone program.

The Department of Defense appropriation bill will be $946 million over the budget. The Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare bill already has been passed by the House of Representatives, and it is $490 million over the President's budget. That includes $233 million for payments to school districts, namely, the impacted areas, and $74 million over the budget for the National Institutes of Health.

The Interior Department appropriation bill was signed into law and the amount recommended was only $18 million under the budget.

The Post Office appropriation bill has been enacted into law and the cost is only $50 million under the budget.

Those are paltry sums compared to increases we have voted, and it is not all in the field of appropriation because we have authorized some expenditures that run into very significant sums, as, for example, the so-called GI cold war bill.

There, I think, we run into something over $200 million. Now here is the civilian pay bill, and on the basis of the dating of the bill, it will be $300 million above the President's recommendations. The military pay bill, which is in conference, will be above the budget to the extent of $360 million. The military medical benefits bill, already approved in the House, will be $213 million over the President's recommendations. The GI cold war bill was $250 million over the President's request. Then comes the water pollution control bill. It is on the calendar, approved by the Senate committee, and it will be $276 million above the President's recommendations.

These are just the major items. If we try to interlard it with a great many other items, it becomes an impressive sum of money. This but adds and will add to the spendable funds in the country. It can do nothing other than feed the inflationary fires.

At some point, it may become the straw which will finally break the back of the camel. I say this against a rather interesting background. I checked some figures and discovered that the Federal Reserve System now has roughly $42,000 million in Federal securities. That is the highest in the history of that institution. It is the highest in the history of the country. If that does not bring apprehension and concern to those who have responsibility for Government, frankly I do not know what will.

I had hoped that in the course of this session of Congress there might be opportunities to cut some of the appropriation bills. Perhaps I have been somewhat remiss in my duty in that field, but opportunities to cut in a substantial way are not too generous, which is to say that when we take out the "untouchables," such as interest on the public debt, the veterans—which we cannot very well cut; and we can do nothing about the affairs in Vietnam because we have to supply what it takes in order to bring them either to the conference table or to provide a victory.

Thus, we have to look elsewhere if we are going to do any cutting and somehow dampen this inflationary fire.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The minority leader, on this side of the aisle, has served his country and Congress well by inviting attention to this situation. Regardless of whether I or any other Senator agrees with him as to specific cuts in the pay bill, or any other matter of that character, there is always a duty to balance the books, and we are not doing it. That is what the Senator from Illinois is pointing out. That is his central theme, with which I thoroughly agree.

Let me suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he has put his finger on two points. In addition to the question of appropriations, which are critically

important to the country, there is the the shortness of money, the tightness of money, and the high interest rate which is unjustified by the Nation's credit standing; and there continues to be a serious imbalance in international payments which is restricting our maneuverability in banking terms throughout the world. The Swiss bankers are pretty much writing the ticket for the United States, as they maintain the books. It is therefore to them that the dollar is weak or the dollar is strong.

Let me ask my colleague, as a responsible leader in Congress, this serious question: It may be that we cannot raise taxes in an election year for political reasons, but political reasons must, occasionally, give way to the interests of the Nation. As the Senator and I both know, it is unlikely that the pay bill will not be adopted, that the water pollution bill will not be passed, or that the antipoverty program will not be raised. Does the minority leader feel that we must give serious consideration to our responsibility, and to the word "responsibility" of Congress and consider a tax increase?

The President is way behind his duty now and has himself brought us, in my judgment, to this present situation because he has been unwilling to face the necessity for a tax increase 4 or 5 months ago, which we could have done at the rate of 5 percent across the board, which would have materially helped us with our situation.

I submit to the distinguished minority leader this serious question as to our responsibility, with which I thoroughly agree. Can we afford to lay aside the alternative of a tax increase, which is an element of that responsibility, because it would be politically uncomfortable?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the very distinguished Senator from New York that if a tax bill were brought in tomorrow, I would vote for it. I would do so because I do not wish to see the country go down the drain, or partly down the drain. I do not want to go through the kind of agony we all went through in 1929 and for all those years thereafter and virtually had to be bailed out by a war before we got our feet on solid ground once again.

Now, time is of the essence. I believe if that is the thing which best counsel advises, then we should come in with a tax bill—and I would be willing—any old time, because something must take place. The day of miracles is over. We have come to the end of that road.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not know nearly so much about national and international finances as do the minority leader and the Senator from New York, but I do know that during the 10 days I have been away from Washington, I have found considerable worry over the economic and credit situation in the United States, that it is fast taking precedence over even the war in Vietnam as the No. 1 cause for concern in this country—although if we go back to the war that probably is the cause for all of it. As it continues to expand, it will continue to increase this concern. But, I found that nearly everyone is upset over the credit situation.

They say, "If you want to build 500 houses, you can probably get money from one of the larger New York banks, but if you want to build one house for just yourself and family, you do not have a chance in the world."

To me, the irony of the situation lies in the fact that the predicament in which we are placing ourselves will redound to the benefit of Russia more than any other country in the world. They will get the benefit of our enormous expenditures.

The action of the administration last week in stepping up the bombing in Vietnam is reflected in a published report in the Los Angeles Times which points out that we have again bailed out Russia at the Bucharest meeting because of our actions. However, I certainly feel, after talking with the people at home, who seem to know a lot more about finance and credit than I do, that the President cannot afford to wait until after the election before he takes steps which are essential in time of war.

Those whom I have confidence in say that the President is courting disaster for the United States by postponing what would ordinarily be called perhaps war measures, such as mobilization of credit and personnel and other controls which go along with a war.

I hope that the President will not delay.

Senators will remember that I spoke on the floor last January 31 and pointed out the things which we should do if the war is to be expanded. We are going to spend in Vietnam alone this year probably one-third more than the total cost of the Korean war. When we say that we can do that without any preparation, when we attempt to put off facing troublesome matters until after an election, we are merely jeopardizing the welfare of this country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have one answer. I can testify to what the distinguished Senator from Vermont says. It shows up in the letters that come in by the score from small enterprises all over the country. We are now having these credit problems. It is in the fierce money competition between the banks and the savings and loan associations. I read that the mutual savings banks in New York have increased their interest rate. So, little by little, competition is being sharpened, and that brings on the evil day.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe I heard on the radio this morning that Great Britain has now announced an increase in interest rates to 7 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understood so.

Mr. AIKEN. That does not look too good for our balance of payments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I know that the majority leader wishes to speak, but I should like to complete my argument and to complete the thought which has now been buttressed by the Senator from Vermont, and to endorse what he has said.

The difficulty with tight money is that it is nondiscriminating. It is tight money for everybody.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. It is tight money for lipsticks; it is tight money for essential construction; it is tight money for entertainment; and it is tight money for automation, where automation can contribute to a reduction in the cost of living.

The administration, so far as I know, has not enforced regulation W or regulation X, which sought to set high standards for consumer credit, which now covers an enormous area of the total credit of the country. If my memory serves me correctly, it is around $50 billion.

The minority leader has opened a subject of tremendous portent to the country. I hope that he will himself join occasionally in the debate and the discussion on the floor of the Senate, so that the administration may be called to the issue of responsibility, which I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Illinois that Congress must assume.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In respect to every bill that raises the budget, there ought to be such a discussion as this, and we should not be timid about it. It was said of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board that he should not have made his speech at Columbia University, because he began to rake the ashes of 1929. He was told, "You must not do it. You must not jeopardize the country."

But the time has come to come to grips with the truth, and we must do it now before anything happens. That is why I undertook now to state that I had misgivings about this bill, but that I would vote for it because it was a part of the President's request in his state of the Union message, except that he wanted it to become effective January 1, 1967, instead of July 1, 1966.

Mr. JAVITS. This is essentially a cause for liberals, not only for conservatives. If we liberals want to vote appropriations because we believe they are essential to the Nation's welfare, we must face up to what it takes to maintain the appropriations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from New York has made the statement he has just made; it counterbalances what I thought he was going to say when he began, which was that he thought the administration was to blame for the inflation which is, in part, upon us at the present time. But the distinguished minority leader throughout his remarks, and the distinguished senior Senator from New York in his later remarks, pointed out that Congress has a responsibility in the field of the raising and lowering of taxes; the President is not averse to requesting a tax increase, if it is needed, political year or not. Last January the President presented his budget to the Congress. It was skinned down to the bone. The various agencies of the Government presented requests of $131 billion; as I recall, the President reduced these requests to about $113 billion.

As the distinguished minority leader has pointed out, this Congress so far, either through appropriations or additional authorizations, has raised the President's budget by more than $3 billion. It is Congress that has done this, not the administration. So if we are seeking to place the blame, let us not place it where it does not belong, let us give Congress its fair share, too.

I am delighted that this subject has been brought up, because the President has been greatly disturbed at the enthusiasm shown by Congress this year in going far beyond his recommended budget.

So far as a tax increase is concerned, the President has never shied away from that possibility. But he had hoped he would get some cooperation from Congress in the field of appropriations, so that his budget requests would not be exceeded but, if possible, would be reduced.

So I thank the distinguished minority leader for bringing this subject up on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I point out that we bear our share of the responsibility—the whole Congress, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives—for what is being done to the budget this year. The figures which the distinguished minority leader presented are correct; the list is even more extensive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my recollection that the President recommended, too, that if in this measure we spent more money than he suggested, we should make up the deficit by the imposition of a necessary tax. That is my recollection. I appreciate the presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I should like to make a brief comment which has relationship to what the Senator from Montana has said.

We can follow any of several courses. First, we can spend and tax. If this first course is followed, the obligation to tax will act as a deterrent against spending.

The second course is to spend but not tax. That is the easy way out. That is what we have been doing, as described by the Senator from Montana. He has stated that we have passed bills which have built up the spending program by $3 billion in excess of what the President recommended. We will spend, but we will not tax. We will not tax because that is a bitter function.

We spend essentially in election years, because that is a sweet method of trying to gain political support.

Those courses are with us. Which one shall we follow? It will not be the course of spend and tax; it will be the course of spend and not tax. I agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that a course of the latter type is dangerous and is a menace to the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me allude to an observation made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] when he indicated that we ought to come to grips with the question of a tax measure now.

Frankly, Congress is not beholden to any agency or branch of the Government with respect to a tax bill. The revenue power is vested in the House of Representatives, under the Constitution. We do not have to wait for the Secretary of the Treasury to appear before the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance. Congress has the power to initiate taxation. The taxing power is here, just as the appropriating power and the spending power are here. We can act on our own initiative, if we like; and in that particular domain, I should say that that is a part of our responsibility along with being the keeper of the national purse. It is high time that we come up full tilt to that responsibility, before it is too late.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I congratulate both the minority leader and the majority leader for calling to our attention the additional appropriations which have been made by Congress this year. As one who is proud to be in the conservative camp I regret that we have not had enough votes and support in the Senate to hold appropriations down.

The Great Society is just too expensive for the American taxpayers.

However, without excusing Congress from our responsibility—and we do have a responsibility—I think we should emphasize that there is a responsibility in the White House also.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And the President should be reminded that it does not cost any more to buy a veto pen than one to sign these bills. Far too often we find the President criticizing Congress for spending too much money, and yet when the President signs the bills he stages a great affair on television to tell what he is giving the people without telling them the cost. I would suggest most respectfully that the President buy a case of veto pens and use them.

Mr. JAVITS. What the Senator from Delaware says is perfectly true, and what the minority leader says is perfectly true. We do not initiate tax legislation. Perhaps that is fortunate, for tax legislation is very complex, and can have many pitfalls for a committee. I have little doubt that if we demanded it, the Treasury would prepare a tax increase bill for us. But I do think it would be exculpating the administration much too far, with all due respect, not to join in what the Senator from Delaware has said about the fact that the President has taken a great deal of credit for getting these new programs through, and further to point out the tremendous amount of machinery available to the Federal Government which is not being used. Essentially—and I speak now as a ranking member of the Joint Economic Committee—we have been using monetary and not fiscal policy to deal with our inflationary dangers. What the Senator from Illinois is saying is that it is high time to employ fiscal policy. Fiscal policy includes not only debt management and taxation, but also includes credit regulation and other measures available to the President. I think the President had better take a hard look at some of these things which are politically unpopular. I think the time has come when we have got to be unpopular and raise taxes. On that issue, I feel exactly as does the minority leader. I will vote for it and take my chances. I think it must be done.

I say it is time to use the power to regulate consumer credit and the various other authorities which the Federal Government has heretofore invoked in war situations, for that is what we are in. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said, those who feel we are following the right course in Vietnam have got to be ready to face that music, too. The country today is at war, but it is not acting that way in terms of its fiscal affairs. I think we should be grateful to the minority leader, with his enormous prestige, for ringing that alarm bell today; and I think we ought to follow through and make it meaningful. The President will act, as we know, if there is an indication of concern in the country. Such concern is very highly justified. The present tightness of credit could bring on a recession, or worse. Senator AIKEN said you could get loans for 500 houses. You cannot, except FHA money. Private money is not obtainable. I talked to one of the biggest insurance companies in the United States this morning. They have no money to lend in 1966 at all, and very little for 1967. That is, generally speaking, the state of the money market. Interest rates are now at 5¾ percent for prime money. They could easily go through the 6 percent ceiling for this country. It is ridiculous, and could be economically suicidal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It could, indeed.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would not want this opportunity to pass by without commending our distinguished minority leader, and also the majority leader, for their part in a discussion which I think is most timely. As mentioned by the distinguished Senator from New York, I think the issue may very well be resolved, not by us ourselves here in Congress, but very possibly by others outside the United States. In this connection, I read from an Associated Press dispatch of this morning:

> LONDON, July 10.—There was speculation in Britain today that the bank rate, prime discount rate on which the country's interest structure rests, might go as high as 9 per cent before the end of the year.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The rate is currently 6 per cent. But many financial experts believe it will have to go up to the traditional crisis level of 7 per cent very soon—possibly Thursday. This will be long before autumn—the season when sterling usually comes under pressure.

I bring this up because I believe it is high time we begin to act, or we shall suffer a serious effect on our balance of payments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from which I have quoted, entitled "Experts See British Bank Rate Boost," published in the Washington Post for Monday, July 11, 1966.

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

EXPERTS SEE BRITISH BANK RATE BOOST

LONDON, July 10.—There was speculation in Britain today that the bank rate, prime discount rate on which the country's interest structure rests, might go as high as 9 percent before the end of the year.

The last time the British bank rate reached that sort of level on a sustained basis was in 1873—though it jumped to 10 percent for a few days at the start of World War I.

The rate is currently 6 percent. But many financial experts believe it will have to go up to the traditional crisis level of 7 percent very soon—possibly Thursday. This will be long before autumn—the season when sterling usually comes under pressure.

London's financial district is already talking of the need for another dose of deflationary action by the government, including the raising of bank rate. The experts also forecast tougher restrictions on installment buying and possibly an increase in the sales tax.

The Observer devoted a long editorial today to the subject, saying: "The solemn fact is that Britain has now got to the point where even the pains of a forced devaluation might be less damaging than . . . refusing to face the fact that our currency is overvalued."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not think the President should be attacked, as he has been this afternoon, because he takes credit for some of the legislation passed by Congress. After all, a good deal of the legislation passed by the Congress is initially presented by the President in the form of messages or in the form of proposed legislation, or both.

However, I do think we should bear in mind the remarks made today by all of the Senators on both sides of the aisle, because this is a serious problem. And may I say that while I can find fault with the Congress for so far, either through appropriations or authorizations, raising the amounts involved between $3 billion and $4 billion above the President's January budget requests, I am not blameless. I am not any Galahad, because I have voted for practically every one of those increases. As a matter of fact, I do not see any on my list that I did not vote for.

But that does not make me any better or any worse than anyone else. It is something which Congress should consider collectively. It is something for which we all bear a share of responsibility.

I commend the distinguished minority leader and other Senators who have spoken this afternoon, and most especially the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has documented everything about which he speaks, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who knows the financial field very well, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is always interested in economy in government, as well as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who is on his feet at all times trying to bring about a reduction in appropriations and authorizations.

I think that together, they have done a service which I hope will be productive in the weeks and months ahead.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the understanding of the Senator from Illinois as to whether or not the recommended expenditure, under the President's message, was raised by the House, and that the level to which the House had lifted the recommended expenditure is now proposed to be raised by the Senate? That is, the President began at the lowest level, House raised the President's level, and we are now proposing to raise both the President's and the House's level of expenditure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. So far as I am concerned, it comes about with respect to the instant bill because of the date that is involved.

The President wished to make the civilian pay bill effective as of January 1, 1967. The House, however, dealt with it in a retrospective way, and made it effective July 1, 1966, meaning this month.

There was hope that perhaps that item could be compromised, and it could be made effective in October. But evidently nothing could be accomplished in that field, so the bill before us now is, in that respect, identical with the House bill; namely, it goes back to the 1st of July of this year, meaning that the 1st of this July it become effective and payable. That will involve, of course, an extra $300 million, or a sum in that neighborhood.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Illinois understand that the bill, as it is now before us, has an effective date of January 1, 1967, or of July 1, 1966?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It will be July 1, 1966.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that is what the President recommended?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, the President recommended January 1, 1967.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. Why would not an amendment be in order to make the effective date January 1, 1967?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would be very much in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that would be in conformity with the President's recommendation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is what he recommended in the state of the Union message in January.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If what we are arguing is sound, why should not the Senator from Ohio offer such an amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is nothing to restrain him from doing so; of that I can assure him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think I will do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me conclude the discussion.

Certainly it is not a tasteful matter to essay the role of a Jonah going up and down the streets of Nineveh, shouting, "Forty days and forty nights, and the world will be destroyed," and then going out and sitting in the shadow of a gourd vine and waiting for destruction to come.

But there comes a time when some warning voices have to be raised. They have not been raised except on very infrequent occasions, as in the case of the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, when he made that statement in New York a few months back.

They have not been raised in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, and this is where the business is being done. It is time now that we take stock of where we are.

When Lincoln became the candidate of his party for the Senate in 1858 he used one sentence that I thought covered the entire waterfront. He began by saying: "If we can but know where we are and whither we are tending, we shall the better know what to do and how to do it."

Four questions are contained in that short sentence. However, that sentence states the case—where are we, what is the direction, what do we do, and how do we do it? Those are the questions to which we should find answers before grief and distress overtake us.

I am grateful to all who have participated in the discussion this afternoon. I trust that my friend, the Senator from Delaware, and my compatriot, the Senator from Washington, have the sheriff of Dover elected and they have had the solicitations made. I trust that the sheriff was generously supplied with money for his campaign, and I trust that it was a Republican sheriff who was elected in Dover.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have received the answer to the question raised earlier by the Senator from Washington. The sheriffs in Washington would not be affected by the amendment. I asked the legislative counsel to prepare this memorandum for me.

Under the Corrupt Practices Act as defined, the political committee is defined as follows:

The term "political committee" is defined, for purposes of section 602 and certain related sections of title 18, in section 591 of title 18. The term, as so defined, includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential and vice presidential electors in two or more States. The term, as so defined, also includes any committee, association, or organization (other than a duly organized State or local committee of a political party) which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential and vice presidential electors, whether or not in more than one State, if such committee, association, or organization is a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, association, or organization. (Section 591 of title 18 also defines the term "candidate" to mean an individual whose name is presented for election as Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected).

The amendment would not change the definitions as outlined under existing law at all. Under the Corrupt Practices Act the existing law defines a committee as affecting only those candidates who are running in two or more States. I thank the Senator from Washington for raising the question, and will thank him now for his support.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I realize that the Senator took the time to check into this matter. That is the trouble with amendments which the committee does not have a chance to look into. There can be many unintended consequences. Under the Senator from Delaware's interpretation, a local candidate, if he were on the same ballot with Federal candidates, would be affected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is covered by existing law. My amendment is clear enough. Perhaps that is the trouble it is too clear for some.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The law provides that if the candidates are on the same ballot—let us say a Member of Congress, the President of the United States, or the Vice President—the candidates would be covered by the existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Republican or Democratic State committee of Washington or Delaware were soliciting campaign contributions for the election of a Senator, a Representative, or the President of the United States and included on that ballot were a local candidate, the contributions are all covered. That is the existing law. My amendment would not change that.

If some want this to be different, they had better repeal the Corrupt Practices Act. Those candidates are already covered under the existing law when their names are on a national ballot. I am sure that the State of Washington is living up to the existing law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that we should find out more about this matter. The Senator states that he has found out about it from legislative counsel. However, I have not run this matter down—pinpointed its full ramifications—and I do not think anyone else has. I think the proper body for examining this matter which is subject to so many interpretations to the committee charged by the Senate with this responsibility.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is about time that the Congress acts. This proposal has been studied for the past 5 years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was unaware that local candidates were covered under this law, even though they have been on the same ballot.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the consideration of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 an amendment was offered, the so-called clean elections amendment. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] did a little research on that, and if he were present he could tell us that the present law is designed to affect elections in which any national candidate is on the ballot.

There was specific reference at that time to a situation in Wilmington, Del. The city of Wilmington elects its city council on the national ballot. They are automatically covered under the Voting Rights Act and are subject to the penalties contained in that act.

The same thing would be true in the State of Washington or any other State. That is the present law. If the local candidates are on the ballot with national candidates the local candidates are covered by the same rule laid down under the Corrupt Practices Act.

The State of Washington, the State of Delaware, the city of Takoma, or the city of Wilmington can hold its election at different times, and in that event it would not be affected; that is, assuming there were no national candidates on the ballot.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code, page 3552, which defines what the Senator from Delaware is talking about.

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

§ 591. Definitions.

When used in sections 597, 599, 602, 609 and 610 of this title—

The term "election" includes a general or special election, but does not include a primary election or convention of a political party;

The term "candidate" means an individual whose name is presented for election as Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, whether or not such individual is elected;

The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or presidential and vice presidential electors (1) in two or more States, or (2) whether or not in more than one State if such committee, association, or organization (other than a duly organized State or local committee of a political party) is a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, association, or organization;

The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make a contribution, whether or not legally enforceable;

The term "expenditure" includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift, of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make an expenditure, whether or not legally enforceable;

The term "person" or the term "whoever" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons;

The term "State" includes Territory and possession of the United States. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 719; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, § 9, 63 Stat. 90.)

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Reviser's Note.—Based on section 241 (a)—(f), (i) of title 2, U. S. C., 1940 ed., The Congress (Feb. 28, 1925, ch. 368, title III, § 302 (a—f, i), 43 Stat. 1070).

First paragraph was inserted to indicate sections to which definitions are applicable.

Minor changes in phraseology were made.

AMENDMENTS

1949—Act May 24, 1949, omitted from the first par. "and, in the case of a Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands, an election by the Philippine Legislature."

CROSS REFERENCES

Contribution, definition of, see section 608 of this title.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not see any such definition referring to local candidates, whether they are on the ballot or not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I quoted the Voting Rights Act and section 602 of title 18 of the United States Code.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The section reads:

The term "political committee" includes any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of candidates or Presidential and Vice Presidential electors in two or more States, or whether or not in more than one State if such committee, association, or organization (other than a duly organized State or local committee of a political party) is a branch or subsidiary of a national committee, association, or organization.

That is all that I find in the section.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is existing law. This would not change that one iota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the Senator from Delaware will give every Senator a chance to look into this in more depth. I do not think that it is right to bring the matter up on such short notice without the committee considering the amendment.

The chairman of the committee suggests that the amendment is not germane to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There could not be a more germane bill than one dealing with 2.5 million employees, such as this bill does. The pending bill is as germane a bill as we can get. Let us not start finding excuses for postponing action.

As I told the Senator from Washington, I appreciate his great concern over committee consideration. I merely wish that such concern had prevailed approximately 3 weeks ago when we had a $400 million cotton subsidy before us. However, that matter was passed in the House and the Senate without any hearings and without anyone having a chance to do anything.

Committee consideration is sometimes a cloak. We do not need to have a committee come back and tell the Senate, "We think there should be a law against anyone soliciting funds on our behalf from civil service employees."

Not a man has defended this practice. All right, if we disapprove let us vote for the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not talking about Members of the Senate at all. I am talking about getting down to all of the thousands of local committees that feel, as a public service, they ought to organize and go out and collect money for a cause, whether there be candidates or not.

Why does the Senator always get back to the Senate or to Members of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I get back to the Senate because I happen to be a Senator. Those thousands of imaginary local committees are not affected at all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is always raised the implication that there are purists around here and that the rest of the Senators need laws of some kind to govern them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator from Washington does not like the amendment, that is his privilege.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is my privilege.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But let us keep the record straight—the amendment would not affect the thousands of committees or, as outlined a moment ago, a committee set up to promote a sewer in Washington. The amendment would not affect the sewers of any city. It would affect sewer politics.

The Senator's President, a member of his own political party, has said that this matter needs correction. Let us correct it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to tell the Senator from Delaware that the sewerage business is big business, and a growing political problem, and if we do not do something about it, we will have much more trouble with it than we have with all our other metropolitan problems.

These are some of the most important issues on the ballot today. That has nothing to do with the Senator's term of "sewer politics."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Those arguments have nothing to do with the pending amendment. The pending amendment deals with the right of a person representing a political committee—a Republican committee or a Democratic committee—to solicit campaign contributions from Government employees under the civil service system.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not disagree with the Senator from Delaware. I did not ask for this job, and neither did Senator MORTON nor some of the other people on the national committee. I understand you fellows got so desperate that you drafted Bliss. He did not ask for the job.

I believe the people involved in this matter should have an opportunity to discuss it. I know what the Senator from Delaware thinks he means, but sometimes amendments are written in such a way that someone thinks he knows what they mean, but they do not mean that. This is particularly true when amendments are offered in the Senate in conjunction with another bill, without anyone having an opportunity to consider the amendment in depth and to discuss it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The proposed amendment is as clear as any amendment can possibly be.

Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee is not willing to take it——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I once offered some amendments, and the Senator from Delaware put me in my place. The amendments involved the Committee on Finance, and the Senator from Delaware and other Senators said that the matter had not been looked into by the committee. If the Senator from Delaware does not remember that incident, I shall locate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The proposed amendment has been looked at for the past several years. It has been talked about a long time I have received many letters from employees about this matter. I have here several articles which have appeared in various newspapers. I read one of these articles which outlines how Federal employees are purchasing tickets on the installment plan. I have a number of articles that have appeared in various newspapers. This practice has been denounced over a period of years.

An article by Jerry Kluttz which appeared in the January 15, 1963, issue of the Washngton Post reads as follows:

BUDGET PLAN ADVISED FOR $100 DINNER

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Play politics now and pay later is a gimmick being used by the Democratic National Committee to sell $100 tickets to hard-pressed Federal employes to its Friday dinner here.

The budget payment plan is being suggested to employes who plead financial troubles and say they can't afford the $100 affair. The minimum is $10 down and $10 a month. No interest is charged on the unpaid balance.

But as a career employe remarked after being called by a Democratic worker who urged him to attend the dinner and pay for it later: "If I go, the price I pay later could be my job when the Republicans return to power. But if I don't go, it could cost me a grade promotion which is several hundred dollars a year in higher salary."

Meantime, if a fraction of what employes say is true, officials in a dozen or more agencies are violating the law, either directly or indirectly, by putting the pressure on employes to buy the $100 tickets on Government time and in Federal buildings. As far as could be determined, no Federal agency has even bothered to investigate the numerous stories of pressure on employes to buy tickets.

Mainly, the indirect approach is used in the belief by officials that it places them on safe legal ground. The arm-twisting gimmick is the cocktail party. A score of such parties are being tossed Friday evening preceding the dinner by top officials who invite their own employes who will attend the dinner.

Employes say flatly that they have been called at their Government offices, on Government time, and told either by phone or in person by superiors that "we're expecting you" (and sometimes "your wife too") at the Secretary's or Administrator's (as the case may be) cocktail party.

This is hardly a subtle approach. The parties are limited to those who buy the $100 tickets.

A highly respected Federal attorney who has handled many cases involving Government employes yesterday denounced the cocktail party gimmick as wrong and unethical. He expressed the belief that a court would hold that an employe was subjected to coercion if he attends his agency's cocktail party and buys a $100 ticket against his better judgment.

"It's just like reaching into a fellow's pockets and taking $100," the legal expert commented acidly, and continued: "this practice should be stopped before the public service is badly damaged by it."

There are also reports of meetings being held in Federal buildings on Government time to discuss ticket sales and what can be done to prevail upon more employes to buy them. Some officials have been told that the employes in their agency have bought only half a dozen tickets while those in another bureau of comparable size have purchased 25 or more.

Meantime, a corporation representative here expressed the opinion that Federal workers were being subjected to an unusual amount of pressure this year to buy tickets because many companies can no longer do it and charge the expense off against Federal income taxes under the new expense account regulations.

He explained that his and many other companies had refused to buy the usual $1,200 table this year.

In the past, it was common practice for a company to buy one or more tables and give the tickets to friendly Members of Congress who would distribute them to friends and political supporters and take credit for the sales. Company representatives here say they have rejected numerous overtures from Capitol Hill to continue the practice because of the expense account rules.

Federal officials and employes alike say they realize that any political party must have money to finance operations but they wonder if tactics used by the Democratic National Committee and the Kennedy Administration are proper and the best that can be devised.

A Democratic official said yesterday that the Party had taken precautions to operate within the law. He said phone directories were secured from a number of Federal agencies and that they were used to look up home addresses and to send invitations to the $100 dinner to employes at them.

He also said some follow up phone calls were made to employes at their homes by Committee workers to urge them to attend the dinner. He said he had no knowledge of pressure on employes by their agencies to buy tickets. "I hope every ticket is purchased voluntarily," he added.

Another person with a background of political fund-raising expressed the view that more than half a dozen eager-beaver Federal officials who are trying to make a big name for themselves in the eyes of the Democratic National Committee are causing all the trouble.

The question is, do Senators desire to do something about this matter or just talk about it? If they do let us act today. If not then tell the employees that this administration is not going to do anything but talk about it. The rejection of this amendment is notice that the employees can legally be solicited by representatives of the political parties and that the Great Society will not do anything about it.

The proposed amendment does not change the rules one iota as to a definition of "committees." It does not change the definition of "contributions" or the definition of "solicitations." It merely states that representatives of these committees cannot do that which the Senator from Washington and I are now prohibited from doing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe the Senator from Delaware is becoming mixed up with all the thousands of local committees. I believe the Federal employee is an intelligent fellow. If he does not wish to contribute to a candidate in Dover, he will not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not mixed up at all. A candidate in Dover is not affected under the proposed amendment nor is the postmaster at Dover if he wishes to support a candidate in Dover for mayor or for the city council. Besides let me worry about Dover.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If he is on the same ballot with someone who runs for Federal office, he is——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is provided for under existing law. That is the situation under the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what the Senator from Delaware says, but I have not had an opportunity to look at the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely the Senator is familiar with existing law. In any event, the proposed amendent would not change the existing law one iota on that point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why should the matter not be taken to a committee and discussed? I shall vote with the Senator from Delaware, if that is what the amendment would do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is all the amendment does; why postpone action? It is time to vote for it now when the pending bill is being passed for Federal employees.

Mr. President, is the Chairman willing to accept the proposed amendment?

(At this point Mr. BURDICK assumed the chair as the Presiding Officer.)

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I do not intend to become embroiled in this enlightening discussion between the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Washington. However, I had the privilege of presiding while the discussion was taking place, and I recalled that some of my staff members and I this year received solicitations for funds from the Republican Party. I do not know how that came to pass. But, inasmuch as no doubt both political parties use mailing lists to some degree to solicit funds from citizens across the board, would this type of solicitation, not from an elected officer—which was plainly stated—but from a member who is an employee of the Federal Government, who has solicited, on an across-the-board at random basis, come under the confines of the proposed amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If those solicitations are made by a salaried employee of the U.S. Government the existing law covers that. The proposed amendment would apply the same restriction if the solicitations were made by a representative of a salaried official, candidate, or a political committee.

Mr. BAYH. Then, the answer to my question is "Yes"?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. And why should it not be prohibited?

Mr. BAYH. The reason why I wonder about the wisdom of it is simply that the Senator from Delaware is concerned about coercion—and the Senator from Indiana is concerned about coercion—in the solicitation of campaign funds.

Most Members of Congress—at least many of them, and I put myself in this category—unfortunately are not financially endowed to the point that they are not required to solicit on a rather broad basis from friends who are willing to support them in the interests of good government. There does not seem to be any likelihood that I will ever get out of that category, and I am not inclined to pressure anyone for whom I have done a favor, nor do I wish to hold out a promise, in order to get a campaign contribution. I refuse to do that, the Senator from Delaware refuses to do that, and all other 98 Senators refuse to do that.

However, I fail to see what type of coercion is involved when the political committee of the Senator from Delaware, or a political committee in my State of Indiana, takes a list of everyone residing in a particular county and sends a card through the mail asking for a contribution. There does not appear to me to be any coercion involved in this type of solicitation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The proposed amendment does not redefine the word "solicitation"; it leaves it the same as present law.

With all due respect to the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Delaware, if the only way either of us can stay in the Senate is to solicit our campaign contributions from civil service employees we both ought to be kicked out.

The definition of a "solicitation" is not changed. The definition of "committees" would not be changed. On that point the proposed amendment merely repeats the existing law. The proposed amendment does provide that representatives of political committees cannot solicit political contributions from civil service employees.

This indefensible method of solicitation has been practiced by both political parties. I am not singling out one party. I have read employees' letters that were written under the administration of both political parties. I do not intend to argue about which party has violated this rule the most. It has been done, and I do not believe any Member of the Senate will defend it. But the time has come to stop it. It is a bad practice.

I read an article dated May 28, 1964, which appeared in the Washington Post, written by Mr. Jerry Kluttz, outlining this evil.

PROMOTION OF GALA FOR JOHNSON LEAVES TAINT OF PRESSURE

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The Democratic gala is over but the political taint from it lingers on in Federal offices here.

There isn't much doubt that Tuesday night's $100 Democratic fund-raising Salute to President Johnson was actively promoted in Federal offices in violation of the spirit if not the letter of the law which makes it illegal to solicit political funds on Federal property.

In the past the State Department with its large body of professional Foreign Service personnel was by-passed by political fund raisers. But things have changed and scores of higher-paid employees there were sent invitations to the gala at their offices.

The employes charge that the Protocol Office there not only distributed the invitations, an apparent violation of law, but also made calls to jog them into responding to them. This is the story of one of the employes:

"About two weeks ago a mysterious-looking letter was hand-delivered to my office in the State Department . . . Inside was an invitation to the gala honoring President Johnson.

"Monday the Protocol Office called to ask if I were going to the gala . . . On inquiring of some of my colleagues, I found that they, too, had received hand-written, hand-delivered invitations at their offices as well as solicitous calls from the Protocol Office. There was more than a little consternation in the minds of many of them.

". . . I'm at a loss to explain why the invitation was a matter of Protocol . . . but the incident has begun to worry me. Lots of timid souls clearly attended the gala for fear that some of their colleagues, who are dependent on political patronage for their jobs, will record the fact and remind any and all who might be interested.

"This may be okay for Assistant Secretaries or even Deputy Assistant Secretaries but for those who are supposedly part of the Civil Service and Foreign Service this potential for al-fresco blackmail is a serious business.

"I am sure the President wants a Civil Service and a Foreign Service which will give him, through his appointees, the best professional advice possible, without fear or favor. After all, one of the hardest problems of being President is making the bureaucracy work effectively for the program of his Administration.

"Those who were in charge of issuing invitations didn't help the President. Somebody ought to tell him."

Representative NELSEN (R-Minn.) charged on the House floor that topgrade employes in Rural Electrification were asked to buy $100 tickets in their offices. Senator WILLIAMS (R-Del.) is sponsoring a resolution to direct the Attorney General to investigate the charges.

Employes in Small Business, Housing & Home Finance, Office of Emergency Planning and Post Office among others have called to say they were "invited" to attend the gala by either phone calls or personal contacts at their offices.

In most cases they say they were asked to attend cocktail parties which were held prior to the gala and given by agency heads. Those who attended the parties were expected to attend the gala.

A postal official commented yesterday that he had never seen employes so eager to buy the $100 tickets and he added that he had heard no one in the Department complain about the pressure.

"Pressure wasn't necessary to sell the tickets this year," he explained, "the employes bought them willingly because I suspect they feel that Mr. Johnson will be around for awhile."

A Commerce official said the "educational" approach was used to sell tickets to employes there. He simply said that employes in the top grades were given the "opportunity" to contribute to the party of his choice and he expressed the personal belief that those who could afford it should contribute to help sustain the two-party system. He also said no pressure was necessary to sell $100 tickets to the gala.

Complaints from employes who charged that their arms were twisted to buy tickets were far fewer than last year. Two reasons were cited for the slump in complaints. First, that employes were getting accustomed to the pressure, and secondly, tickets sold better this year as many business firms bought them.

If this practice is to be stopped this is the time. Under the existing law if the civil service employee who is quoted here were solicited by a Member of Congress or by any salaried official of the U.S. Government it would be a violation of the law. The article does not say that he was solicited in that manner but that they were solicited by a representative of a political party. The proposed amendment would cover such representative of any polictical party or committee.

Although this incident involved a Democratic dinner the same situation has arisen involving Republican dinners.

This is not written for one party or the other. It lays down the same ground rules for both. The definition of a political committee under this amendment is exactly the same as is now written in the Corrupt Practices Act. It does not change it one iota.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts assumed the chair.)

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I did not mean by anything that I said to give the inference that one political party had certain sins that do not belong to the other. All persons and organizations have their shortcomings. But the parties are anxious to shore up those shortcomings which might exist.

However, if we are going to adopt an amendment like this, it is important to know what is in it and what its effects will be.

When we come to the language "directly or indirectly solicits," this would appear to mean that any one who gets a large mailing list and sends out requests based on that mailing list would be included if there happens to be a Federal employee among the names. It would also apply to one who engages a group of party members to go block by block to contribute dollars for Democrats or contribute dollars for Republicans—but you do not buy much influence in this fashion. Anyone who does this would come under the penalty of $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 3 years.

I do not believe that this is what the Senator from Delaware wants but I do not see any other definition or any other result, or how one can escape those results.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Indiana is only reading the existing law.

Mr. BAYH. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator from Delaware says that existing law applies to Government employees?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAYH. I am talking about Democratic or Republican leaders in a community who get together 100 party officials—not employees but party officials—and send them out block by block, or who says, "Sit down here and send these cards out en masse to 10,000 people in this county."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us not confuse this with a lot of camouflage. The amendment is clear enough.

Mr. BAYH. I am not covering it up by a lot of camouflage. What does the Senator mean by "covering it up with a lot of camouflage"? The language of his amendment seems to me to state this. The Senator should read it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall again read the existing law.

Mr. BAYH. I am not worried about the existing law. The Senator desires to change the existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have the floor?

Mr. BAYH. The Senator yielded to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I did not yield the floor. I wish to read the existing law for the special enlightment of the Senator from Indiana.

The existing law reads:

§ 602. Solicitation of political contributions. Whoever, being a Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, or a candidate for Congress, or individual elected as, Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, or an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof, or a person receiving any salary or compensation for services from money derived from the Treasury of the United States, directly or indirectly solicits, receives, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever, from any other such officer, employee, or person, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 722.)

I now read the language under the proposed amendment, and all that this amendment would do would be to add a new section prescribing the same criminal penalties to any person acting on behalf of a political committee who "directly or indirectly solicits, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any officer or employee of the United States."

That is the part that the Senator read before.

The existing law is applicable to salaried employees of the Government, but the existing law does not cover the situation if that salaried employee of the Government seeks out nonemployees of the Government to do his dirty work or solicit from civil service employees.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, please?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. We are all trying to get rid of dirty work. But we want to make certain that we do not throw out the baby with the bath water.

Suppose he formed a "JOHN WILLIAMS for Senate Committee."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He would come under the amendment.

Mr. BAYH. May I ask the question? I think the Senator has answered it; but I wish to make sure.

I will make it the "BIRCH BAYH for Senate Committee." We get 100 volunteers, using the language of the Senator, acting on behalf of this committee; each person takes a five-block area and they go down that five-block area asking for a "buck for BAYH." Now, if they indirectly solicit in any matter someone who works for the Federal Government, it seems to me, according to the language here—not camouflage—they subject themselves to a fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to say this now so that there will be no misunderstanding. If the committee is formed in the State of Delaware to elect JOHN WILLIAMS for the Senate or if a committee is formed in the State of Indiana to elect BIRCH BAYH for the Senate, those committees or representatives of those committees would be covered under this amendment and barred from soliciting civil service employees for campaign contributions and why should they not be covered?

If Senators do not want them covered they should vote against the amendment because its adoption would stop a representative of any committee, Democrat or Republican, from soliciting funds from civil service employees for candidates who are running in two or more States. If Senators do not wish to correct this loophole they might as well reject the amendment.

Mr. BAYH. So that we may move on, I believe the distinction is there. It has been explained by the Senator from Delaware.

The present law prohibits those who are employees of the Federal Government from soliciting. The Senator would include in his amendment every Tom, Dick, and Harry or advocate of good government who wants to get out and support his candidate by collecting funds. He would prohibit them from doing this. He would include the little old lady who wants to go out with a tin cup from door to door, and who has no influence or impact at all. The Senator from Delaware, whether he desires that or not, prohibits them from having this opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I can assure the Senator that this may hurt the tincup politician. There is the rule of commonsense in the law, and with respect to the solicitation of the dollar from each house, I doubt if that would be covered if done by someone who did not know he was a civil service employee.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] knows what we are talking about here. Let us stop hedging.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have two articles here which appeared in the Washington Star of June 23, 1965, which I shall read. They state the case very well:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 23, 1965]

WORKER PRODDED ON $100 TICKET, WIFE COMPLAINS

The wife of a top Civil Service grade employe at the Office of Emergency Planning called The Star this morning to complain that her husband had been asked by his boss to buy a $100 ticket to tomorrow's Democratic dinner.

"He was told," the irate wife said, "that the White House is displeased with the number of tickets purchased so far" by OEP employes.

The wife said she would not give her name in order to protect her husband. "I know they wouldn't fire him," she stated, "but they could easily abolish his job."

Early this afternoon, Emet F. Riordan, OEP director of information, released a statement which said: "There is no solicitation of any kind within the agency for ticket buying."

MONEY AND POLITICS: DEMOCRATIC DINNER APPEARS A SELLOUT

(By Walter Pincus)

Tomorrow night's $100-a-plate Democratic Congressional fund-raising dinner appears to be a solid success—the promoters have booked an overflow dinner crowd of 2,875

into the Washington Hilton Hotel on top of about 5,500 that are now expected at the D.C. Armory.

The apparent sale of 8,000 or more tickets came despite a reported falloff of purchases by federal workers. A survey of government workers indicates the sales effort toward them was less intense this year and was limited primarily to home mailings to lists of last year's donors.

"It was a light touch, nothing like last year," one aide to a Cabinet member said yesterday. Another added that plans for and in-house solicitation had been dropped three weeks ago.

Though both President Johnson and Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey are expected to appear at both affairs, the real money draw has been a nationwide solicitation of small business, labor and corporate contributors both directly from Washington and indirectly through individual representatives and senators.

The fact that this is being billed as Washington's only Democratic party fund-raising dinner this year has been impressed on the representatives of the various lobbying organizations and other interest groups in Washington.

The bulk of the money raised, after expenses, will go to support Democratic candidates in the 1966 House and Senate races.

Success of this year's ticket sales assured promoters of the dinner that net receipts will surpass last year's dinner which yielded $400,000 to be divided by the Senate and House Democratic Campaign Committees.

It also guaranteed that the Democrats would be well on their way toward amassing a record campaign-fund kitty to be disbursed among House and Senate candidates next year.

Though the solicitation effort is being run from Democratic National Committee headquarters under the over-all direction guide, its all being handled in the name of a specially formed group—the Democratic Congressional Dinner Committee.

Use of this organization will permit the Democrats to take advantage of a campaign fund law loophole and not report the names of those who actually paid $100 or more for tickets—contributions that are normally required to be disclosed under federal law. Political committees, such as the dinner unit, that receive and spend their money within the District are exempt from reporting.

Chairman of the Congressional Dinner Committee is Neil Curry, California trucking executive and long-time party fund-raiser. Curry last year acted as treasurer of the $1,000-A-Member President's Club. He also has played a key role in encouraging trucking firm owners and operators around the country to contribute to the party and its candidates.

The purchase of 16 full-page advertisements by truckers in last year's Democratic Convention program at $15,000 a page was reportedly promoted primarily by Curry.

Despite the lack of hard-sell techniques on government employees, there will be a round of federal agency cocktail parties before the dinner. However, they apparently will be fewer in number and smaller in size than those which preceded last year's Democratic gala.

There also, reportedly, has been less in-house calling to ask if employees were planning to attend their bosses' parties.

Health, Education and Welfare employees will gather at the Skyline Inn tomorrow night. At the Presidential Arms, between 1,000 and 1,500 government workers from five agencies, including the Commerce Department, are expected.

Some Post Office Department employes and officials, along with a number of Congressmen, are to attend a pre-dinner gathering sponsored by the National Association of Postmasters of the U.S., a private organization that has purchased tickets and distributed some to its guests.

D.C. Transit buses will carry the government employes from their cocktail parties to the armory. Though, for the most part, top agency officials pay for pre-dinner parties out of their own pockets, the Democratic National Committee has arranged for the bus transportation. But party officials last night could not say who would pay for the buses.

The Democrats apparently have not spared expense to make the dinner a success. One estimate put the cost of each meal—including service—at from $12 to $15 a plate.

The Mayflower Hotel, which is catering the armory affair, refused yesterday to give any information on the dinner—from the number expected to be served to the name of the main course.

Decorations for the armory, which were described by someone involved in their preparation as "the biggest the Democrats ever had for a dinner," are expected to cost about $20,000.

Democratic party finances are a closely guarded operation. According to records filed with the Clerk of the House, some $900,000 has been contributed to the party in the first five months of 1965. All but $75,000 of that amount came from $1,000-and-up contributors.

The Republican party, on the other hand, reported that during the same period it collected almost $800,000 of which over 75 percent came from contributors of less than $100.

To stimulate small contributors, the Democrats have begun a contest aimed at $10 givers. Though it is not expected to draw much in the way of money, it will create the impression that the party is seeking to encourage the small donor.

The amendment would stop this type of soliciting from the civil service employees. It should be stopped. Those who believe it should not be stopped, if they believe civil service workers should be solicited under the Hatch Act as now interpreted, may vote against it.

The issue is clear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of articles which have been published over the last few years in various Washington newspapers criticizing this practice, followed by excerpts from a series of letters written by many civil service employees protesting this solicitation which they interpret to be in the form of a shakedown. Copies of these letters were sent to President Johnson May 18, 1964, by Congressman ANCHER NELSEN.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 18, 1963]

EMPLOYE GROUPS' SILENCE VIEWED AS STRANGE IN $100 TICKET PRESSURE

(By Joseph Young)

Perhaps the strangest aspect of the entire spectacle of unashamed Democratic pressure on Government career employes to attend tonight's $100-a-ticket gala is the complete silence of Government employe unions and the National Civil Service League on the matter.

Not a peep has been heard from any of the major unions or the non-partisan league, which came into being 80 years ago to uphold the merit system, since this reporter and The Star on December 6 first disclosed the pressure on career employes to purchase the $100 tickets.

The employe leaders appear too intent on such unattainable pie-in-the-sky objectives as a 35-hour work week, etc., to bother with the unprecedented pressure on career employes by the Democratic National Committee and officials of the Kennedy administration, only the recently formed National Society of Federal Engineers, Scientists and Allied Professionals have criticized the goings-on.

The unions' excuse is that not many career employes in the upper-middle and top grades are members of their organizations, and hence they don't want to get into the fray. The long-range adverse implications on the merit system seem to escape them.

The silence of the National Civil Service League is even more puzzling. The main purpose of the non-partisan business-supported league is ostensibly to protect and support the merit system.

The failure of Government employe unions to protest the situation may stem from the close relationship the groups have with the Kennedy administration, and their reluctance to do anything to endanger this alliance. Under President Kennedy, the unions have won formal bargaining rights, pay adjustments, support for a union dues checkoff, etc.

Another reason may be the unionists' indifference to groups of career employes who generally aren't found in their memberships.

This could be very shortsighted on the part of the unions.

The Kennedy administration won't last forever, and the next administration—if it is Republican—isn't likely to forget how the unions backed the Democrats by their silence.

This year's pressure was put on grade 12 and above career employes. Next year the pressure could be put on employes in grade 9 and above, and on even lower grade employes in the years ahead. The Kennedy administration is not bashful in telling employes it is responsible for their latest pay raise and the upcoming one next year, and probably doesn't have many qualms in "selling" $100 tickets to as many career employes as the traffic will bear.

As for the Civil Service Commission's silence until now on the situation, this is rather understandable. CSC officials privately are most unhappy over the situation. But there are only two men in Government who could have done something to stop it—President Kennedy and his brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, who could have ordered such practices stopped on threat of Justice Department prosecution under the Corrupt Practices Act. Under the circumstances, the CSC could do little but remain silent.

Meanwhile, the performers at tonight's gala—stellar stars though some of them may be—will have to be extra good to get any kind of ovation from the many Federal career employes who have reluctantly shelled out their $100 to attend. And without Frank Sinatra yet.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 26, 1964]

MONEY AND POLITICS: DEMOCRATS EXPECT TO GROSS OVER $3 MILLION THIS WEEK

(By Walter Pincus)

"It can be a real help to your company."

That was the closing line of a sales pitch made last week by a solicitor for tonight's $1,000-a-plate Democratic Party President's Club dinner to the Washington representatives of a national corporation.

The dinner at the International Inn and the subsequent Salute-to-President Johnson Gala at D.C. Armory, combined with two dinners and another gala at New York City's Madison Square Garden Thursday night, should gross over $3 million for party coffers.

Solicitors have been active in the past two months selling everything from $1,000 mem-

berships in the President's Club to the $5 balcony New York gala tickets.

HOW TICKETS ARE SOLD

A party spokesman estimated that more than 500 tickets, at $1,000 each, have already been sold for tonight's dinner, while a crowd of between 7,000 and 8,000 at $100 a ticket is expected at the Armory.

The President's Club dinner in New York Thursday is expected to draw 1,000 persons at $1,000 each—making it the first publicly-reported $1 million dinner in campaign fund-raising history.

How are the $1,000 tickets sold in Washington? Many of them go to old party contributors whose names regularly grace such lists.

To get the hesitant new big money men, one sales pitch last week included:

Assurance that the $1,000 membership in the President's Club would put the donor's name on a list of those to be considered for invitations to White House social functions.

An understanding that the donor's name would be on a list seen by the President.

A statement that a personal letter would be sent the donor from Democratic Party Finance Chairman Richard Maguire stating that the gift was appreciated and the Democratic National Committee was available for assistance if such help was needed.

CONTROVERSIAL SOLICITATION

And finally, that the funds can originate from any source—so long as someone's name is attached to the $1,000 when it arrives at the national committee.

The most controversial solicitation attached to tonight's gala is that of Government employes. Both parties, when in power, have solicited top civil servants by mail. Democrats recall that at each Salute-to-Eisenhower dinner there was an announcement listing the number of tickets sold in each executive department.

Since 1962, the Democrats have made a strong effort to get those Federal employes who were appointed to their positions—so-called Schedule C jobs—to buy $100 tickets each year to one major party function.

1,440 C POSITIONS

Currently, there are about 1,440 Schedule C positions of which, according to a Civil Service spokesman, about 80 per cent are filled. Some 400 of the persons holding down these jobs, however, are regular Civil Service and not political appointees.

However, the pressure on employes to buy the $100 ducats is not limited to those under Schedule C. Regular civil service employees in grades 11 and above in many agencies have received mailed "invitations" and follow-up telephone calls and direct appeals from their bosses to attend the affair.

Winking at the Federal laws that prohibit solicitation of Federal employes in Federal buildings, the Democratic National Committee has designated sales co-ordinators in each executive agency. Quotas have been established normally based on the number of Schedule C positions in a given department, combined with a 10 per cent increase over the past year's ticket purchases.

SOLICITATION EVIDENT

In 1962, the Democratic National Committee filed its report with the Clerk of the House listing contributions received chronologically. By cross-checking names it was possible to see blocks of ticket-purchases as they came in from various departments—a clear indication that solicitation was made and contributions received within the department.

For example, on January 18, 1962, seventeen $100 contributions in a row were recorded for top officials of the Defense Department. On January 12, of that year, twenty-five $100 contributions in a row were recorded for upper-level Agriculture Department officials.

One Agriculture Department employe who contributed said he was solicited by his division chief who indicated a 10-ticket quota had been given him.

Since 1962, the Democrats have shuffled their contributors in reporting to the House Clerk and it is no longer feasible to determine how contributions are received at the National Committee.

This year, the dinner promoters have taken to marking the solicitation cards distributed to the executive departments with a number so that when the contributions come in directly to the committee they can easily be traced to the department of origin and credited to that department's quota.

In justifying their approach to Schedule C employes, one Democratic contributor said, "They had no hesitancy in seeking political support when they went for their jobs; they shouldn't complain now when they have to pay for that support."

In New York City, three events Thursday night, all run by the city's President's Club, are expected to raise almost $2 million. Headed by United Artists President Arthur Krim, the New York fund-raising group has become highly active in national party affairs.

Complementing the $1,000 President's Club dinner is a $100-a-plate affair for a new group known as the senior club's Associates Division. Promoted among younger New York Democrats, this group has already held a pep rally with White House aide Bill Moyers as speaker.

Solicitors have fanned out, making their appeal particularly among young lawyers who might some day want jobs in Washington. In more than one case, a ticket purchaser was told his name would go on a list that would be consulted when applicants were being cleared for political jobs next January.

Spiced with this type of sales appeal, the Associates dinner has steadily grown to where some 1,300 are now expected to crowd the ballroom of the Americana Hotel.

The Madison Square Garden re-run of tonight's gala is expected to draw 17,500 with the bulk of the tickets purchased and distributed to regular party organization workers.

Not all the money raised in New York goes to the national campaign effort. The New York State Democratic organization is seeking some of the funds to help defray its coming State campaign expenses and to meet some of the debts that have been run up over the past years. Though the National Committee under President Kennedy reportedly demanded and received $300,000 of the first $400,000 cleared in 1962, plus half the remainder, no such agreement on fund division has yet been reached.

Number One. An REA employee received a letter at home inviting him to contribute $100 to the Democratic party shortly before the 1961 inaugural. When he failed to respond to the letter and to telephone calls, he was summoned to the office of the deputy administrator. Here is his story:

"The deputy administrator made the appointment at 3 p.m. during a regular working day. He reviewed the salary situation and my then recent appointment to the power supply division, implying that my salary, the then new congressional wage scale and civil service grade classification were solely due to the efforts of the administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration, and further, that out of gratitude I should financially support the party with a cash contribution of $100. A ticket was then taken from a drawer in his desk and offered. I was advised that if necessary I could buy it on the installment plan. I replied that I had worked for REA for 24 years and never publicly affiliated myself with either political party, and wasn't about to break that precedent. I thought I had earned my salary and would continue to work faithfully and conscientiously up to the limit of my ability."

Number Two. Another REA employee reports this to me:

"Received in my mail a one hundred dollar 'request to attend the second inaugural salute dinner.' Frankly, I am experiencing more than a slow deep burn deep down inside. . . . Let's examine this latest attempt by the Democratic National Committee to extract extortion from civil service employees. It is a fact and can be proved that the deputy administrator and one of the assistant administrators called practically all employees GS–13 and above to their offices and personally handed them the invitations with a not subtle request to attend. Take note, this was a direct violation of the Hatch Act since this solicitation occurred in their offices. There were many grumblings among those good Democrats because of the way in which this was handled, and, surprisingly, some of them had the courage to turn this invitation down. One employee who has been here since the agency started stated that in all the years he had never been called to kick in. This is a top employee."

Number Three. And, to demonstrate that the practice goes on, here is one that came to me just a few days ago:

"For your information, the same two people are doing the same things they have done here since 1961. Again they are calling employees GS–13 and up to their offices, handing them the invitations and accepting their checks for $100—right here in a federal building."

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a moment ago, I promised not to labor this point any further, but after listening to the fine presentation of the Senator from Delaware, I ask my colleagues to forgive me for making one further comment.

The examples, as I interpret them, in connection with the newspaper articles which the Senator has placed in the RECORD, show that they are already existing violations of law. He has said many times that department heads or employees of the Federal Government—and in my estimation, I think that I speak for my colleagues—cannot and should not be permitted to put the "hammerlock" on someone working under him to get him to contribute to a political party. But whether we like what the amendment proposes or not, whether we talk about "reasonable interpretation" or not, I think that to get at whatever the Senator is after, he should use more precise language.

For instance, the amendment uses the phrases "Whoever, acting on behalf" of any political committee and "who directly or indirectly" solicits funds would be covered. The solicitor would not have to know whether a person is a Government employee or not. He might just accidentally encounter him, according to the wording in this language. "In any manner concerned" is another phrase in the amendment. Any member acting for a political committee, directly or indirectly, "in any manner concerned in soliciting," would be subject to penalties provided by the law.

If perchance solicitors should encounter someone who works for the Federal Government, that employee immediately becomes subject to a $5,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both.

This seems to be a reasonable interpretation of the present language of the

amendment. If the Senator from Delaware has other language to accomplish what he is striving to do, which could exclude these people who I think would be inadvertently encompassed within the confines of this amendment, I would support him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The words "directly or indirectly solicits" are in the existing law. My amendment repeats existing law. As to the example the Senator pointed out that existing law now prohibits the head of an agency from soliciting the employee in his department or any other department for political contributions and that such action would be a violation of existing law, on that point he is correct. But under existing law the head of that agency can take this list of his employees, give it to a man outside the Government, and send him out to do the soliciting; that is not prohibited under existing law. My amendment would state that anyone who is acting on behalf of that public official or political committee would be covered, and I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am puzzled as to exactly what the Senator means in the language:

> Whoever, acting on behalf of any political committee (including any State or local committee of a political party), directly or indirectly solicits, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for these of such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any officer or employee of the United States (other than an elected officer) shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

In most States, it is customary to pay to secure mailing lists of voters in certain precincts and certain wards. Letters are sent out, and fortunately, I think the law is drafted so that responsible Federal officials, particularly, Senators and Representatives know what the law is, and they will not write, do not choose to write, and do not care to write for a list that might involve perhaps one out of every four people on that registration list to receive mail asking for $1, $5, or $10 in campaign funds from a large block of people who may want to participate in politics, or support a political candidate or political party. This applies to primaries and also to general elections. I think it is very much better to have 1,000 people contributing a few dollars than to have a few people contributing $1,000 to a man's campaign.

The only way these small amounts will be raised will be done, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] has stated, by volunteers, by those who take an interest because they like politics and are willing to work at the level at which they may have to sell perhaps buttons, or perhaps tickets to a banquet, or other things of that kind. We have absolutely prohibited, with a $5,000 fine or 3 years imprisonment, any elective official or any employee of this great Government to participate in reaching or threatening any civil service employee, or give him an intelligence examination requiring him to have a certain IQ in order to pass. Certainly a Federal employee does not have to be intimidated or coerced or driven like sheep to be clipped for campaign expenditures. I do not know of any group in my State which is avoided as much as are Federal employees in campaign solicitations. Certainly, those who belong to the employee unions, I imagine they contribute but I do not know exactly how the unions do contribute vis-a-vis the two parties. This is not covered by the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I also do not think that many other means of raising finances are covered. I do not think the Senator is getting at what he is trying to do. I think the bill, which would prohibit any Federal employee from asking any civil service employee or any other employee of the U.S. Government for a contribution, is effective, broad, and complete. I do not know what the Senator means by the definition of "any officer or employee of the United States." This could include servicemen. Of course, I hope that it would not, because I do not feel that they should be asked to contribute. Does it involve only civil service employees? The bill does not speak on that. Would the Senator kindly advise me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The language which the Senator read as being confusing to him in my amendment is verbatim of the language that is existing law now. I am not changing existing law. I only propose to add another section.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to the Senator that Representatives, Senators, and employees have sense enough to know not to fool around with that. Therefore, this does not apply, because no one is going out to try to solicit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What about the man representing an official in an agency. He could take the list of the names of civil service employees and start talking to them on the official's behalf. So far as confusing this with mass mailing lists which go out where people have no way of knowing if they are civil service employees or not, that is not mentioned under either. Existing law states that a salaried official cannot solicit civil service employees as such.

The amendment would add a new section to this to prohibit a representative of a political committee or a representative of the public official from making the solicitation on his behalf.

Mr. MONRONEY. It does not say "as such."

Mr. BAYH. It says "in any manner concerned in soliciting"——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely. Why not?

Mr. BAYH. Anyone can represent a political party to solicit money. If that does not encompass a mail order list, then I do not know what would.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If I may read it again:

> Anyone who solicits or is in any manner concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for any political purpose whatever from any other such officer, employee, or person. . . .

Mr. MONRONEY. I cannot find that language, because the Senator's language says nothing about "existing."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am reading existing law. That is exactly the same definition as is in the pending amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Except "receiving." I do not find "receiving." I see nothing in here about "receiving." What I see is "soliciting."

I think the amendment offers a wide opportunity for blackmail on the part of someone who may say, "I represent Senator so-and-so. I have been told to call on you to get $10. If you do not give it, you will suffer the consequences of not being promoted"; or something like that.

The burden of proof lies with the candidate, then, to say, "I have never seen this man before. I do not know him or anything about him."

The language is so broad:

> Whoever, acting on behalf of any political committee (including any State or local committee of a political party), directly or indirectly solicits, or is in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of such political committee or for any political purpose whatever from any officer or employee of the United States (other than an elected officer) shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

It does not say anything about receiving; it does not say anything acting responsibly in the employ of a Representative or a Senator or an officer of the third ward branch of a State party committee. It states no qualifications whatever.

The amendment is proposed without its having received any committee hearings or any testimony whatever.

I certainly hope we shall be able to pass legislation—and I intend to vote for it, as I have voted for all similar legislation, including the Hatch Act—to provide for clean elections. But I do not want to rush in without notice or committee hearings on an amendment that is not germane to the bill before the Senate, a bill which relates to better retirement. I do not believe we should vote on an amendment such as this on such short notice. We had not 1 minute's notice that this proposal was coming up. We had no testimony. No one has examined into the proposal at length.

If the Senator from Delaware does not desire more time, I am prepared to move to table his amendment, so that the Senate may move on to complete action on a bill which affects so many Federal employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope the Senator will not move to table the amendment. If he thinks it is not germane let him make a point of order. I am sure the amendment is germane, and I am sure that the Chair would sustain my view. So far as a motion to table is concerned, that motion could be made, but the vote would still be on the merits. If I were against the amendment I would certainly vote to table it.

This proposal has not just come before us today. I shall read an editorial pub-

lished in the Washington Evening Star of January 18, 1963, 3½ years ago. It is entitled "Down the Hatch" and reads as follows:

An undetermined number of unhappy Civil Service workers, having put up $100 for the greater glory of the Democratic Party, will toss down a drink or two tonight as guests of their bosses.

The Civil Service Commission, with no pun intended, says that it cannot treat this thinly disguised form of coercion as a violation of the Hatch Act unless it receives complaints from Government workers.

I digress at this point to say that, certainly, Government workers are afraid to complain.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to complete my reading of the editorial; then I shall yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I continue to read:

We would rather doubt that any worker who has sense enough to find his way in and out of the building is going to be foolish enough to file such a formal complaint. So this throws the whole shabby business back into the realm of the Corrupt Practices Act, which is enforced by the Department of Justice, not by the CSC. Of course, one may always be mistaken in a judgment. But it is our guess that no Justice Department bloodhounds will be sent off on the trail of Democrats who have resorted to this device to raise funds for other Democrats. And if our estimates in this respect should be erroneous, we are willing to bet ROBERT KENNEDY a $100 dinner that any bloodhounds unleashed in this cause will not be young and eager, but, rather, will be of that variety which is old, tired and quite ready to call it a day.

All of this has prompted some Republicans to rise up in righteous wrath, a circumstance which, we think, should be put in some perspective. In former administrations, both Republican and Democratic, there has been a certain prodding of the Federal worker to kick into the party coffers. But nothing in the past has rivaled the brazenness or the scope of what the New Frontiermen have been doing. As our Federal Spotlight reporter, Joe Young, puts it when speaking informally: "The Civil Service worker is damned if he doesn't, because his promotion prospects may be adversely affected. And, should the Republicans come in, he is damned if he does, because his new GOP bosses are not apt to look with understanding and tolerance on the fact that he tossed a hundred bucks into the Democratic war chest."

By tomorrow this affair will be over and done with. But the bad smell will linger on. People who make a career of working for the Government ought not to have their shins kicked or their arms twisted to force them to put their money on the line. Nor should they be subjected to the slightly more subtle pressure of not having a drink with the boss unless they pony up.

The Kennedy administration speaks in noble terms to the American people of virtue, dedication, high purpose, etc. If the President, by chance, doesn't know what has been going on recently, he ought to take time out for a closer look.

I should say that since the editorial was published both President Kennedy and President Johnson have recommended that Congress take action to correct the loophole in the law in that while officials of the departments themselves cannot solicit they can designate someone outside the Government to take the lists of names and call on the civil service workers.

This is a practice that is common knowledge to all. I think it is time to stop it, and my amendment would stop it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I listened carefully as the Senator from Delaware read the editorial. It is my understanding that a boss who invited employees has been for many years under the prohibition of contacting Federal employees on behalf of candidates for office. That is the law today.

If the Senator from Delaware wishes to bring in people who have no connection whatever with Government and no connection with promotional activities and say, "You cannot conduct political activities," that is one thing. But I say that persons have a right to go out and solicit on behalf of their candidates if such persons are not connected with the Federal Government in any way, shape, or form.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware would prohibit such a practice by a fine of $5,000, or 3 years in the penitentiary or both. That is an impingement on the rights of individual citizens, nongovernmental employees, who work in the field of democracy, who want to participate and urge young people to become active and to help in the field of politics, so that they may become acquainted with their Government and move forward in political organizations.

Yet if they go out and sell a tag on tag day or sell a $5 or a $10 or a $100 banquet ticket, no matter how remotely connected they are with the Federal Government, if they are connected with a political committee, if they represent a party, and if they are working on behalf of a political party, they would be under a threat of fine and imprisonment.

I think the Senator from Delaware has not thought this amendment out. It would not do what he had hoped it would do. I favor a tightening of the law so far as it concerns Federal employees raising money from other Federal employees, no matter what class of civil service or any other type Federal employment he may have. But I certainly feel that to have on the books legislation which would deny the right of 90 percent of the volunteer workers in the United States to feel comfortable by having a 3-year sentence facing them, if they worked in this field of activity, for fear that talking to neighbors or others they might be accused, directly or indirectly, or in any other vague way, of soliciting or being concerned in soliciting an assessment, subscription, or contribution for the use of any political committee, is carrying it too far with people who have no authority and who are not Federal employees.

It is those who have authority over Federal employees that the law has wisely sought to prevent from raising funds, and I think it is a good law. I would vote to strengthen it if I knew how. But I believe that what the Senator proposes does not strengthen it in any way.

I am prepared to move forward, if the Senator wishes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall take only a minute, and then I shall be ready to vote.

The Senator has summed up the issue very clearly. As he has stated, the law as it exists today prohibits an official in the Government from soliciting his employees for campaign contributions or from selling them this $100 ticket, as outlined in the editorial. The Senator is correct on that point. The existing law does not prohibit that same official from inviting those who may have purchased ticket to stop by his house for cocktails so he can get their names. The existing law, while it does prohibit the head of an agency from soliciting the employees under him for these $100 dinners, does not prohibit that agency head from designating some individual who is not on the Government payroll to take that list of names and make the solicitations. The existing law does not prohibit that.

My amendment would prohibit anybody designated by that official from soliciting civil service workers, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator managing the bill yield for a question soliciting information?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the bill pending before the Senate is amended to make the effective date January 1, 1967, instead of July 1, 1966, to what extent, in dollars, will the cost of the bill be reduced for the 1 year?

Mr. MONRONEY. It will be exactly one-half, which will be in the neighborhood of $252 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Instead of costing $504 million, it would cost $252 million?

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be delayed one-half year.

I might say to the distinguished Senator that the vote in the committee, when it was taken, to move the effective date forward to October 1, even, was 14 to 1 against doing so and for making July 1 the effective date; and the single vote was that of the chairman of the committee. I favored the other position, and 14 of the committee members, who heard the same evidence I did, favored the other way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has answered my question. If we make the effective date January 1, 1967, instead of July 1, 1966, there will be a saving of $252 million.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll on the quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 127 Leg.]

Allott	Hartke	Morse
Bayh	Hill	Murphy
Boggs	Holland	Pearson
Burdick	Jordan, Idaho	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Carlson	Lausche	Robertson
Cooper	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ervin	Mansfield	Tydings
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Harris	Monroney	

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Hruska	Muskie
Bartlett	Inouye	Nelson
Bennett	Jackson	Prouty
Bible	Javits	Proxmire
Brewster	Jordan, N.C.	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Kuchel	Russell, Ga.
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Smith
Case	McCarthy	Stennis
Church	McGee	Symington
Cotton	McGovern	Talmadge
Curtis	McIntyre	Thurmond
Eastland	Miller	Tower
Fannin	Mondale	Yarborough
Fong	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Moss	
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry. A quorum is present. The yea-and-nay vote had been demanded by the senior Senator from Delaware, but had not actually taken place. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, no Senator had responded before the absence of a quorum was suggested.

Mr. MONRONEY. Therefore, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Senators who wish to defeat the amendment would vote to table it, and Senators who wish to vote for the amendment would vote against tabling it.

Do I understand correctly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware understands correctly.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Bartlett	Burdick	Eastland
Bayh	Byrd, W. Va.	Ervin
Bible	Cannon	Fulbright
Brewster	Church	Gore
Harris	Mansfield	Proxmire
Hartke	McCarthy	Randolph
Hayden	McGee	Ribicoff
Hill	McGovern	Russell, S.C.
Holland	Metcalf	Russell, Ga.
Inouye	Mondale	Sparkman
Jackson	Monroney	Stennis
Jordan, N.C.	Montoya	Symington
Kennedy, Mass.	Moss	Talmadge
Long, Mo.	Muskie	Tydings
Long, La.	Nelson	Yarborough
Magnuson	Pell	Young, Ohio

NAYS—33

Aiken	Fannin	Morton
Allott	Fong	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Boggs	Hruska	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Prouty
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Robertson
Case	Kuchel	Smith
Cooper	Lausche	Thurmond
Cotton	McIntyre	Tower
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Morse	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Griffin	Saltonstall
Bass	Gruening	Scott
Clark	Hart	Simpson
Dodd	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Dominick	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Neuberger	
Ellender	Pastore	

So Mr. MONRONEY's motion to table the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], is as follows:

On page 46, line 17, beginning with the word "as", strike out all down through line 23 and insert in lieu thereof "on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1967".

On page 49, line 2, strike out "July 1, 1966" and insert "January 1, 1967".

On page 52, line 24, strike out "July 1, 1966" and insert "January 1, 1967".

On page 62, line 10, beginning with the word "as", strike out all down through line 19, and insert in lieu thereof "on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1967".

On page 69, line 8, strike out the word "second" and insert "fifth".

On page 69, line 23, strike out the word "date" and all of the language on line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the words "January 1, 1967".

On page 71, line 10, strike out "July 1, 1966" and insert "January 1, 1967".

On page 71, line 16, strike out "July 1, 1966" and insert "January 1, 1967".

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a 30-minute limitation on the pending amendment, 15 minutes under the control of the proponent, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and 15 minutes under the control of the manager of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield unto himself?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to myself as much time as I shall use, not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. President, the bill pending before the Senate provides that the effective date of the increase in the wage grants shall be July 1, 1966. July 1, 1966, manifestly, has already passed.

The President, in recommending the adoption of the pay-increase bill and the liberalization of survivor benefits, stated:

> I recommend to the Congress the enactment of a pay raise for Federal employees effective January 1, 1967, ranging from 1 percent to 4-½ percent.

The recommendation of the President was disregarded by both the House of Representatives and the committee in the Senate that considered the bill.

Today arguments were made by various Senators that the Congress has already adopted authorizations increasing Federal expenditures by about $3.5 billion over the President's recommended budget.

While the bill was being discussed today, there appeared a brief flash of controversy concerning who was responsible for the increased expenditures that have been created in this session of the Congress.

There were arguments that the President is responsible. There were arguments that the Congress is responsible. The fact is undoubted, however, that up until now the authorizations exceed the President's budget by about $3.5 billion. There is no question that the Congress has exceeded the President's recommendations in the amounts which I have stated. I am not trying to defend the President. I am trying to relate the facts as I understand them to exist.

The second dispute on the floor of the Senate today was whether the Congress, if it is increasing the expenditures, should not impose a tax. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] said the President was delinquent in not recommending a tax increase to meet the huge expenditures of South Vietnam and the increased expenditures authorized by the Congress.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] did not participate in the argument. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] argued that if a bill of that type were submitted he would vote for it.

Senators may want to know the cost if the effective date is January 1, 1967, as recommended by the President, instead of July 1, 1966, as proposed by the House of Representatives, and the committee that had charge of this bill. The answer is that the cost will be $252 million.

If July 1, 1966, is made the effective date instead of January 1, 1967, the cost will be $252 million more than it would be under the pending bill.

With respect to the merits, I do not like to mention this but it is an absolute fact. Every election year we increase the survivor benefits and the wages of the Federal employees.

I have before me a document prepared by the Library of Congress covering the years I have been in the Senate.

In 1958, the classified employees received a wage increase of 10 percent. In 1960, the classified employees received a wage increase of 7.7 percent; in 1962, 5.5 percent; in 1964, 4.3 percent. Even in the odd year, in 1965, the classified employees received an average increase of 3.6 percent.

Practically the same program and the same table of increases deals with postal employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the tabulation contained in this document.

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

General pay increases since 1950: Classified, postal, and Armed Forces

Year	Public Law	Percent increase
CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES		
1951	82-201	Average increase of 10 percent.
1955	84- 94	Average increase of 7.5 percent.
1958	85-462	Average increase of 10 percent.
1960	86-568	Average increase of 7.7 percent.
1962	87-793	1st step increase, effective October 1962, 5.5 percent. 2d step increase, effective January 1964 4.1 percent.
1964	88-426	Average increase of 4.3 percent.
1965	89-301	Average increase of 3.6 percent.
POSTAL EMPLOYEES		
1951	82-204	4th class postmasters' pay increased 20 percent. Other postmasters and supervisors increased 8.8 percent (but not over $800). All other employees increased $400, but the elimination of the 2 lowest grades meant that employees who had been in these grades got as much as a $600 increase.
1955	84- 68	Average increase of 8.4 percent.
1958	85-426	Average increase of 10.27 percent.
1960	86-568	Average increase of 8.35 percent.
1962	87-793	1st step increase, effective October 1962, 8.6 percent. 2d step increase, effective January 1964, 2.6 percent.
1964	88-426	Average increase of 5.6 percent.
1965	89-301	Average increase of 3.6 percent.
ARMED FORCES		
1952	82-346	Average increase of 4 percent in pay; 14 percent in food and rent allowance for those eligible. Average of these factors: 5.7 percent.
1955	84- 20	Percent of increase under this law is complicated. For officers with more than 3 years' service and for warrant officers and enlisted men with more than 2 years' service, increases were based on length of service. Some examples: Major generals, 26 to 30 years' service, 6.7 percent; 2d lieutenants, with more than 3 but less than 4 years' service, 25 percent; corporals, with 8 to 10 years' service, 17.35 percent.
1958	85-422	Increases ranged from about 1 percent for privates to as much as 33 percent for some generals.
1963	88-132	Increase averaged about 17 percent for all active duty personnel with 2 or more years of service. Those with less than 2 years' service received no increase.
1964	88-422	Average increase of 2.5 percent for all uniformed personnel with more than 2 years of service.
1965	89-132	Average increase of 11 percent for all enlisted personnel with 2 or more years of service; varying increase for those with less than 2 years of service, and 6 percent for all officers.

Source: Legislative Reference Service, Government and General Research Division, Feb. 1, 1965.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Armed Forces have not been dealt with so leniently. They have been allowed to falter and stand by the wayside while we have taken care of postal employees and civil service employees. Not until 1965 were the armed services given what was supposed to be a substantial increase, and that was 11 percent for all enlisted personnel with 2 or more years of service.

In the arguments made today, there was stressed deficit operations, the largeness of the public debt, and the scarcity of money throughout the Nation where banks are bidding for deposits by paying as high as 5.5 percent—and of course, when they pay 5.5 percent for deposits, they will collect an interest rate on their loans of 7 percent and 8 percent. When they do that, they will take bad security. I have been through this program. I was on the bench in 1936 when foreclosure proceedings were coming through, and it was quite evident that the more extravagant the collection of interest, the greater the extravagance in demanding ample security.

Finally, in simple terms, we can save $252 million. We can stand by the President in his recommendations that the bill be made effective as of January 1, 1967, and we can help stop the inflation which is running rampant; on the other hand, we can cast aside the word of the President, we can blame him for what is happening, we can forget about inflation, we can forget all the other dangers which are incident to this bill. The bill is most liberal. The workers should be satisfied with an effective date of January 1, 1967.

That is my argument.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I admire the courage of the Senator from Ohio in offering his amendment. He knows it takes courage to offer it, because it would be disappointing to millions of employees were the Senator's amendment to carry. The fact is that none of us has the right to criticize the administration for profligate spending at their end, and then vote to advance the pay raise date on this end. Federal employees have had a raise every 2 years. In recent years, we have voted one every year. I want to say to the Senator from Ohio that certainly the executive branch of the Government is very much concerned with profligate spending on this end.

We should do what we can to hold down the spending to that authorized in the President's recommendations, and for that reason I will vote with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HARTKE. Is the Senator from Ohio interested in the law of 1962 which provides that there shall be the doctrine of comparability, which is the law of the land? Does the Senator want to disapprove of that law?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am thoroughly familiar with the law of 1962, which provides that there shall be a comparability between the salaries paid by the Federal Government and those paid by private industry. I say to the Senator that the President of the United States thought this matter out and recognized the huge

expenditures necessary for Vietnam. My belief is that in a generous mood he said:

I will recommend this increase but I want it effective as of January 1, 1967.

Let me point out further to the Senator that the comparability law would help only with the comparability of salaries paid by the Federal Government and private industry and not at all with salaries paid by villages, counties, cities, and States.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator well knows that John Macy, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has said publicly in committee that this provision, at this moment, will not even bring Federal employees up to a comparable standard with private industry as required by the law of 1962. He himself has admitted this publicly, willingly, and without any question of doubt whatsoever in his mind. He merely says that what is being recommended today will not bring the Federal employees up to a comparable standard as we have determined ourselves to be. Even by July 1, 1966, rather than January 1, 1967, we will still be where——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sorry, but my time is very limited. If the Senator wishes to make a speech on his own time——

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me answer the Senator's question. One of the great problems confronting our country is, who will stop the inflationary processes? Private employers have not been able to do so because when a strike is declared against their industry, they are helpless. We should set the example. We should demonstrate to the people of the Nation that there is grave danger of excessive inflation, and if inflation comes, our employees will suffer. We will suffer. The whole Nation will suffer irreparable damage.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio—on my own time—will the Senator from Ohio be as willing to defend economy when it comes time to vote upon the authorization this week—as I understand it will come up—on cutting out the giving of military aid to foreign countries so that they can use it against each other?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with great reluctance, I would make the statement that the question the Senator from Indiana has asked is demagogic.

Mr. HARTKE. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that if my statement is demagoguery, the war between India and Pakistan took approximately 5,000 lives on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment. We must realize that the data on which the pay increase is based is now 15 months old. The survey of comparability with private industry was made in March 1965. We have all had experiences with the inflationary spiral which has taken place and its effect upon the cost of living and know what it has done to those in the lower income groups.

This overall wage increase of 2.9 percent is the maximum that anyone will receive under the provisions of the bill and applies primarily to those in the lower paid grades where the pinch of rising food costs and higher rentals is felt the most.

We voted a pay increase of 3.6 percent last year. If Senators will check back on the going rate of increases which took place last year and this year in private enterprise, they will find that the Government employees are the low men on the totem pole.

Few, if any, of the industrial wage agreements which were made with large groups of individuals are as low as the levels which the leaders of our Government employees organizations were willing, finally—when the facts were pointed out—to accept. This is a very important matter, I think, to meet rising living costs, and to retain the high caliber of Federal employes, and to assure the continuation in Government service of these men and women who have spent years in knowing and faithfully performing the duties of our widespread Government operations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy now to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member on the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate will think twice before reaching a conclusion on this vote on setting back the date from January 1, 1967, to July 1, 1966.

I say that for two reasons. First, the committee spent several weeks trying to work out a program for paying Federal employees and we arrived at a figure of 2.9 percent. I challenge anyone to name an industry anywhere in this country which would settle for 2.9 percent.

If the proposed amendment should be adopted, we will be paying Federal employees 1.6 percent. I cannot conceive that the Senate would do that at this particular time, particularly in view of the fact that it would save $252 million, which sounds like a large sum of money. But the subject of pay comparability, which the committee and the Senate have been working on, dates back to March 1965. The last pay increase was in October 1965.

If Senators do not wish to give Federal employees any pay increase in 1966, they should vote for the amendment. But frankly, I cannot conceive that Congress will do that, when workers in industry are receiving a settlement of more than 4 percent. I would not be surprised if it were soon 5 percent. I placed in the RECORD this morning a statement indicating that construction workers are now getting 10-, 12-, and even 14-percent pay increases. Certainly it is not proposed that Congress should not treat Federal employees fairly. I hope we shall have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have had contact with the matter of pay for postal and other civil employees for many years, both in the other body and in the Senate. There are two promises that Congress made them years ago, but which were never fulfilled. They are not kept in this bill. The first is comparability with pay in private employment; the other is the keeping pace with the cost of living. The rise in the cost of living is not the fault of postal and other civil employees; it is the fault of Congress, if we are not running the country right.

On page 6 of the committee report, we read that the Consumer Price Index, which was 110.4 when Congress increased Federal salaries in October 1965, is now 112.5, an increase of 1.9 percent in 6 months. But the pay increase provided in the bill gives the Federal employees an increase of only 1 percent net. The report is quite clear on that.

For myself, I would not wish to shortchange Federal employees by not even giving them the raise as of July 1, but they might be shortchanged further by deferring the raise.

On the issue of the general economy, we had a magnificent debate about 2 hours ago, led by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It is clear that if we are to meet our responsibility, we must do justice to the Federal employees, who have only us as the representatives of their employers. We can do them justice; and if, having done that, in the exercise of our responsibility, the tax revenues are inadequate to the purpose, it is our duty to increase taxes by facing the issue squarely. That is our responsibility. I shall be happy to do it. Every Senator who wishes to grant an increase of this kind must face his conscience.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from New York think there is a chance of getting a tax increase?

Mr. JAVITS. I certainly do. We shall have to have one to restrain the inflationary spiral in this country, and not have the ax fall on innocent people, who are looking for credit in order to do constructive things.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If a tax increase cannot be had, what will be the result?

Mr. JAVITS. It is within our power to grant this rise in wages, which is justly

due, and also it is within our power to fulfill our responsibility to raise taxes. We now have a chance to do this. Therefore, I am for doing it and shall face up to my responsibility to raise taxes whenever that issue is before us.

The continuation of excessive reliance on monetary policy has already raised interest rates to their highest levels since World War II, slowed down housing construction considerably and engendered a rate war between savings and loan associations and other credit institutions. Unless there is a moderate across-the-board tax increase, there cannot be a corresponding easing of credit conditions and interest rates which is highly desirable in my opinion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio knows that I feel as deeply about inflation as he does. I have joined him on many occasions in voting for measures which were designed to cut back Federal spending. But I suggest that this bill is not the place to war on inflation. It is not Federal Government salaries that cause inflation. What might be causing a part of the inflation is that Congress has been voting for a proliferation of organizations and programs which have resulted in the placing of about 250,000 more Federal civil employees on the payroll today than were on the payroll 5 years ago. That would have something to do with the situation.

But as to those who have been in the Government service a long time, many of them, especially those in the postal service, are not making enough money so that it might be said that they are comparable with their counterparts in private industry.

We shall have an opportunity to vote to cut some of the spending a little later in foreign aid and the so-called war on poverty. There are plenty of areas to go after, but I do not believe this is an area that can fairly be said to be causing inflation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one thing that I hope Senators will consider is that the committee felt that we were striking a level on the total amount, giving Federal workers the very minimum that we calculated was their due, but still 15 months after the data had been accumulated. It is far better, I believe, not to have the total amount of the pay increase high, and to have it come into effect at a later date, because then the level to which it is moved up would be followed for years. So the lesser amount of money that the bill will cost by going into effect July 1 is better by this much higher pay increase than if it were postponed until January 1. For this reason, the committee took the 2.9 figure, which I think, while it is fair to Government employees, is not extremely generous.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Is it not true that even with the increase provided in the bill, with the effective date provided in the bill, not alone is the Federal employee's wage still below the comparable wage paid in private industry——

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the statistics will bear that out.

Mr. HARTKE. Not alone is comparability a factor, but the Federal worker will still be, roughly, 9 to 15 months behind the present effective date, due to the fact that there is a lag in the Bureau of Labor Statistics report on private industry?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is now 15 months behind.

Mr. HARTKE. If we were to apply the law of 1962, we would not alone have to provide, as in this bill, an effective date of July 1, but provide for 21 more months of retroactivity.

Mr. MONRONEY. That was asked of the committee and was denied.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is it not true, as stated on page 6 of the committee report, the second paragraph, that from October 1965, the date of the last pay increase, there was an increase in the cost of living of 1.9 percent in 6 months; and that in purchasing power, the Federal employee will get a net increase of 1 percent, minus Federal, State, and local taxes, civil service retirement deductions and life insurance premiums?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

RANDOLPH SUPPORTS FEDERAL SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS ACT: CITES WEST VIRGINIA INTEREST IN JULY 1 EFFECTIVE DATE—OPPOSES LAUSCHE AMENDMENT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I can well understand the concern of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] with respect to the inflationary spiral, a spiral which is, frankly, of concern to our constituencies in general. We who are close to our people know that this is a situation which is causing real concern—I repeat the word for the third time—in the country, and in the States that we individually represent. But as the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has stated, the effective date of the increased pay and fringe-benefit program for Federal employees is a realistic one and must be separated in this debate from any rising cost of living in the United States.

I think we should say in this body this afternoon, that probably the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has never given more careful consideration to the setting of a date for the beginning of a pay increase than have we as members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in this instance.

Mr. President, it has been a privilege and honor to join with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I congratulate the chairman of the committee for his performance of a difficult and admirable task in preparing this legislation for debate in this body. The fairness with which he approached this problem, his objectivity and grasp of the complexities of this legislation are well known to those of us who are members of the committee.

I feel that ofttimes we forget that, by and large, the persons who form the career service of the Government of the United States are men and women not only of ability but of loyalty, and I feel that this afternoon the Senate would commit an error if we extended the effective date of this legislation to a date any later than July 1.

I have long been dedicated to the principle of guiding our Federal pay scale into a truly equitable position relative to the salaries and fringe benefits enjoyed by those in the private sector of our Nation's economy. It has been my pleasure to support the legislation before us today, H.R. 14122. I am firmly convinced that this measure should be enacted, and I hope that the differences between the Senate and House versions may soon be resolved.

Our Federal employees have already waited beyond the July 1 date, which is realistic. They should not be made to wait longer. I have heard from many, many of our Federal employees in the State of West Virginia on this subject. They are looking to us to support their fair demands today as we have done so often in the past. It is my hope that, for the benefit of those of my constituents as for the rest of our loyal civil servants, the July 1 effective date will remain in the bill we pass today, and I oppose the amendment by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague on the committee. May I say that the rate at which we are losing our experienced employees, and the cost that we must pay out to train new ones, who will not qualify with the skills and experience that the present employees already have in their jobs, would make it a very risky thing to postpone the effective date to January 1, as proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, the yeas and nays, please.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield myself 1 minute.

Page 6 of the report states:

> The Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was 110.4 when Congress increased Federal salaries in October 1965. For April 1966, the most recent report, the indicator was 112.5, an increase of 1.9 percent.

I now wish to read what the President said with respect to who will be benefited by this bill:

> I recommend to the Congress the enactment of a pay raise for Federal employees effective January 1, 1967, ranging from 1 percent to 4½ per cent. The high brackets will receive the 4½ per cent, the low brackets the 1 per cent.

The arguments of those who try to use cost of living as a justification of the 4.5

percent pay increase fall upon fallow ground. With these increases, nearly 1 million of the 1.8 million employees affected will achieve pay comparability with private enterprises. These employees include about 88 percent——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 1 additional minute .

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. These employees include about 88 percent of all postal workers and more than 470,000 in the classifications. The high pay raises will go to the recipients of high salaries now; the low pay raise, of 1 percent, will go to the low. I submit that the cost of living has no relationship to this. If you grant me 4.5 percent, at $30,000 a year, you are granting me much more than my cost of living is.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill the committee brought out is not the recommendation which the Senator from Ohio read. This bill is 2.9 percent, across the board, for all employees from the porters to the Secretary of State. We did not bring out a bill in accordance with the President's recommendations. As best we could, under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, we tried to deal fairly with everybody and made it across the board.

Mr. MONRONEY. We raised the very lowest paid people in the Government above the 1 percent recommended, and made it straight across the board 2.9 percent, which we felt was as equitable a solution as could possibly be made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five seconds, Mr. President. My argument is still sound. The cost of living has risen 1.9 percent in the last 6 months; the pay increase averages 2.9 percent. The benefits coming to the Federal employees by the pay increase are greater than the burdens produced by the increased cost of living.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. On this question, 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 New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 71, as follows:

[No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—9

Bartlett	Holland	Stennis
Dirksen	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Long, La.	Young, Ohio

NAYS—71

Aiken	Hayden	Morton
Allott	Hickenlooper	Moss
Bayh	Hill	Mundt
Bennett	Hruska	Murphy
Bible	Inouye	Muskie
Boggs	Jackson	Nelson
Brewster	Javits	Pearson
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Cannon	Kuchel	Randolph
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Case	Magnuson	Robertson
Church	Mansfield	Russell, S.C.
Cooper	McCarthy	Russell, Ga.
Cotton	McGee	Smith
Curtis	McGovern	Sparkman
Eastland	McIntyre	Talmadge
Ervin	Metcalf	Thurmond
Fannin	Miller	Tower
Fong	Mondale	Tydings
Gore	Monroney	Yarborough
Harris	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Morse	

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Griffin	Saltonstall
Bass	Gruening	Scott
Clark	Hart	Simpson
Dodd	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Dominick	McClellan	Symington
Douglas	Neuberger	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Pastore	

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

On page 62, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 409. Section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1959 (73 Stat. 698, Public Law 86-375), is amended by striking out the figure '$10,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '$15,000'."

On page 62, line 10, strike out "SEC. 409." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 410.".

On page 62, line 17, strike out "Sections 402 and 408" and insert in lieu thereof "Sections 402, 408, and 409".

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment with respect to one employee of the Wabash Valley Compact Company in the State of Indiana.

I spoke to the committee chairman concerning this amendment and he agreed to take the amendment to committee.

This employee has not had any increase in salary since he has been in his position.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendment was presented to the committee and explained by the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

I have taken the matter up with my distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I agree to take the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the amendment would do?

Mr. HARTKE. My amendment deals with one employee with the Wabash Valley Compact Commission. This position was establishment in 1959 on a day basis and did not include any other salary. When all other employees received their pay increase, this employee was not included. He must be included some place or he will stay in the position he was in at the beginning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I understand that the amendment was before the committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Was the amendment accepted or rejected?

Mr. MONRONEY. We asked that the amendment be withheld and presented to the Senate. We wanted to make further study. We will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then this is nothing more than a private bill for one man, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 69, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"INCREASE IN CONTRIBUTION RATE

"SEC. 508. (a) The first two sentences in section 4(a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2254(a)) are amended to read as follows: " 'From and after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after August 1, 1966, there shall be deducted and withheld from each employee's basic salary an amount equal to 7 per centum of such basic salary and from each Member's basic salary an amount equal to 8 per centum of such basic salary. From and after August 1, 1966, an equal sum shall also be contributed from the respective appropriation or fund which is used for the payment of his salary, pay or compensation, or in the case of an elected official, from such appropriation or fund as may be available for payment of other salaries of the same office or establishment.'

"(b) The schedule contained in section 4 (c) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2254(c)) is amended (1) by striking out:

" '6½---------- After October 31, 1956'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

'6½------ November 1, 1956, to July 31, 1966
'7-------- After July 31, 1966'

and (2) by striking out:

'7½---------- After October 31, 1956'

and inserting in lieu thereof:

'7½------ November 1, 1956, to July 31, 1966
'8-------- After July 31, 1966'."

On page 69, line 20, strike out "SEC. 508" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 509", and strike out "section 509" and insert in lieu thereof "section 510".

On page 70, between lines 14 and 15 insert the following:

"(d) Section 508 shall become effective on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after August 1, 1966."

On page 70, line 16, strike out "SEC. 509" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 510".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. It merely provides a method for financing the retirement provisions of the pending bill. The pending bill provides numerous liberalizations for the civil service retirees. I think that many of these liberalizations are meritorious. There is no provision in the bill, however, to finance this procedure.

Over the past several years Congress has been passing numerous bills to liberalize civil service retirement benefits for employees without any method of paying for them. Prior to this bill, the unfunded liability of the retirement fund was $43,637,602,000. That figure is based upon the civil service figures furnishes in a letter dated May 5, 1966, signed by Mr. Ruddock.

That unfunded liability is largely the result of numerous increases and benefits voted by Congress over the past 6 or 8 years but for which we did not provide any increase in the rate of contribution.

There has been, however, during these years one increase in the rate of contribution, an increase from 6 to 6.5 percent. However, we still have this unfunded liability. The enactment of the pending bill would add to that unfunded liability of the civil service retirement fund an additional $1,698,700,000. That would be over the entire life of the effect of this bill and would bring the total deficit to $45,336,302,000. The letter giving these statistics was placed in the RECORD earlier today.

The policy of the Committee on Finance for the past several years—as with the Ways and Means Committee in the House—has been that when social security benefits are increased the tax of the employee and the employer are increased sufficiently to finance the increased benefits provided for under the bill. If the Senate liberalized those benefits it would increase the tax also. I believe that would be a good policy to initiate with respect to the civil service retirement fund.

The proposed amendment would increase the contribution rates one-half of 1 percent on the part of the employee and the employer—the Government. The contributions of both would be increased. Also, the proposed amendment would increase the contribution of Members of Congress to the same extent, one-half of 1 percent, from 7.5 to 8 percent. If the pending bill is to be passed, fairness requires that a price tag be put upon it.

I would favor the bill, if the cost could be financed in this manner, but I do not believe Congress should pass legislation of this type, as has been done in the past, and say that next year it will come forth with a formula to raise the contribution rates to pay for the increase. I believe it should be done in one package, with one vote. Then Congressmen can go home and say, "We voted for your benefits, and this is what they will cost."

I have spoken with many civil service employees. They want the provisions of the bill, and they are willing to pay for them.

Much has been said about fiscal responsibility. This is an opportunity to practice it. Fiscal responsibility was recommended by the President when he recommended a liberalization of the retirement benefits. He included the words "properly financed."

I hope the proposed amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Unless I misunderstood the Senator he may be in error when he uses the figure 43.3. Is that the figure?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. $43,656,606,000.

Mr ALLOTT. That is $43.6 billion. That is due entirely to the increases in retirement that Congress has voted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not mean to say that. About $5 or $6 billion of that amount is a result of the failure of the Government to have matched the contributions in the earlier years, something which I believe should be done.

A few years ago, the Senator from Illinois offered an amendment to an appropriaton bill in that regard, and I supported it.

There should be some degree of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe that the amount is far greater than that, and it is due to the failure of the Government—the failure of Congress—to match the funds which have been collected from the civil service employees.

The Senator from Delaware and the members of the Appropriations Committee will have an opportunity this year—I can assure them of that—to make a substantial contribution to this fund.

Each year, some members of the Committee on Appropriations have brought up this subject, and each year we have been defeated. An opportunity will be presented for the members of the Committee on Appropriations—and I presume for all Senators—to cast a vote which will start us along the road of complying with the law.

The bulk of the problem arises because the Government has not matched the cash contributions which it is obligated under the law to have made, and the appropriations have not been made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To the extent that the Government has not matched the contributions the Senator from Colorado is correct. I assure the Senator from Colorado that I shall support his amendment when it is brought before the Senate.

The time is long overdue when the Government should recognize its responsibility to make its payments into the fund so that the American people will be shown what the program really costs and so that those who are on retirement will know that it is properly financed.

Mr. ALLOTT. I did not know that the Senator from Delaware was going to raise this question, or I would have brought the exact figures. However, I have the figures in my mind. On July 1, 1964, the amount in arrears was $37.7 billion. By July 1, 1965, it had grown to $39.9 billion. The figure given to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations within the last month or 6 weeks was $43.3 billion. This is the reason I made the inquiry of the Senator from Delaware.

Therefore, since July of 1964, the amount owed by the Government to this fund, which provides for the retirement of civil service employees, as well as Members of Congress, has grown from $37.7 billion to the figure which the Senator from Delaware has used today, $43.6 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Colorado is correct.

Enactment of the pending bill without some provisions to finance the cost will increase that figure by another $1.7 billion. The time has come to begin financing as we go along. This would be a constructive step in the right direction. It would be in the direction of the point made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] several times—that if we vote for these programs we must pay for them.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Delaware has said that unless something is done, passage of the bill will result in $1.7 billion being added to the unfunded liability of the retirement fund.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. $1,698,700,000 is the figure furnished by Mr. Ruddock.

Mr. MILLER. I ask the Senator from Delaware whether or not the payment of one-half of 1 percent by the Government and one-half of 1 percent by the employee is necessary to fund that amount, or whether one-quarter of 1 percent by the employee and the employer would fund that amount and make up the difference of $1.7 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the exact figures, but my understanding is that between one-quarter and one-half of 1 percent is necessary. The amount is closer to one-half of 1 percent.

The reason I inserted one-half of 1 percent in the proposed amendment is that another increase in the retirement benefit is apt to be triggered in the next few months.

About 2 years ago a bill was passed which provided that when the cost of living rises 3 percent and holds at that level for either 3 or 4 consecutive months during the calendar year a 3-percent increase in all retirement benefits would automatically occur and it would stay in effect in perpetuity, even though the cost of living were to decline, say, 10 percent.

A 2.7-percent increase in the cost of living has occurred since that bill has been enacted. Therefore, we are close to another 3-percent increase in benefits which would require the full one-half of 1 percent. It is my thought that if the proposed amendment were agreed to, the matter would be in conference, and the Commission could recommend whether or not the full one-half of 1 percent were necessary.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. To the extent that an increase due to inflation would be involved, I believe that the Federal Government, which has caused the inflation, should pick up the tab, rather than the individual employee, who cannot legislate the deficit spending as we in Congress can. To the extent that the increase is not caused by inflation, I believe the Senator from Delaware has a valid point.

I like the thought that if the one-half of 1 percent is high, this can be worked out in a conference committee, so that the contribution could be reduced to one-quarter of 1 percent, if it should develop that the figures show this.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the managers of the bill can show it is closer to one-quarter of 1 percent than to one-half of 1 percent, that is the figure that should be enacted.

I am attempting to have adopted the principle that as retirement benefits are liberalized they should be paid for, as is done with social security. If this principle can be put into effect I would be glad to support these liberalizations because I believe there is merit in the bill. I am willing to vote for the bill, but I wish to be able to say that I also voted for the increased tax necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

The deficit in the fund reserves is not the result of the retirement benefits. Of the $1,600 million mentioned as being the possible deficit, only part is the result of the retirement benefits included in the bill; about $1 billion is the direct result of the pay increase. The retirement level of the Federal employee is based on the 5 years in which he receives his highest salary.

The so-called $43 billion is an actuarial deficit that perhaps will occur in this fund in 30 years, because, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware has said, we did not properly fund in the early days of this enterprise and consequently we are missing nearly 10 years of the principal and accumulated interest of those reserves.

It was not until 1956 that we required the agencies each year to contribute 6½ percent in matching funds. Today there is $16 billion cash in the fund. Each year we receive about $2.7 billion income and we disburse $1.5 billion. It is not building up fast enough. We admit this. Actuarially, down the road, Congress will have to do something about it.

Why should we not do it today? This is the logical question that people ask. The administration is proposing and is committed to the proposition that we will have to blend the benefits of social security into our Federal retirement system. People under social security get more protection, particularly for wives and children, than we are giving under the program we have under the Federal retirement system for the early years.

Second, the amount that the people are paying for social security is running at a lesser rate. We will have to set a new rate, perhaps, because of the guarantee of social security benefits. People will find in Federal employment that this is a better system for the short-term worker who can leave proper protection for his family.

It would be a disservice to make it at this time and come back next year. We want to know the kind of program the administration proposes. It comes through the Committee on Finance. The Senator from Delaware is a member.

While we do want to raise the income of this fund so that the actuarial deficit will not occur, we want to be sure of what we are doing.

We are paying now 13 percent of payroll to meet the requirements of the program, and we have a deficit at the present time of twenty-two one-hundredths of 1 percent.

I believe it would be wise to reject the amendment at this time, but not to feel that we have disposed of the problem. We will dispose of it when the time comes, when social security protection is blended with the Federal retirement system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What the administration may next year recommend with regard to extending social security benefits to Federal employees, or what the Congress may do in that connection has no effect on the civil service retirement fund.

If social security were extended to Federal employees it would be extended in a manner whereby there would be a tax levied on the employee and employer in the same way as it is on all other social security participants. It will be paid into the social security retirement fund and not commingled in the civil service fund. No one suggests differently.

As one always carrying the banner for this administration when I find them to be right, I point out that the administration is for this amendment. The President said that he wants it properly financed.

Of course, if there are those in his party who think the President had his tongue in his cheek when he advocated that it be properly financed, then let them vote against the amendment.

It is a case of whether we want to do it now or postpone it until after the election. We have been passing these liberalizations on civil service retirement for the last 20 years, and we have never changed the rates but once. This bill alone will add $1,698,700,000 to the unfunded liability of the civil service retirement fund.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a part of Mr. Ruddock's letter dated May 5, 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Unfunded liability under H.R. 14122

From report of the Cabinet Committee on Federal Staff Retirement Systems, H. Doc. No. 402, p. 25:

	Thousands
55/30—60/20	$283,000
Widows' remarriage	174,000
Child to age 22	6,000
Salary increases	880,000
Recomputation of annuities	355,700
Total, H.R. 14122	1,698,700
Unfunded liability present law (estimated as of June 30, 1966)	43,637,602
Total after enactment of H.R. 14122	45,336,302

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The figures reflect the complete breakdown on the proposed cost of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the administration did not appear to ask for an increase in the employee's rate at this time, and as late as this morning the Bureau of the Budget had not asked for any increase in this rate.

I disagree strongly with the claim that the amount of the deficit would be incurred because of the retirement benefits alone.

I ask that the amendment be rejected.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the position of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] on the bill and the facts and figures which have just been given. I shall join with him in opposing the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. We shall make every effort to meet the needs when we have the comparability established.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to ask a question. I understand a great many people are deeply concerned about the possible blending of social security and the Federal retirement system. But forgetting that for a moment, what is wrong with having something like the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] taken to conference where the Budget people and the Civil Service people can get together at one-fourth of 1 percent or something less than that to properly finance the increase?

It seems to me that if the administration sent this over with the request that it be properly financed it is little enough for us to accede to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The administration did not make that request.

Mr. MILLER. I understood the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to say that the request was that this be properly financed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President said he was going to recommend liberalization of the retirement system properly financed. It is true that when the officials of the agency appeared before the committee they did not ask that it be done. That is typical of this Great Society. The President makes a statement for a balanced budget, and when he sends the officials down here they advocate the opposite.

I am not saying that the President had his tongue in his cheek, but others must think he did.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in connection with the costs of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1966.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am glad to send you the following response to the four points of your letter of April 12, 1966, concerning H.R. 14122 as passed by the House of Representatives:

1. Estimated first year cost:

	Millions
Title I—Executive branch	$394.7
Title II—Judicial branch	*2.2
Title III—Legislative branch	*1.4
Title IV—Miscellaneous	78.3
Title V—Civil service retirement	60.7
Title VI—Health benefits	48.0
Total	585.3

*House report estimate

2. Projected Ten-Year cost: Inasmuch as we have no 10-year projections of employment by grade and within-grade step rate, we can only suggest the 10-year cost of the bill as $5,853.0 million.

3. 1967 Budget Allowance: As you are aware, the Administration's pay proposals envisaged a January 1, 1967 effective date. Their fiscal 1967 cost would be $243 million, which is covered in the allowance for contingencies in the 1967 budget. The full year cost of these proposals is $485 million.

4. Recommendation: As the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee itself stated, in its report, H.R. 14122 exceeds the President's wage guideposts. The Committee report indicated a willingness to accept changes necessary to make the bill conform to the guideposts. H.R. 14122 also has an effective date of July 1, 1966, six months earlier than the date proposed by the Administration. This earlier effective date adds several hundreds of millions of dollars to FY 1967 budget costs during a period in which we can ill afford such increases. For these and other reasons recently spelled out by Civil Service Chairman John Macy and me in testimony before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, we believe that H.R. 14122 needs important modifications in order to meet criteria of economic and fiscal responsibilities.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SCHULTZE,
Director.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Bureau of the Budget is not now asking for an increase. The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives also suggested that no action be taken on the social security matter by the Civil Service Committee.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 130 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Allott	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Russell, Ga.
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Dirksen	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dominick	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Morton	Young, Ohio

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Mundt
Boggs	Hruska	Muskie
Brewster	Inouye	Nelson
Burdick	Jackson	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Carlson	Kuchel	Randolph
Case	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Church	Magnuson	Robertson
Cotton	Mansfield	Russell, S.C.
Curtis	McCarthy	Smith
Eastland	McGee	Sparkman
Ervin	McGovern	Talmadge
Fong	McIntyre	Tower
Fulbright	Metcalf	Tydings
Gore	Mondale	Yarborough
Harris	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Montoya	

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Griffin	Saltonstall
Bass	Gruening	Scott
Bayh	Hart	Simpson
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Dodd	McClellan	Symington
Douglas	Neuberger	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Pastore	

So the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading.

Mr. CARLSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent analysis of the fringe benefits provided in the bill. The analysis was written by Jerry Kluttz and was published in the Washington Post this morning.

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

SENATE TAKES UP FRINGE BENEFITS OF PAY BILL TODAY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

The controversy over the 2.9 per cent basic pay raise has overshadowed the attractive fringe benefits for Federal employes in the House approved bill to be debated today in the Senate.

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD looks for the Senate to approve the bill later today, and to return it to the House.

Many Federal employes are more interested in the fringes than they are in the small salary increase because the fringes could cover all 2.7 million Federal workers, while the pay raise is confined to the 1.8 million classified, postal and related employes. Besides, many employes stand to get several improved fringes.

This is a rundown of fringes in the bill before the Senate as recommended by its Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

Health Insurance: The Government would pay a larger share of the cost of this benefit, which covers nearly 7 million employes and members of their families.

The bill would require Uncle Sam to increase his contribution of self-only coverage from $1.30 to $1.68 each pay period, and from $3.12 to $4.10 for family coverage. Also, the U.S. would pay up to half the cost of retiree coverage.

Widows: Those who remarry after age 60 would continue to receive their survivor annuities, and those who remarry before age 60 could have their annuities reinstated after that date.

Survivors: Raises the maximum age from 21 to 22 for student survivors to receive annuity benefits, and a companion proposal would permit the children of a working mother who dies to receive survivor payments even though the husband also is a Federal employe.

Sunday Pay: Classifieds and per diems would be paid a 25 per cent differential for Sunday work. The full premium must be paid regardless of the length of time worked on a Sunday. Postal employes won this benefit a year ago.

Postal Overtime: Postal supervisors in Levels 8 and 9 would have to be paid in cash for overtime. Those in Levels 7 and above are supposed to be given compensatory time off for overtime but the supervisors complained they weren't always allowed to take it.

A companion provision would have the effect of paying junior supervisors as much or more than any employe they supervise.

Classified Overtime: The House approved a plan to pay overtime to classified employes after eight hours in any one day, and to boost the maximum rates for premium pay from the entrance rate of Grade 9 (now $7479) to the starting rate of Grade 10 (now $8184).

But the Senate committee amended the proposal to exempt from the daily overtime plan scientists, technical and professional personnel who are playing a larger and more significant role in Government. The salaries of the professional classes lag far behind pay rates in industry.

Unions: Full-time officers and employes of Federal employe unions could participate in the Federal employe life and health insurance programs, provided the total cost is paid by the employes and their unions.

Uniforms: Employes required to wear them on the job would be given a 25 per cent increase in allowances to buy them. Federal agencies would have the option to pay the sellers directly for the uniforms to prevent collusion between a few employes and merchants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The committee amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today the Senate is voting on an extremely important piece of legislation. I refer to the 1966 Federal Employees' Salary and Fringe Benefits Act, H.R. 14122. After some delay here in the Senate over an effective July 1 date, the measure is now before us for a final vote. I cannot emphasize enough, Mr. President, just how important this measure and this vote is, not only to the Federal worker, but to our Government as well.

Going back for a moment to 1962, when Congress enacted Public Law 87–793, the most important part of that law, briefly stated, is the requirement that a pay recommendation be presented to Congress every year. This was a very sound idea, Mr. President, and I know that a majority of my distinguished colleagues here in the Senate share that same feeling. However, the recommendation set out in Public Law 87–793 has served as a detriment to the Federal employee, rather than to his advantage, as it was intended to.

With Congress establishing the principal of a yearly salary recommendation and the administration establishing the principal of wage guidelines, it is now up to each and every Member of Congress to recognize the full scope of these principals and to see that they serve to achieve true comparability with private industry.

I have stated before, Mr. President, that up to and including this bill, the principal of comparability has broken faith with union and Government employee representatives when it comes time to negotiate salary contracts. Because of the administration's insistence that Congress adhere to so-called guidelines, all bargaining power and rights to negotiate have been wiped away.

If Congress is to be bound by governmentally imposed guidelines, then, Mr. President, let them at least be realistic ones which the Federal employee can live by. This would eliminate the necessity for these persons to go elsewhere for gainful monetary employment. I have numerous newspaper and magazine articles sent to me daily by Federal employees pointing out where this union, or a particular section of private industry has just been granted anywhere from a 3½-percent to a 6- or even 7-percent salary increase. The truth of the matter is that where Government salary negotiators end abruptly at 3.2 percent, that is where private industry starts and negotiates upward.

Mr. President, I say that we cannot continue to permit this double standard between private employees and Government employees. Too much dissension has already been created. Can we possibly expect public servants to be equal on less than comparable pay?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to address the Senate in favor of the Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1966. This act is an exemplary piece of legislation combining a fiscal responsibility too seldom seen recently in Federal financing with an urgently needed raise in pay for deserving Federal employees.

This is an important pay adjustment bill, but it is equally important for the Federal Government to take steps to assure that these increases are not eroded by inflation into a valueless gesture.

Let us simply note that Federal employees have been hurt in recent months by cost-of-living increases just as have all Americans. With federally induced inflation running at nearly 5 percent this year the average American family—including employees on fixed Federal payrolls—will lose $1,124 in purchasing power. Over the last 5 years the same average family has lost a total of $3,322 in purchasing power because of higher costs of living. Since 1959 inflation has, in effect, added a 12 percent "sales tax" penalty to every American's buying power. Today's dollar is the cheapest in our Nation's history. It is worth only 75 cents compared to the 1950 dollar and only 44 cents in relation to the 1940 dollar.

Now, we have heard a lot of people blamed for this inflation in recent weeks. But, certainly, nobody can legitimately blame the postman or the soil conservation worker or the scientist at the National Institutes of Health or the Veterans' Hospital employee for causing inflation. Federal employees are victims of inflation just like every other individual American. We cannot expect them to bear unaided the burdens caused by Federal deficit spending policies implemented by higher Government officials who are outside the civil service and postal service.

I have long favored responsible legislation granting just pay increases to civil service and postal employees. I voted for the 1965 pay adjustment bill. If we are to continue to attract the high caliber of people needed to operate the machinery of our Government and to administer the laws and programs we all have a part in enacting, then we must offer those people salaries and fringe benefits comparable to those offered in private industry and business.

This Federal Employees' Salary Act does much to maintain the attractiveness of a career in Government service. It provides for an average pay increase of 2.9 percent which is within the President's wage-price guideline limitation.

Included among the recipients of the raise are all employees subject to the four statutory schedules—the general schedule of the Classification Act, the postal field service schedule, and the schedules for employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration and the Foreign Service. Employees in the offices of county committees under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act will also benefit from this legislation. The pay raise will enable these Government employees to meet higher living costs which have resulted, in part, from other, less fiscally responsible Government spending.

The bill before us also provides for an across-the-board 10-percent increase in the annuities of widows of all Federal employees who died or retired prior to the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of October 1962. This increase will go to the group receiving the smallest average annuity at the present time. It provides these widows with an immediate and greatly needed income supplement but does not place too great a burden on the civil service retirement and disability fund or endanger the solvency of the entire program.

Mr. President, may I just add that I am especially pleased that this legislation does not include a raise in the pay of Members of Congress as have so many earlier Federal pay-raise bills. In the past, I have felt it necessary on occasion to vote against final passage of bills authorizing what I felt to be legitimate pay increases for Federal civilian employees because those bills have been burdened with unnecessary, unwarranted, and inflationary increases in the already adequate pay of Members of Congress. In such instances I always have supported attempts to amend those bills so as to obtain the civilian pay increases without the congressional increases.

This year it appears that the lesson has been learned. We have before us a bill prudently considered, carefully constructed, and vitally needed. I hope we can give it prompt and overwhelming approval.

There are two other matters of concern to Federal civilian employees, Mr. President, which I would like to call briefly to the attention of the Senate and which I hope we can deal with in subsequent bills.

One is the matter of homeowners facing serious financial losses on their property because the Federal installation they serve has been ordered closed down, and they must move. Last year, in the housing bill, we made relief programs available for these hard-pressed homeowners, but the Defense Department—perhaps they considered it a part of their so-called cost-reduction program—refused to request the authorized funds. So, no relief was forthcoming as Congress intended.

Once again this year, I have offered bills to accomplish this relief for both military and civilian personnel. I have asked the Armed Services Committee on which I served to coordinate its actions with the Housing Subcommittee on which I also serve and to study promptly both the needs and existing possible solutions to the housing problems of Defense Department personnel.

I have also introduced a bill (S. 3571) providing specific assistance for homeowners faced with base-closing situations. The first part of this bill incorporates the Defense Department's own current suggestions that it at least share with homeowners the losses taken by forced sale of homes. Additionally, my bill provides that such homeowners can secure from appropriate Federal agencies a moratorium on mortgage payments for up to 2 years. And, Federal agencies would be required to assist such homeowners with the sale of such houses.

Too much time has been wasted on this matter already. These bills deserve prompt attention and favorable action on behalf of all our military and civilian defense employees.

In addition, Mr. President, I support and will vote for H.R. 10607 when it comes before the Senate later this week. I am a cosponsor of the Senate version of this bill which would bring the Federal Government's policies on reimbursement of employees for moving expenses into line with the policies of the more progressive industries.

This bill provides an income-tax exemption for reimbursement expenses incurred by Federal employees transferred "at the pleasure of the Government," and would define as "reimbursable" expenses for such things as pretransfer travel to inspect the new location, pay during the period of the move, certain settling expenses and other costs.

The Civil Service Commission has called for adoption of this measure, along with the General Accounting Office and several Federal employee organizations.

This measure is vitally needed by those who by nature of their jobs are transferred from time to time and from city to city. These transfers are hard enough on the individual families who have to leave old friends and familiar communities to reestablish themselves elsewhere. At the same time these moves have been very hard on family budgets.

The cost of moving and of finding a suitable new home in a strange town is a considerable burden. Many private companies have recognized this and now assist their employees with the costs of such moves. However, previously families have been forced to pay income taxes on moving-reimbursement funds just as if it were additional salary.

Such income taxes simply reduce the level of assistance received by the family and mean that moving reimbursements do not really go as far as they are intended. It is only reasonable that this expense money be exempt from income taxation, and that is the purpose of H.R. 10607. It should be promptly enacted.

So, Mr. President, there are three matters with which the Senate can deal soon to assist our Federal employees—the pay bill, the moving expenses tax exemption, and the homeowner base-closing assistance measures. I hope we can enact them all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to say a few words in support of the Federal Employees Salary Act in general and in behalf of the Alabama Federation of Postal Clerks in particular.

I have always strongly supported meaningful and realistic legislation intended to benefit Federal employees and their families. These dedicated public servants deserve recognition and status in their respective fields of endeavor much the same as honorable men and women engaged in private enterprise. It is absolutely necessary that legislation be enacted to provide them with salaries and fringe benefits commensurate with their counterparts in the private sector of our economy. We need them and the stability and capability they possess.

Therefore, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I would like to take a few minutes to discuss an organization that has contributed much to the welfare and well-being of all the people of Alabama. While I am most familiar with an Alabama organization, it has counterparts in every State of the Union which render an invaluable service to our people.

The Alabama Federation of Postal Clerks recently held their 40th annual convention in Birmingham. I had the honor of appearing before this wonderful group and learning firsthand of the excellent job they are doing throughout our great State.

As we all know, postal clerks play a vital role in the progress of our modern American economy. Our mail volume increases at a 2.5 billion rate annually. Yet, somehow, each year the postal clerks rise to meet this challenge. I salute them and their inventiveness in meeting the rapidly expanding and complex problems of this technical age.

Too often we have a tendency to take our postal system for granted. We have grown so accustomed to dropping our correspondence in the nearest mailbox and having it delivered swiftly and efficiently that we frequently fail to appreciate the amount of actual work that goes into its delivery.

Our population explosion is being accompanied by a "mail explosion." With this "mail explosion" the demands are increasing for greater skills on the part of those persons who handle the mail. The demand is also increasing for more people to do the job.

In order to recruit and maintain a vital postal service, it is imperative that we create a progressive environment conducive to the best postal service possible. If this Nation is to continue to maintain the high-level efficiency of the postal service, postal workers must be paid wages comparable to wages in private industry.

For these reasons, through the years I have searched for, sponsored, and voted for legislation which has provided better salaries and better fringe benefits for our postal workers. I expect to continue to do so.

In closing, I salute the Alabama postal clerks, and I know that they will meet the challenge of the "mail explosion" cheerfully, efficiency, and with determination.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offered amendments to the pending bill and cast votes which I thought would improve the bill. The bill can be divided into two parts, parts that are good and parts that are bad. I have concluded finally that I shall vote for the bill because the good is in excess of that which is bad.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the call of the roll, I wonder whether the majority leader or the assistant majority leader could say what the schedule will be for tomorrow and whether it is expected to take up the so-called child nutrition bill tonight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that we shall take up Calendar No. 1328, S. 3035, at the conclusion of the pending business; and then to lay before the Senate Calendar No. 1326, S. 3112, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act, which will be the pending business for tomorrow.

That bill will be followed by the child nutrition bill, or the bill to amend the National School Lunch Act.

Some time during tomorrow afternoon, it is hoped that the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, will be able to bring before the Senate the military procurement conference report, after it has been agreed to by the House. That, by the way, will place the military on the same basis as the civilian employees of the Government, so far as the effective date of the pay raise is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. The Senator from Montana is correct. Under the provisions of that bill, the date upon which the civilian employee's pay increase becomes effective will likewise apply to the 3-percent raise allowed those serving in the Armed Forces of the country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14122) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? 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 New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 131 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Aiken	Hartke	Morse
Allott	Hayden	Morton
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Moss
Bayh	Hill	Mundt
Bennett	Holland	Murphy
Bible	Hruska	Muskie
Boggs	Inouye	Nelson
Brewster	Jackson	Pearson
Burdick	Javits	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Carlson	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Case	Lausche	Robertson
Church	Long, Mo.	Russell, S.C.
Cooper	Long, La.	Russell, Ga.
Cotton	Magnuson	Smith
Curtis	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dirksen	McCarthy	Stennis
Dominick	McGee	Talmadge
Eastland	McGovern	Thurmond
Ervin	McIntyre	Tower
Fannin	Metcalf	Tydings
Fong	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Mondale	Yarborough
Gore	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Montoya	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Gruening	Scott
Bass	Hart	Simpson
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Dodd	McClellan	Symington
Douglas	Neuberger	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Pastore	
Griffin	Saltonstall	

So the bill (H.R. 14122) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the unanimous passage of the pay raise bill today the employees of our Federal Government are once again indebted to the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] for his strong and articulate leadership on their behalf. So often has he devoted his vast and able efforts to their welfare. And once again he has achieved success—overwhelming success, at that.

The ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. CARLSON] is similarly to be praised for his unfailing support of legislation on behalf of the Nation's Federal workers. The pay raise victory today is just another triumph in a long line of important achievements obtained under his highly able cooperative leadership.

Also the chairman of the Postal Affairs Subcommittee [Mr. YARBOROUGH] deserves commendation for his long and arduous endeavors both in committee and on the floor today. He indeed is to share in this great success.

Other Senators of course contributed to assure unanimous passage. Particularly noteworthy was the characteristically strong and able support of the senior Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], who were joined by the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. Additionally, the able minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] are to be commended for making orderly and efficient action a certainty.

To the Senate as a whole I am grateful once again for uniting in a cooperative effort to achieve the disposition of this measure today.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this is a banner day for Federal employees. The Senate has passed not only the Federal pay raise bill, but also a milestone piece of legislation to reimburse Federal employees for their moving expenses when their Government jobs require them to move to another locality.

The moving expenses bill passed today is virtually identical to S. 2516, which I introduced last September 13. The bill passed today, H.R. 10607, was introduced in the House by Mr. ROSENTHAL. S. 2516 was its Senate companion.

The Federal Government is making an effort as never before to improve the quality of its civil servants by increasing the appeal of a career in the Government. The President, as is well known, has sought to attract to the Federal service the most valuable and capable people in the Nation, and to retain the qualified people already in the Federal service. The recent pay raises, designed to bring our Federal salary standards closer to those of the private sector of the economy, are another example of the efforts

to upgrade our civil service. A third example is provided by the management intern program whose goal is to select and train promising individuals for high Government posts.

These are worthwhile steps toward a worthwhile goal. Our Federal Government must attract the most qualified personnel possible. The problems of today require no less.

In this era, an efficient government is a mobile government. The functions of the Federal Government are spread throughout the United States. Federal employees frequently must move so as to keep the performance of regional offices at the highest level.

Yet more and more Federal employees are reluctant to move, even with the incentives of pay grade increases. This is so because there is a definite, sizable gap between what it costs to move and the amount of that cost which is assumed by the Federal Government. John W. Macy, head of the Civil Service Commission, believes that this gap is the most important single factor in the reluctance of Government employees to move. Mr. President, we must eliminate that gap.

When a Federal employee is asked to move for the improved operation of the Government, he must make a difficult decision. If he has children, he must take them from their school to another, a move which rarely is pleasant for anyone concerned. If he has his own house, he must dispose of it. This always involves certain costs of selling, such as closing costs, and brokerage fees. It may also involve a loss of the employees equity investment. To find a new home, he must make a househunting trip at his own expense.

When an employee moves, he must pay his family's living expenses while enroute from the old home to the new. If, by the time he is required to begin work in his new location, he has not found permanent lodgings, he must occupy temporary quarters, often at quite considerable expense—his own expense. If his new quarters are such that he cannot find room for all of his household goods, he must store much of his furniture—again at his own expense.

I do not think it fair to the employee or in the best interest of the Government to require him to bear these expenses himself. Almost all large businesses offer their employees generous moving allowances. If the Federal Government expects to compete with private industry for qualified personnel it must not lag behind industry in the consideration given to the moving expenses of its employees.

Nonetheless, we cannot repay Federal employees for the intangible and psychological costs of moving from their circle of friends, for the difficulties their children suffer when they move from one school to another, for the unpleasantness of tearing up their roots in the community. To absorb these social costs, we must depend upon the devotion of Federal employees to their Government.

But, Mr. President, we should do what we can to mitigate this financial burden upon employees who are required to relocate.

The Civil Service Commission has surveyed those employees who moved for the good of the Government in fiscal 1962. The conclusions cry for action. More than 4 out of 5 employees lost money on their moves, and the losses were significant. The average loss was $558. Approximately 17 percent of the movers lost more than $1,000. The average loss on closing costs for selling a home was $677. Needless to say, Federal employees are generally not rich men.

Both the Civil Service Commission and the President are anxious to see the burden of moving lifted from the shoulders of the Government employee. I agree with them, and accordingly I submitted S. 2516 to make our Federal service more equitable, more mobile, and more efficient.

Accordingly, I am extremely pleased that the Senate has now cleared this bill for the President's signature.

PROGRAM FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ADDITIONAL HISTORIC PROPERTIES THROUGHOUT THE NATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1328, S. 3035.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3035) to establish a program for preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

The Congress finds and declares—

(a) that the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic past;

(b) that the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people;

(c) that, in the face of ever-increasing extensions of urban centers, highways, and residential, commercial, and industrial developments, the present governmental and nongovernmental historic preservation programs and activities are inadequate to insure future generations a genuine opportunity to appreciate and enjoy the rich heritage of our Nation; and

(d) that, whereas the major burdens of historic preservation have been borne, and major efforts initiated by private agencies and individuals, and both should continue to play a vital role, it is nevertheless necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to accelerate its historic preservation programs and activities, and to assist State and local governments and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States to expand and accelerate their historic preservation programs and activities.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(1) to expand and maintain a national register of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, hereinafter referred to as the National Register, and to grant funds to States for the purpose of preparing comprehensive statewide historic surveys and plans, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, for the preservation, acquisition, and development of such properties; and

(2) to establish a program of matching grants-in-aid to States, and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, chartered by Act of Congress approved October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), as amended, for projects having as their purpose the preservation for public benefit of properties that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture.

(b) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(2) The term "project" means programs of State and local governments and other public bodies and private organizations and individuals for the acquisition of title or interests in, and for the development of, any district, site, building, structure, or object that is significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture, or property used in connection therewith, and for its development in order to assure the preservation for public benefit of any such historical properties.

(3) The term "historic preservation" includes the protection, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, or culture.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 102. (a) No grant for a project may be made under this Act—

(1) unless application therefore is submitted to the Secretary in accordance with regulations and procedures prescribed by him;

(2) unless the application is in accordance with the comprehensive statewide historic preservation plan which has been approved by the Secretary after considering its relationship to the comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan prepared pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897);

(3) for more than 50 per centum of the total cost of the project, as determined by the Secretary and his determination shall be final;

(4) unless the grantee has agreed to make such reports, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time require;

(5) unless the grantee has agreed to assume, after completion of the project, the total cost of the continued maintenance, repair, and administration of the property in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary; and

(6) until the grantee has complied with such further terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem necessary or advisable.

(b) The Secretary may in his discretion waive the requirements of subsection (a), paragraphs (2) and (5) of this section for any grant for projects under this Act to the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States, in which case a grant to the National Trust may include funds for the maintenance, repair, and administration of the property in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) No State shall be permitted to utilize the value of real property obtained before the date of approval of this Act in meeting

the remaining cost of a project for which a grant is made under this Act.

SEC. 103. (a) The amounts appropriated and made available for grants to the States for comprehensive statewide historic surveys and plans under this Act shall be apportioned among the States by the Secretary on the basis of needs as determined by him: *Provided, however,* That the amount granted to any one State shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cost of the comprehensive statewide historic survey and plan for that State, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) The amounts appropriated and made available for grants to the States for projects under this Act for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States by the Secretary in accordance with needs as disclosed in approved statewide historic preservation plans.

The Secretary shall notify each State of its apportionment, and the amounts thereof shall be available thereafter for payment to such State for projects in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Any amount of any apportionment that has not been paid or obligated by the Secretary during the fiscal year in which such notification is given, and for two fiscal years thereafter, shall be reapportioned by the Secretary in accordance with this subsection.

SEC. 104. (a) No grant may be made by the Secretary for or on account of any survey or project under this Act with respect to which financial assistance has been given or promised under any other Federal program or activity, and no financial assistance may be given under any other Federal program or activity for or on account of any survey or project with respect to which assistance has been given or promised under this Act.

(b) In order to assure consistency in policies and actions under this Act with other related Federal programs and activities, and to assure coordination of the planning, acquisition and development assistance to States under this Act with other related Federal programs and activities, the President may issue such regulations with respect thereto as he deems desirable, and such assistance may be provided only in accordance with such regulations.

SEC. 105. The beneficiary of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the disposition by the beneficiary of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

SEC. 106. The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted project in any State shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the project, take into account the effect of the project on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in the National Register, and, if any such historical properties are affected, report such effect to the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established under title II of this Act for its consideration. There shall be a sixty-day waiting period, beginning on the date a report is made to the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, before Federal funds may be expended for the project concerned.

SEC. 107. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title for fiscal year 1967, and not more than $10,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Such appropriations shall be available for the financial assistance authorized by this title and for the administrative expenses of the Secretary in connection therewith, and shall remain available until expended.

TITLE II

SEC 201. (a) There is established a National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of seventeen members as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

(3) The Secretary of Commerce.

(4) The Administrator of the General Services Administration.

(5) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(6) The Attorney General.

(7) The Chairman of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

(8) Two appointed by the President from a panel of at least four Governors submitted by the Governors' conference.

(9) Two appointed by the President from a panel of at least four mayors submitted jointly by the United States Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities.

(10) One appointed by the President from a panel of at least two county officials submitted by the National Association of Counties.

(11) Five appointed by the President from among individuals in private life who are significantly interested or experienced in the matters to be considered by the Council.

(b) Each member of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) may designate another officer of his department or agency to serve on the Council in his stead.

(c) Each member of the Council appointed under paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11) of subsection (a) shall serve for a term of five years from the expiration of his predecessor's term; except that the members first appointed under such paragraphs shall serve for terms of from one to five years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, in such manner as to insure that the terms of not less than one nor more than two of them will expire in any one year.

(d) Any vacancy in the Council shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment (and for the balance of the unexpired term).

(e) The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

(f) Eight members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 202. (a) The Council shall—

(1) advise the President and the Congress on matters relating to historic preservation; assist in the coordination of activities of Federal, State, and local agencies and private institutions and individuals relating to historic preservation; and disseminate information pertaining to such activities;

(2) encourage, in cooperation with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and appropriate private agencies, public interest and participation in historic preservation;

(3) make and publish studies in such areas as adequacy of legislative and administrative statutes and regulations pertaining to historic preservation activities of State and local governments, and the effects of tax policies at all levels of government on historic preservation;

(4) prepare guidelines for the assistance of State and local governments in drafting legislation relating to historic preservation; and

(5) encouraging, in cooperation with appropriate public and private agencies and institutions, training and education in the field of historic preservation.

(b) The Council shall submit annually a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the President and to the Congress, and shall from time to time submit such additional and special reports as it deems advisable. Each report shall propose such legislative enactments and other actions as, in the judgment of the Council, are necessary and appropriate to carry out its recommendations.

SEC. 203. (a) The Council or, on the authorization of the Council, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Council or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Council, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194, inclusive), shall apply in the case of failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Council is authorized to secure directly from any department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this title; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Council, upon request made by the Chairman.

SEC. 204. The members of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (7) of section 201(a) shall serve without additional compensation. The members of the Council appointed under paragraphs (8), (9), (10), and (11) of section 201(a) shall receive $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Council. All members of the Council shall receive reimbursement for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Council.

SEC. 205. The Secretary of the Interior or his designee shall be the Executive Director of the Council. Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel and procurement) shall be provided the Council by the Department of the Interior, for which payments shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Council in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Council and the Secretary of the Interior; *Provided,* That the regulations of the Department of the Interior for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46e) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Council employee, and regulations of said Secretary for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(G)) shall apply to appropriations of the Council: *And provided further,* That the Council shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

(b) The Council shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out its duties, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

(c) The Council may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses

Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(d) The members of the Council specified in paragraphs (1) through (6) of section 201(a) shall provide the Council, on a reimbursable basis, with such facilities and services under their jurisdiction and control as may be needed by the Council to carry out its duties, to the extent that such facilities and services are requested by the Council and are otherwise available for that purpose. To the extent of available appropriations, the Council may obtain, by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such additional property, facilities, and services as may be needed to carry out its duties.

SEC. 206. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to be joined as a cosponsor of this bill, if agreeable to the majority and minority managers.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I would be delighted to have the Senator from New York as a cosponsor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I joined with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in sponsoring this bill. A number of others have joined since that time, and I know we would be very happy to have the distinguished Senator from New York join with us as a cosponsor.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, S. 3035 represents a major step forward in our efforts to preserve and protect our national heritage. The legislation reported by the Interior Committee combines features of the bill submitted by the Department of the Interior to implement President Johnson's message on preserving our natural heritage and two bills, S. 3097 and S. 3098, which I introduced with other Members of the Senate to implement the recommendations of the Special Committee on Historic Preservation of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. As a member of that committee I was pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, Mr. Jackson, in cosponsoring the amended version of S. 3035.

The special committee studied historic preservation in Europe and examined our efforts in the United States. We were struck with the need to act now, before much of our heritage of architectural and historic sites is destroyed by the constant change of America.

In her foreword to the special committee's report, "With Heritage So Rich," Mrs. Lyndon Johnson wrote:

> We must preserve and we must preserve wisely. As the report emphasizes, in its best sense preservation does not merely mean the setting aside of thousands of buildings as museum pieces. It means retaining the culturally valuable structures as useful objects; a home in which human beings live, a building in the service of some commercial or community purpose. Such preservation insures structural integrity, relates the preserved object to the life of the people around it, and not least, it makes preservation a source of positive financial gain rather than another expense.

The legislation we are considering today, coupled with S. 3097, which is being considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, will help us achieve this kind of preservation. I hope both measures will receive speedy approval. Time is getting short in protecting the priceless reminders of our Nation's development.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to speak in support of the passage of S. 3035, which would establish a program to assist States and communities to preserve historic sites, buildings and places. I joined Senator JACKSON in sponsoring this bill, for I believed it offered a program which will help save historic properties and places, which are fast disappearing, and will contribute to the appreciation of the history of our Nation by future generations.

The first purpose of the Senate bill is to secure a comprehensive survey by the States of places which are of historic value and ought to be preserved. After completion of the surveys and preparation of statewide plans of projects by the States, the Department of the Interior is authorized to expand its National Register to include historic properties of National, State, regional, or local importance. I emphasize that the designation of the sites would be made in the States by the appropriate authorities in each State.

The bill authorizes $2 million for the first year, in which surveys are to get underway in the States, with matching assistance available under this bill. The report notes that a large part of this first year authorization may also be utilized by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, which has worked on the acquisition and preservation of large properties with accepted national historic significance.

In the second phase of the program established by the bill, matching grants to the States are authorized to assist in the preservation of their designated local historic sites. Beginning in July 1967, $10 million is made available annually for 3 years, to be apportioned among the States on the basis of the needs shown by surveys.

I have been concerned about expenditures in wartime, but I must say that the sums authorized by this bill are modest when we consider the national and local interest in preserving the great landmarks of our country. If we can preserve them, we will help to bring the present and future generations a greater understanding and appreciation of the history, traditions, and character of our great Nation.

I have seen no better statement explaining the purposes of the bill than section 1 of S. 3035, and I ask unanimous consent that this section be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, section 1 of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 1. The Congress finds and declares—

(a) that the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic past;

(b) that the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people;

(c) that, in the face of ever-increasing extensions of urban centers, highways, and residential, commercial, and industrial developments, the present governmental and nongovernmental historic preservation programs and activities are inadequate to insure future generations a genuine opportunity to appreciate and enjoy the rich heritage of our Nation; and

(d) that, whereas the major burdens of historic preservation have been borne, and major efforts initiated by private agencies and individuals, and both should continue to play a vital role, it is nevertheless necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to accelerate its historic preservation programs and activities, and to assist State and local governments and the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States to expand and accelerate their historic preservation programs and activities.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the bill also seeks to avoid any overlap in the functions of different Federal agencies. Grants are to be available under the program for projects which have not received assistance under any other established Federal program. After the surveys are made and the plans are completed, a determination of the number of projects that can get underway annually can be made, and the necessary funds can be requested from Congress.

A very thorough report has been submitted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Senator JACKSON, the chairman, and the members of the committee, deserve commendation for their work. The bill before the Senate also reflects the recommendations made by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and by interested national organizations, all of which indicates the wide interest in the purposes of the bill.

In my State of Kentucky, which came into the Union in 1792 as the 15th State, great interest has been manifest in historic preservation. In recent weeks, I have heard from citizens and organizations of well over half the counties of Kentucky, expressing the desire to preserve for future generations particular sites and structures important in the history of our State and this Nation.

This kind of interest is reflected across the Nation, and I was glad to join in sponsoring this legislation. I know that its passage today by the Senate bill provide a start toward assisting the State in the efforts to preserve historic places, and I hope the bill can be enacted by the Congress this year.

I hope also that this bill will help to stimulate and expand the work now being done by States, communities, individuals, and private organizations. The Louisville Courier-Journal of June 22, 1966, discussed some of these efforts in

Kentucky, and I ask unanimous consent that this column by the well-known Kentucky writer, Joe Creason, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOE CREASON'S KENTUCKY—A CONCERTED PAUSE FOR LOOK AT PAST

Almost overnight there's been a great reawakening of interest in Kentucky history all across the state, and it's apparent in more ways than you could shake a handful of significant dates at.

Actually, this reawakening really isn't a stuffy, exact date-type of interest. Rather, it's an interest in why and how the history of the state was made, and in the preservation of important sites where it was made.

Perhaps the most obvious indication of the sudden new interest is the remarkable growth of the Kentucky Historical Society. From a membership of 1,200 last year, it has grown to more than 2,800. Moreover, the Kentucky Young Historians Association numbers 3,600 members in 82 chapters.

But these totals only partially tell the story. Equally impressive is the number of persons who may not be members of the state or a local historical society who are trying to preserve and restore sites where important chapters of Kentucky history were written. Much work in this area has centered around the Kentucky Heritage Commission, an organization created by Gov. Ned Breathitt to make an audit of historical buildings and stir up interest in saving them.

Several groups have completed ambitious projects. The Harrodsburg Historical Society has restored part of Morgan Row, a series of two-story brick buildings dating back to 1807. Historic Homes Foundation of Louisville, which previously saved Farmington, now has restored Locust Grove, where George Rogers Clark lived out his years.

The multimillion-dollar restoration of Shakertown is nearing completion; the Owen County Historical Society has acquired one of Owenton's oldest houses as its headquarters, and the Mason County Historical Society has refurbished Mefford's Fort, a pioneer structure built from the flatboat on which early settlers floated down the Ohio River to Kentucky. The Lindsey mansion in Frankfort was saved from destruction by the Kentucky Heritage Commission.

At present the old college try is being given to many projects that were only talked about for years, including the acquisition and restoration of White Hall, Cassius Clay's home near Richmond; the Mary Todd Lincoln home at Lexington; the site of Squire Boone's fort near Shelbyville; sites of the five pioneer forts that once stood just outside Louisville, and the entire village of Washington in Mason County.

Groups in Greensburg, Bowling Green, Paducah, Russellville and Bardstown have shown great interest in historic local sites and buildings. A meeting in Russellville on June 29 will study the economic value of restorations and perhaps take the first steps forward saving some of the town's many significant buildings.

Who ever said history is dead?

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who both have a sense of the history of our country, are entitled to the thanks of the Senate and of the country for doing what they have done in sponsoring this measure.

New York State has many historical landmarks. Kentucky is a very historic State. Some of the new States have great historic landmarks. We spend very little money to preserve these landmarks, other than to declare them to be national landmarks.

I consider myself most privileged to be a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this is a program which would not only preserve the historic landmarks of the country but would also contribute to the culture of our Nation.

I am sorry that the Senator from Washington is not present. It was his initiative and thoughtfulness that suggested the introduction of the bill.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in the remarks of the senior Senator from New York concerning the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed belatedly as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I am very happy to have the Senator listed as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am proud to be a cosponsor of S. 3035, a bill to aid in the preservation of properties that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture.

I pay tribute to the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], who pioneered in this field and introduced a bill earlier than the pending bill.

It is shocking to learn that already, over half the buildings recorded in the Historic American Buildings Survey are gone or mutilated.

One might ask at this point why we should preserve these old buildings anyway. After all, if they have passed the age at which they can be used, and if they are standing in the way of "progress" in the form of a parking lot, highway, or skyscraper, why not tear them down?

In answer I would say that any country, any society, must be aware of its past. A country is what it is because of the road it has traveled. A country's culture is a product of its history. "A land without ruins, is a land without memories."

In the case of the United States, the stability and continuity of our society are dependent upon the roots which have grown deep in the almost 200 years of our existence. We have a past of which we can be proud. We are a constantly evolving society, and no one would say that we have reached a state of perfection. However, we are constantly striving toward a more perfect society, and it is important that we know the road over which we have traveled.

Unfortunately heroes of the past pass on. Only their memories survive. Yet there are associations with the past that are with us each day. They are part of American history; they have witnessed as great events. In them we can trace the story of our development.

I am speaking of our historic properties. And so they must be preserved, so that our knowledge of who we are and what we stand for will never be lost to us.

There are other reasons why this legislation is important. Many of our historic buildings are architectural masterpieces. Many are not masterpieces, but are outstanding examples of their style. Others are architectural curiosities. But all add delight to our lives.

Anyone who has seen some of our urban renewal projects, or a modern housing subdivision, or a new high-rise apartment complex knows that we have not discovered how to build variety into a planned project. There is a depressing sameness about it all.

We must not allow ourselves to be victimized by these monolithic exteriors. The housing bill passed last year recognizes that fact, and contains explicit recognition of the need to preserve and refurbish existing buildings in urban renewal areas, wherever possible.

The bill we shall pass today establishes a program of matching grants-in-aid to States, and to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, for projects "having as their purpose the preservation for public benefit of properties that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, and culture." A national register of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, archeology, and culture is authorized. And a National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will be established.

Mr. President, S. 3155, an amendment to the highway act, will be considered by the Senate on tomorrow.

There are dangers to our historic buildings in addition to those of old age, misuse, and destruction for the purpose of putting up high-rise apartments or parking lots. I am speaking particularly of the destruction of these properties in order to build highways.

The highway program of the United States has made a magnificent contribution to the economy of the country. Yet in recent years we have come increasingly to know of cases in which highways, which can be blessing to our lives, have become blights. They have slashed through residential neighborhoods, cut across college campuses, invaded parks and parkland, and destroyed historic sites. In deciding where to put our highways in urban areas, we must give sufficient weight to considerations of what will be the effect upon our urban environment of depriving subsequent generations of these irreplaceable treasures. We must take care lest we create cities which are wondrously efficient for automobiles but in which no human cares to live.

Therefore I have introduced an amendment to the Federal Highway Act which would declare a national policy that in carrying out the provisions of the Federal-aid highway program maximum effort would be made to preserve Federal, State, and local government parklands and historic sites.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"PRESERVATION OF PARKLANDS

"SEC. 8. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'§ 137. Preservation of parklands

"'It is hereby declared to be the national policy that in carrying out the provisions of this title maximum effort should be made to preserve Federal, State, and local government parklands and historic sites and the beauty and historic value of such lands and sites. The Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and programs which carry out such policy. After July 1, 1968, the Secretary shall not approve under section 105 of this title any program for a project which requires the use for such project of any land from a Federal, State, or local government park or historic site unless (1) there is no feasible alternative to the use of such land, (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize any harm to such park or site resulting from such use, and (3) where possible and appropriate substitute land will be provided for such park or site. Any additional project costs incurred for the purpose of acquiring any such substitute lands shall be considered to be included in "costs of rights-of-way" for the purposes of this title.'

"(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'137. Preservation of parklands.'"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the adoption of this proposal would be a fitting complement to the bill before us now. Indeed, the effect of S. 3035 will be greatly diluted unless we take steps to give more sensible and more rational guidance to our great highway program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1326, S. 3112. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3112) to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriations under the act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support of air pollution control programs to 20 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments on page 2, line 8, after "1967", to strike out "and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1973" and insert "$70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969", and on page 3, line 13, after the word "and", to strike out "by inserting in the third sentence the word 'control' after 'air pollution'" and insert "in the next to the last sentence by inserting a comma after the word 'funds' and adding 'for other than nonrecurrent expenditures,' and in the same sentence after the word 'pollution', the word 'control'"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Clean Air Act Amendments of 1966".

CONSOLIDATION OF APPROPRIATION CEILINGS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 306 of the Clean Air Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, $46,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

(b) Section 209 of such Act is hereby repealed.

AUTHORIZATION OF MAINTENANCE GRANTS FOR AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS AND REMOVAL OF 20 PER CENTUM CEILING

SEC. 3. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 104 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857c(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount up to two-thirds of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, and grants to such agencies up to one-half of the cost of maintaining, programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to intermunicipal or interstate air pollution control agencies (described in section 302(b) (2) and (4)) in an amount up to three-fourths of the cost of developing, establishing, or improving, and up to three-fifths of the cost of maintaining, regional air pollution control programs. As used in this subsection, the term 'regional air pollution control program' means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same or different States."

(2) Subsection (b) of such section 104 is amended by striking out "under" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "for the purposes of", and in the next to the last sentence by inserting a comma after the word "funds" and adding "for other than nonrecurrent expenditures," and in the same sentence after the word "pollution", the word "control".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section 104 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Not more than 12½ per centum of the total of funds appropriated or allocated for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section shall be granted for air pollution control programs in any one State. In the case of a grant for a program in an area crossing State boundaries, the Secretary shall determine the portion of such grant that is chargeable to the percentage limitation under this subsection for each State into which such area extends."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] be excused from the proceedings of the Senate for the remainder of the week due to a death in his family.

On behalf of the Senate as a whole, I extend deep and sincere sympathy to Senator MCGEE on the death of his father.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING THE SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education, which is scheduled to mark up the secondary education bill, be authorized to meet on tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, has the Senator cleared this matter with the minority Members? None of them is present in the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. I have not. Last week the meeting was scheduled to accommodate Republican Members who could not get here until tomorrow.

I asked to have the meeting on tomorrow, but I have not asked for it before on the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do not object.

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

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS' WALKOUT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the International Association of Machinists continues its walkout from jobs with five major airlines, the Nation's transportation industry is facing a major adjustment. The dislocations have been many and severe, but they are being met and will be met in the days ahead.

Because the Washington Post erroneously quoted me over the weekend as calling the strike unpatriotic and un-American, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the close

of these comments the texts of the two statements I issued last week on the subject of the dispute.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MORSE ON THE AIRLINES DISPUTE, JULY 7, 1966

The Emergency Board in the Airlines Dispute appointed by the President handed down its recommendations on June 5. The parties to the dispute understood from the very first day of the hearings held by the Board that the recommendations would be based upon the evidence submitted by the parties to the Board and on no other consideration. The Board made its recommendations based upon the evidence submitted by the parties. It was the responsibility of the Union and the carriers to present all the evidence available to them. The parties understood this.

The Board's report shows that, in some instances, the representatives of the Union failed to sustain their burden of proof. In some instances, this was true of the carriers. Now the Union complains that the Board should have granted them benefits which the Union's evidence failed to justify.

The recommendations of the Board offered a fair and reasonable framework within which the parties should come to an agreement between themselves for a final settlement of their dispute. This was so recognized by those in the Administration who studied the report, including the President of the United States.

Under the Railway Labor Act, which applies to disputes involving air carriers, the parties had 30 days following the submission of the Emergency Board Report to the President to mediate any agreement over any issue that remained in dispute between them after the submission of the recommendations by the Emergency Board.

The Parties have up until this hour failed to reach a mediation settlement although they have had available to them for mediation conferences the Assistant Secretary of Labor, James Reynolds, who I consider is without a superior in the entire field of labor mediation in our country today. The union is now threatening to strike because it has failed to reach an agreement, although the carriers have been willing to accept the recommendations of the Emergency Board and have indicated a willingness in the mediation negotiations with Secretary Reynolds to accept some modifications in the Board's report.

Any strike called by the officers of this Union at this critical hour in the history of our country with all the security problems that confront the Republic cannot be justified on any basis whatsoever. Any strike called by the officers of this union in this hour of crisis is not reconcilable with the patriotic responsibility of the Union to its government, and to the people of our country, including our troops in Vietnam. The members of the Union should face the fact that it would be an unconscionable strike.

As one who has for 32 years been involved in the settlement of labor disputes, I want to plead with the leaders of this union and its members that they announce immediately that they are willing to postpone any strike action for an additional two weeks, for further mediation in this case. As Chairman of the President's Board, I would be perfectly willing to reconvene the Board to answer any questions that the parties to the dispute may have as to any misunderstandings concerning the Board's report. In addition, I would be willing to have the Board, in cooperation with Assistant Secretary James Reynolds, if the President so desires, make itself available to mediate any issues that stand in disagreement during the next two-week period.

This is one case in which there is no possible justification for the Union to strike. The Union has made great gains under the Board's report; I am convinced that such differences as remain can be resolved on a fair basis to both parties and to the public, without a strike. In any event, I wish to make clear that this union cannot justify holding a strike gun at the head of its government in this hour of international crisis. The strike would not only be a strike against the airlines, it would also be a strike against the American people and their security, because uninterrupted operation of airline transportation throughout the country is essential at this critical time.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MORSE, JULY 8, 1966

The statement which President Johnson issued yesterday, July 7 on the airline strike is one of sound statesmanship and it is unanswerable. The President has called for further mediation and the parties have agreed to meet with Assistant Secretary of Labor, James Reynolds at 10:00 A.M. Saturday morning, July 9.

I wish to commend both the leaders of the union and the airlines for this act of industrial responsibility on their part. However, it makes no sense on the part of the union to continue to strike while mediation proceeds. Every official of the union and every member of the union knows full well that a mediation settlement will be and must be pounded out on the anvil of conscionable compromise. Continuing the strike during the period of further mediation will only redound to the discredit of the union because it cannot justify the economic loss to the country and the risks to the welfare of the nation which the strike is already causing.

This is not a labor dispute which in any way threatens the existence of the union or jeopardizes the precious right of collective bargaining. The International Association of Machinists is one of the strongest unions in our country and has a long history of industrial statesmanship which it cannot justify besmirching by this unnecessary, uncalled-for strike. This union owes it to the President of the United States to respond to his fine and fair statement of yesterday by announcing immediately that the union will call off the strike for a two-week period so that the mediation hearings can proceed in an atmosphere of calm reason, free of economic duress.

As the President has so often quoted in connection with other emergencies, "Come now, and let us reason together," so, too, in this emergency the same advice should be followed by the representatives of both the union and the airlines with the men back at work and the airplanes flying on schedule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the statement by President Johnson printed in the RECORD, together with two editorials from the New York Times which point out the reasonableness and equity of the recommended settlement by the emergency board which I headed.

They are the only statements I made. A reading of the statements show that the Washington Post needs proofreaders.

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

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON, JULY 7, 1966

I have just been informed of the breakdown in negotiations between the five airline carriers—Eastern, National, Northwest, Trans-World and United Airlines—and the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, and of the decision of the Union to strike the carriers.

The serious implications of this dispute make it imperative that the parties try to reach a prompt settlement. At my request, Assistant Secretary of Labor Reynolds will get in touch with the parties immediately and reconvene them as soon as possible. I am sure that all the American people share my deep concern over this matter and the conviction that the parties must do everything within their powers to bring about a settlement promptly.

I am disappointed by the failure of the parties to reach agreement and by the decision of the Union to strike. I am particularly concerned that our essential military needs be met, that the important space work at Cape Kennedy be continued, that the inconvenience to the travelling public be held to a minimum and that mail deliveries continue with the least interference possible.

I have asked Acting Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance to make certain that all military requirements for air transport are fully met and to report to me immediately if any problems arise.

I have requested Chairman Charles Murphy and the Civil Aeronautics Board to take all appropriate action to provide needed airline services with the air carrier remaining in operation.

I have directed General William McKee, the Federal Aviation Administrator, to cooperate in every way possible with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I have requested Chairman John Bush and the Interstate Commerce Commission to take all appropriate action to provide the maximum available rail and bus transportation to minimize the inconvenience to the travelling public.

I have instructed Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien to use every available mode of transportation to move the mails as rapidly as possible, particularly to our servicemen in Viet Nam, and reduce to a minimum any delays in mail delivery.

On April 21, I established an Emergency Board under the Railway Labor Act to investigate this dispute and to make findings of fact and recommendations. The Board was composed of Senator WAYNE MORSE, David Ginsburg, a distinguished Washington attorney, and Richard Neustadt of Harvard University. When the Board reported to me on June 7, I transmitted the report to the parties with my strong recommendation that they settle their differences within its framework. At that time, I expressed by belief and the belief of my advisers that the Board's recommendations formed "the framework for a just and prompt settlement, which is in the national interest." On June 13, the carriers informed me that they accepted the recommendations of the Emergency Board. Since that time, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and Assistant Secretary of Labor James Reynolds have been working with the carriers and the Union to bring the dispute to a conclusion without a strike and with a fair and just settlement for both parties.

I have done everything within my power and have taken every action available to the Federal Government to minimize the inconvenience to the public resulting from the strike, but the basic responsibility to the public rests with the Union and the airlines.

They have a great responsibility to the traveling public and the public will expect them to live up to that responsibility.

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1966]

TILTING THE GUIDEPOSTS

Far from smashing the Administration's wage-price guideposts, the recommendations a Presidential emergency board has made in the airlines pay dispute may have given the much-battered anti-inflation standards the kind of flexibility they need for survival.

The board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, made a great point of its determination to ignore the guideposts. These are

aimed at keeping the over-all level of wage increases in balance with the long-term rise in national productivity of 3.2 per cent a year. Under the Morse board's proposals, 35,000 mechanics employed by five major airlines would get annual increases averaging 3.5 per cent.

The recommendations were arrived at by considering a wide array of factors, including "the public interest in the maintenance of a stable economy." Perhaps the most interesting of the panel's specific proposals was that the union be free to reopen midway through the contracts forty-two-month span, if living costs next year go up faster than they have over the last five years.

The recommendations point the direction in which the Administration must go if voluntary restraints are to have any real chance of working in the wage field. The guideposts were never intended to operate as ironclad pay limits; their original formulation in the 1962 report of the Council of Economic Advisers emphasized that no single standard would be practical for all industries.

It is plain that gains in productivity represent the foundation for a noninflationary wage policy. It is equally plain that such a policy will be hard to sustain unless Government fiscal and monetary policy combine to hold the general price level steady. The airlines report provides a realistic approach to both elements of the stabilization problem.

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1966]

AN "UNCONSCIONABLE" STRIKE

The strike by the International Association of Machinists that has grounded 60 percent of the nation's commercial airplanes has an atavistic flavor. The union, it seems, cannot be swayed by an objective offer of a fair settlement or by appeals to act in the national interest. It just wants more. And it is apparently counting on the disruption and inconvenience caused by the strike to get it.

There is no question that the airlines are now prosperous. They are benefiting from both a boom in air travel and the widespread use of jets, which have proved far more popular and profitable than they had expected. Their profit figures are not secret; they are in fact reflected in offers to the union.

The machinery of the Railway Labor Act, which applies to air carriers, was first employed to bring about an agreement. But the union refused to accept the National Mediation Board's offer of binding arbitration. Then President Johnson appointed an emergency board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, which made proposals that would have provided what Mr. Johnson described as "the framework for a just and prompt settlement." This, too, was rejected. Finally, the airlines made a new offer that reportedly exceeded the Morse proposals; but the union decided to strike rather than to bargain.

At a time when the nation is at war and must be operating all of its air transport, the strike harms the entire union movement and its reputation for responsible and reasonable leadership. The machinists, as Senator MORSE has pointed out, are not being asked to make any sacrifice. His board ignored the Administration's wage guideposts, recommending increases averaging 3.5 per cent; it also proposed a reopening of the contract by the union if living costs go up faster than the board anticipated. Given these concessions, MORSE holds that the strike is "unconscionable."

Conceivably, the union's strategy will succeed in getting it more. But the machinists must recognize that excessive demands can provoke an excessive reaction. If they hold out for a settlement that is uneconomic for the airlines and inflationary for the country, they will surely provoke demands for action to curb union power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is frequently reported in the coverage of the union position in this dispute that the leadership is under pressure to bring back a big package settlement to offset raiding of its membership by rival unions. But while these men are not working, they and their union are suffering great economic loss as well as the airlines.

This is why I believe it is to the interest of all parties, not to mention the public interest, that the IAM go back to work while mediation and bargaining continue. The strike and lockout are the ultimate weapons of labor-management relations. There is no issue at stake between the Machinists and the airlines that justifies resort to ultimate weapons by either party. The issues belong on the bargaining table, not on the picket line.

No one would fight harder for the right to strike and to lock out than would the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, the union is not in any way jeopardized in this dispute. No attempt has been made to eliminate the union. No attempt has been made to deny to the union the precious right of collective bargaining. In my judgment, the union is misusing its power and right to resort to economic action.

Let me make myself perfectly clear. The answer is not a strike, it is not a lockout, and it is not compulsory arbitration.

Today, a bill was introduced in the Senate which seeks to end this strike by compulsory arbitration. I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that I oppose the bill in its present form.

It would be a sad day for America if we began to straitjacket employers and unions by imposing upon them a compulsory arbitration program. That is not the method to retain economic freedom in this country.

Mr. President, neither this dispute nor any other dispute of which I am aware between management and labor would justify, in my judgment, the passage of compulsory-arbitration legislation aimed at one specific, ongoing dispute. The whole subject of emergency disputes procedure needs review and revision. But it should not come when industry and the public are caught up in the heated atmosphere of a given work stoppage.

BOMBING OF HANOI AND HAIPHONG

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although administration spokesmen are traversing the world in an effort to justify the expanded American bombing of North Vietnam, the effort will not gain approval or win support from the dozens of countries and millions of people alienated from the United States by our war policy in Vietnam. The explanations and justifications at the official level silence governmental criticism. But they do not gain anything more for the United States than acquiescence from nations simply unwilling to get involved.

If foreign response to our bombing in Hanoi and Haiphong is adverse, a good part of the reason may be found in the testimony of Secretary McNamara last February to the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I am certain that the President of the United States does not know that his own Secretary of Defense answered him in advance of the bombing in Haiphong and Hanoi, for I read the testimony given by the Secretary of Defense in February. In discussing the supplemental military authorization Secretary McNamara said:

Secretary MCNAMARA. Most of the petroleum used in North Vietnam comes by way of Soviet vessels into Haiphong, and there is Chinese commerce as well into the port of Haiphong.

Senator ERVIN. So they could cut down a number of the essential supplies that would come in there by mining the harbor.

Secretary MCNAMARA. Essential supplies, perhaps, to the economy of North Vietnam, but not essential supplies to the operation in the south.

The tonnage that is required in the south, as I indicated, is relatively small, and it is not necessary for it to come in by port or, for that matter, by railroad or even over automotive roads. It could be carried on the backs of men, as it has been done many times before by the Chinese.

Senator ERVIN. But the North Vietnamese would be unable to send those supplies down there unless the industries could keep going.

Secretary MCNAMARA. No, sir. The industries in the north contribute very little to the supplies that are used in the south for the prosecution of the war.

Senator ERVIN. They would contribute to taxation, would they not, to the support of the Government?

Secretary MCNAMARA. No, sir.

Senator ERVIN. Which is operating and directing the war in the South.

Secretary MCNAMARA. No, sir; I do not believe so. The industry in the north is so small that it plays a very little role in the economy of the north, and I think any of the analysts who have studied the problem would say it could be completely eliminated and not reduce in any substantial way the contribution of the North to South Vietnam.

Senator ERVIN. And you are telling us, am I to infer, that you could wipe out the entire industry of North Vietnam, and have no effect whatever upon their capability to prosecute the war?

Secretary MCNAMARA. It might affect their will to do so. In my opinion, it would have no measurable effect upon their capability to furnish the supplies they are presently supplying to the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

Senator ERVIN. What do they do with their oil and gasoline that comes in?

Secretary MCNAMARA. Yes—they use it for the operation of their aircraft which, so far, have played practically no role in combat operations in North Vietnam. They use it for fuel for their trucks, some of which are used on the infiltration routes.

The portion of fuel used by their trucks could be obtained even though we were to mine the Haiphong and Hon Gai harbors. And, if they got no fuel for trucks, they have demonstrated many many times before that, in the Orient, they can move the quantities of supplies now being moved into the South by animal and manpower.

Senator ERVIN. Well, it would seem that North Vietnam is entirely unessential to this war, according to your testimony.

Secretary MCNAMARA. No, it is not unessential. They are supplying the leadership, they are supplying the cadres, they are moving the equipment obtained from other Communist countries.

Senator ERVIN. Don't you think a massive air attack on North Vietnam would have a

vast effect on the will of the people to continue to fight?

Secretary McNamara. No one can be sure how they would react. I do not believe that it did in Japan and I do not believe that it did in World War II, and I do not believe it did in Korea.

I think a study of the record will show that massive air power by itself did not break the will of the people nor did it break the will of their political leaders.

It was airpower, massive airpower complemented by ground and sea action, that broke the will of the people and their leaders.

It is difficult for me to reconcile this testimony of the Secretary of Defense with the President's ordering of the bombing of Haiphong and Hanoi, so-called essential oil deposits, and other military targets. In fact, it is difficult for me to reconcile this testimony of the Secretary of Defense with his present statements, in which he is supporting the President in the bombing.

However, Mr. President, the world knows the costly mistake that the United States has made by this shocking policy in North Vietnam.

I say to the American people: "Your intelligence is being insulted by the officials of your Government, when they seek to lead you to believe that civilians are not being killed in Hanoi. Read the foreign press. It is not a kept press. Read the foreign press to get the truth about the shocking outlawry that the President of the United States has implemented, in what I consider to be an inexcusable course of conduct on the part of our country in the killing of civilians in this escalated bombing in Hanoi and Haiphong."

It is the assumption in official Washington, as reported in the press, that bombing industry in North Vietnam will have relatively little effect upon the northern war effort, but may induce them to quit the war unless they can get further help from the Soviet Union or China or both.

If they do get help, our privileged sanctuaries in Thailand, the Philippines, Okinawa, Japan, not to mention Hawaii and the continental United States, could be privileged no longer, as we move into World War III.

But suppose she does not, and suppose North Vietnam drops out of the war? Every evidence, past and present, is that the Vietcong will continue warring against Marshal Ky or anyone else the United States puts up.

The administration is fond of asking what solution its critics have. But I ask the administration, How do you propose to keep a Ky government in power except by perpetual warfare by Americans, and by keeping hundreds of thousands of American boys in South Vietnam, none of whom should ever have been sent there?

If there is a national goal to be served in Vietnam that is not to be questioned, then let the administration set it forth in a request for a declaration of war, and a justification for it. Then we can all know what the facts are, and what our purpose is.

But let us not hear on the Fourth of July weekend, as we just heard across the country when we celebrate a document dedicated to "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind" and Government deriving just powers from the consent of the governed, that all facts, opinions, and decisions of war and peace are vested in one man, the President of the United States.

They are not. The decision of war or peace is vested only in Congress by our Constitution, and it has not been exercised. Our President has failed to follow the responsibility under article I, section 8 of the Constitution that he owes to the American people.

I hope the day has not come in our land when the actions of one man—however powerful—are beyond discussion, debate, and disagreement. If it has, then we are far down the road where Government operates without benefit of constitutional limits and procedures.

Under present policy, the best hope we have in Vietnam is for indefinite occupation of the country by half a million Americans. Every minute carries the danger that North Vietnam and China will extend support to the Vietcong of the magnitude we have extended to General Ky.

Such a situation is fraught with World War III. Far from avoiding that danger, it enlarges it, for what inducement would it be if half a million Chinese or Russian soldiers came to occupy Mexico to the south of us. It would be no inducement to peace. It would be an incitement to war.

For the years since the end of World War II, we have been strong enough to intervene almost at will in foreign countries. From the Caribbean to the Middle East, Europe to Asia, we have put large U.S. military forces wherever we thought some American interest was threatened. Some 350,000 of them are still in Europe. Fifty-five thousand are still in Korea. Roughly a million fight or serve outside the borders of the United States. This is creating a very bad image for the United States around the globe.

This cannot make for stable international relations. It can only produce resentment and a will to drive us out, either diplomatically as France is doing, or by whatever other means are available.

This is why I oppose the continual build-up in southeast Asia. It does not protect the men there—it jeopardizes thousands upon thousands more in areas where our normal commonsense should tell us the United States cannot hold dominion except by constant war and increasing use of American military power.

The American people must not stop thinking and talking about our position in Asia. Short of a declaration of war, it cannot be a closed issue.

I have received a letter from two constituents in Merrill, Oreg. The writers circulated it to several people. It closes with a footnote addressed to me. I shall read a part of the letter:

Death in Viet Nam

Merrill, Oreg.,
June 12, 1966.

Yesterday we received notice that our grandson, Tommy Chatburn, aged 23, was killed in action in Viet Nam. He lived with us here in Merrill and we loved him as our son. On his last furlough before going to Viet Nam he talked with me about his plans for after the war.

In his last letter to us Tommy wrote that he would be coming home in August or September, and maybe sooner, and we counted the days as we know he did.

He is coming home all right—in a casket.

I can see him now through my tears coming through the kitchen door.

Oh God, how many other brave boys will be sacrificed before the people put an end to this useless killing!

It wouldn't be so hard to take if our boy had died for his country or for a worthy cause. But he didn't.

We have no more business over there than the people over there have over here.

Tommy died a victim of the attempt of the Johnson Administration to impose a military dictatorship on the people of South Viet Nam through our hand-picked, hated, little and cruel tyrant, Nguyen Cao Ky.

What reasons are the American people given for waging this war on a hapless people in a small impoverished country half way around the world? These are the reasons given:

(1) We are there to defend the people of South Viet Nam against Ho Chi Minh.

(2) We are there because we have made commitments to the government of South Viet Nam, and have been invited over there.

(3) We are there to fight Communism, to prevent its spread, and to stop a Communist take-over of South Viet-Nam.

As to reason No. (1), the people of South Viet Nam do not want us to defend them any more than we would want them over here to defend us.

The people of South Viet Nam demonstrate against us, carry signs that say, "Yanks go Home", burn American buildings and vehicles, dance in glee around the burning property and mob and shoot at our people. What else can they do to show they want us to go home and leave them alone? They hate us and our puppet, Ky. No wonder! Wouldn't we hate them if they were over here? The only Vietnamese people that want us over there are the puppets, prostitutes, and profiteers.

It is obvious the people of Viet Nam are against us and helping the Viet Cong. How else could the Viet Cong put up such a fierce fight against the might of the United States? South and North Viet Nam is one country—not two countries—and Ho Chi Minh is its leader. He is a national hero. He led the fight against the French. The French were trying to do the same thing we are trying to do. After 10 years they were defeated and gave it up. They say that we are stupid to try to carry on this war.

Our Tommy wrote shortly after arriving in Viet Nam, "These people don't want us here."

And yet Johnson insists we are there at their request only to defend them; that we want nothing for ourselves. How stupid does he think the American people are?

When Viet Nam was divided into two parts in 1954 by the Geneva Accord Agreement, the people of Viet Nam were told that the division was only temporary and that there would be a free election to give the people a chance to choose their own government. This commitment was broken for the reason that at least 80% of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh and against us and our puppet. This is the estimate of President Eisenhower, who was then president. The percentage against us now would be greater. We again promised a free election; but again the election has been postponed and our promise broken.

As to reason No. (2), relative to our commitments to the Government of South Viet

Nam, since when did Johnson start keeping his commitments? What about his commitment to the American people not to escalate this war? He condemned Goldwater as being the war party candidate and held himself out as our best hope for an end to the war. Millions, including the undersigned, voted for Johnson on that basis. Then he betrayed us.

Furthermore, our commitment was to defend the government of Ngo Dinh Diem. Diem was our hand-picked puppet. But he was too hard to handle. So, with our consent and by our connivance Diem was assassinated. Thirteen other puppet dictators have fallen since then. It is hard to find a reliable puppet who will take orders from the United States. When we tell the world that we are not dictating to the government of South Viet Nam, these puppets start believing it and start giving orders on their own. So they don't last long!

If we were being invaded, every man, woman and child would spring to the defense of our country. So will the people of the countries we invade. They will fight like wildcats, just as our people would under the same circumstances. That is why we will never be able to "win the people" of South Vietnam as HUMPHREY and other Johnson men say we must do. Could they win us if we were in their place? Not in a thousand years! We would never submit to foreign subjugation, and it is doubtful that they will.

The Johnson policy of bomb, bribe and blackmail will never work. We are now the most hated country on earth, and Johnson is probably the most hated man on earth, and this hatred is building up.

As to reason No. (3)—that we are fighting Communism, preventing its spread and a Communist take-over-this is just as fictitious as the fiction that we are in South Viet Nam to defend the people there.

In the first place, this is not a war against communism. If it is, why don't we fight Russia and China, the sources of communism; and why do we give communist countries like Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland, Austria and Czecho-Slovakia millions of dollars every year? Three fourths of the people of the world are Communists. Does any one propose that we wage war against the communistic world? We can never shoot communism out of people, nor shoot our form of Democracy into them.

The way to stop communism is to abolish the conditions that cause communism. These are oppression, injustice, cruelty, disease and ignorance.

Our action in Viet Nam is making more communists because it is creating the conditions that cause communism.

The people of South Viet Nam don't even know what communism is, nor what Democracy is; and they don't care. They want to be left alone and this war to end. But if they did know what communism is and they wanted it, is it our business to see that they don't have it? Who are we to dictate to the world? Also,

All Viet Nam is not worth the life of one of our brave boys.

We cannot police the world, and we shouldn't try.

Let us solve our own problems before we try to run the world. If we attend to our own business here in America, we will have a full time job.

Let us keep our boys home, keep our country strong, and not dissipate our strength.

We are not the sole possessors of the atomic bomb, as we once were. We will have to learn to get along with other countries. If we engage in a death struggle with communism, civilization will be destroyed. We cannot survive an atomic war.

Communism is an economic theory. It is a stage in the evolution of government. Economic theories change. Communism in Russia has changed considerably in the last few years, and it will change in other countries. The thing for us to do is to let other countries work out their own problems, just as we want to work out our problems without foreign interference.

Consider the changes during the Johnson Administration in our own country. Our free enterprise system will be a thing of the past if this undeclared war doesn't end soon. No country can wage a major war without adopting a totalitarian form of government. If we continue this sordid adventure in Viet Nam, we will create in this country the very thing that we claim to be fighting in Viet Nam. Johnson already claims the right to send our boys to a lottery of death any place in the world, without consent of Congress. This was the way of Hitler, and is leading to executive dictatorship in this country.

The National Council of Churches, the International Council of Churches and the Pope are all against this war. Johnson's popularity is going down and down. As the war escalates, support for the Johnson Administration decreases.

Johnson and his supporters are sowing to the wind and will reap the whirlwind.

The Administration announces that it is sending an additional 18,000 men to Viet Nam at once. The communists can send 10 men for every one that we send.

We can't win this war!

Neither Russia nor China will permit an American take-over in Southeast Asia any more than we would permit an Asiatic take-over in America.

We state that our boy died in vain in a cause that was not just; and we charge that Johnson, McNamara, Rusk and their supporters are responsible for the death of our boy.

Johnson made a speech in which he said, in substance:

"Why are the people making such a fuss over 1500 American casualties last year, when more people than that die in automobile accidents?"

What a cruel and heartless thing to say!

We know nothing can be done to bring our boy back to us. But we hope we can have a small part in helping to stop this useless, barbarous, criminal and sinful killing with its resulting agony, and suffering; and for that we pray to Almighty God.

TOM CHATBURN, Sr.
MYRTLE CHATBURN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our views on the war in Asia were the same before our boy was killed in action. His death makes us more determined to help stop this useless criminal war, with its resulting agony and grief. We will continue to do all we can to support you. You do not need to answer this as you have a heavy burden. God Bless You.

THOMAS W. and MYRTLE CHATBURN.

Mr. President, I read this letter because it represents the grassroots of America speaking. It represents a disunited America.

Let me say to the President of the United States, who has been making some unfortunate remarks in recent days in regard to the opposition of his critics, that no amount of criticism on the part of the President will silence me. In my judgment, my President is writing a sordid and sorry chapter of American history. If he pursues this course of international outlawry, I will oppose him as long as I sit in the Senate. In my judgment, the course of the President's action must be changed if America is going to survive an honorable place in world history.

Mr. President, the Chatburns who wrote this moving letter to me are representative of millions of Americans who are not going to take the President's course of action. If the President thinks he can get a united America by seeking to make the appeals that he made from Texas over the Fourth of July, he is sadly mistaken.

I want the President to know that there are millions of Americans who will never unite behind him short of a declaration of war, because the President—I repeat tonight—does not have a scintilla of constitutional right to send American boys to Asia to be slaughtered on the battlefield without a declaration of war. Congress has no right to support him in this war short of Congress living up to its constitutional responsibilities of declaring war.

Mr. President, that is the issue. That issue has been drawn in this Republic.

Let me say to the boys who are dying in South Vietnam the very hour that I speak, that we do not have the slightest justification as a Congress—nor does the White House—to send them to their deaths. Those who are letting down those boys are Members of Congress—and the President—who are making available the funds with which to kill them instead of exercising the check on the purse strings under the Constitution by denying to the President the funds with which to escalate the war, and to force him to follow the course of action of deescalating the war and follow the recommendations of a General Ridgway, a General Gavin, and a George Kennan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain telegrams, editorials, and articles bearing on the subject matter which I have just discussed.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 3, 1966]

WASHINGTON: "COUNT 10 BEFORE YOU HURT"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, July 3.—President Johnson said in Omaha that we should count ten before we dissent from his policy in Vietnam. Okay: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10; but it doesn't work. On the Fourth of July, a man is still entitled to a stifled cry, for the Omaha speech is a mishmash of bad history and dubious logic.

"What happens in Vietnam," the President said, "will determine—yes, it will determine—whether ambitious and aggressive nations can use guerrilla warfare to conquer their weaker neighbors. It will determine whether might makes right."

This is quite a proposition. If Vietnam will really determine this ancient dispute about right and might, which goes back to Plato in 370 B.C., every porky middle-aged character in the country will surely want to volunteer for Saigon, but will it settle this or anything else? Here is the basis of the dispute between Mr. Johnson and his critics.

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW

The President sincerely believes it will. Increasingly he is talking as if Vietnam were one of the decisive battles of the world: stop the enemy there and we've stopped him everywhere. Defeat the guerrilla technique now and we have convinced the enemy and reassured our uniting Asian allies, and for such historic ends, no matter what the cost

of sacrifice, "We will see this through; we shall persist; we shall succeed."

Mr. Johnson is escalating his speaking as well as his bombing. He is applying the do or die sentiments of the Alamo (which, after all, was not a glorious success) to one of Walt W. Rostow's latest theories. This is that President Kennedy's stand against Khrushchev in the Cuban missile crisis was the "Gettysburg" of the cold war, and that Vietnam is the Wilderness Campaign—a difficult, untidy mopping-up exercise before the end.

Maybe so, but it is hard to look ahead to the end of President Johnson's Administration and imagine this stable, free, cooperative Asian world that will, in his view, be established by the sacrifices of Vietnam.

THE MISSING ELEMENT

If President Johnson told us bluntly that we were in a power struggle to establish a decent order in Asia—which we are—and intended to establish American military bases at Kam Ranh Bay and elsewhere to maintain in Southeast Asia what he calls the "vital security interests of the United States," that, at least, would be a policy. But he has not said that.

He has said that we want to prove to the Communists that guerrilla warfare does not pay, and after they have seen the light and come to the conference table, the United States wants no bases in southeast Asia and will go away leaving the future of Vietnam to the converted Democrats in Saigon and the defeated and intimidated Communists in Hanoi and Peking.

This, with the best will in the world, is hard to believe. It is not a policy but a myth. It is possible that American power will finally smash the main units of the North Vietnamese Army in the South and disperse the Vietcong guerrillas—after severe casualties on both sides—but it is highly unlikely that this will produce either a democratic order in Saigon or an acquiescent Communist order in Hanoi and Peking.

THE ENDLESS STRUGGLE

The struggle will go on. China will still represent a quarter of the human race. Rhetoric will not change geography. Mr. Johnson may get his "honorable settlement" and get past the election, but what will he have settled, and what will he have achieved that will justify the lives that will be lost between now and then?

The President has already proved to the Communists that guerrilla warfare is an expensive business. He has a chance now to influence the constitutional convention in Saigon so that it will bring in a representative government that will negotiate peace with all the enemies in the field, including the National Liberation Front, but he is not doing this.

Either now, before more and more killing, the Communists are going to participate in a compromise settlement; or later, after our "victory" and departure, they are going to participate in such a settlement anyway. The President, however, does not see it this way. It is awkward politically. It involves a compromise with the Communists which is harder to explain than letting them force a compromise after we are gone. But the cost of fighting on until Hanoi, Peking and Moscow agree to an American conquest on the battlefield is likely to be very great, and the end result, after we leave, not much different.

The President talked at Omaha about fighting for the "will of the people" in Vietnam but the will of the people there, so far as it can be determined, is for peace, while the will of the generals, whom the President is supporting, is for war.

He defended bombing Hanoi and Haiphong on the ground that it was necessary to halt the large-scale infiltration of arms which the previous bombing was supposed to control. He tells us that instead of diminishing the flow of Communist supplies by bombing, the flow of supplies has been increased; instead of human supply trails through the jungle when the bombing started, "the trails turned into boulevards," [which seems a little odd]; instead of small weapons carried on the backs of human beings, "they built all-weather roads . . . they began sending troops in by trucks rather than on foot . . . they shifted over to heavy weapons using imported ammunition, most of it coming from Communist China." And the President's conclusion from all this was that there must be more bombing "at the source", which will probably mean China if the supplies at Hanoi and Haiphong are destroyed.

THE POLITICAL STUMP

Something happens to Lyndon Johnson when he crosses the Appalachian Range. He drops the restraint of the Capitol and picks up the idiom of the political stump. Our soldiers in Vietnam, he says, are not going to fail us; the question is whether the critics are going to fail them.

Count ten, he says, before you let me and them down, before you "hurt." But something is wrong. We count and we don't want to "hurt," but somehow it doesn't work.

[From Newsweek, July 4, 1966]

THE POLLS AND THE WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

Now that the polls have become such a part of our political life, we are realizing that it is by no means easy to read them correctly. Thus, while the recent Gallup and Harris polls show a sharp decline of confidence in the President, they can be read as meaning that the country is more warlike than the President or that the country very much dislikes the war and wishes to end it quickly.

Mr. Elmo Roper, who is one of the pioneers in the art of polling, has an article in the Saturday Review of May 28, pointing out that polls cannot be used to guide policy and that the test of Presidential leadership "is not in the crucible of public opinion but in the crucible of events." The essential question is not whether the polls are favorable to a policy but whether the policy leads to satisfactory results.

The main reason why the polls are not a good guide to policy is that, as Mr. Roper has observed, so large a part of the public is "uninformed or misinformed about the facts and issues on which national policy is based." There is present, it would appear, an instinctive tendency to rally around the President when he is in trouble abroad. President Kennedy, for example, reached his highest peak of approval in the polls, a peak higher than was ever reached by President Eisenhower before him or by President Johnson since then, just after his fiasco at the Bay of Pigs. President Kennedy never did so well again, even after his greatest triumph in the Cuba missile crisis.

This same phenomenon, that of a rally to the President when he is in trouble abroad, occurred during the Eisenhower Administration. Will it occur again if President Johnson, having escalated the Vietnamese war, fails to win a victory that brings the war to an end? The polls cannot answer this question, for they cannot prophesy. Yet this question is of the greatest interest to practical politicians and indeed to all who are concerned about the coming elections this November.

Hawks and Doves. Presently, the Republicans are assuming that almost universally the Vietnamese war is unpopular; they then assume that the country is divided between those who think it can be ended by hitting harder (the hawks) and those who believe it can only be ended by negotiation (the doves). What is common to both the hawks and the doves is that they dislike the war, want a quick end to it and are opposed to a long war of attrition.

That much the polls do seem to say. Is there any other objective evidence which bears on this conclusion? There is, I submit, the draft and how it is working. For the draft poses choices which involve the lives and careers of the young men of the nation and also the concern of their parents, their friends and their teachers. These choices which the draft compels young men to make cut closer to the bone than the questions of the Gallup and Harris polls.

It is generally agreed that the draft is working unfairly, and Secretary McNamara has not only acknowledged this to be true but is reported to have a large task force at work trying to devise a better system. He is not likely to succeed. For the fundamental trouble is not in the draft system but in the war.

Dangerous and Disagreeable. The trouble is not in the system as it works but in the unpopularity of the war into which the system is drafting men. No system—not a lottery, not universal military training, not a national service corps—can make a war equally dangerous and disagreeable to all young men. What makes a mobilization possible is that enough young men with the support of their parents, their friends and their teachers *want* to take part in the war.

What distinguishes this war in Vietnam sharply from the other three wars of this century is that it is neither popular nor fashionable to volunteer for it, that it is even viewed as correct and honorable to avoid military service.

This is the point of the baccalaureate address by president Pusey to the Harvard graduating class this year. He pointed out that "contemporary circumstances has a great deal to do in determining popular attitudes in time of war." In the first world war, "when we were finally called upon to fight, the issues were clear and the cause impelling * * * president Lowell then had to try to prevent Harvard undergraduates from rushing to enlist" instead of "taking officer's training first." There was a similar rush of Harvard undergraduates in the second world war.

But not in this war. "So far as I know," said president Pusey, "no one [and this includes the present Administration in Washington] feels any remotely impelling excitement in being involved in the war in Vietnam."

How men act when there is a choice which may mean life or death is a truer measure of their real convictions than their speeches or their answers to the questions of the pollsters.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 27–July 3, 1966]

ESCALATION: NEITHER PEACE NOR VICTORY

With the bombing of oil storage depots at Hanoi and Haiphong the Viet Nam war has now been escalated another notch. Once again the country is told that only the sternest military necessity and a strong desire to bring about peace negotiations lay behind the decision.

There is every reason to believe, however, that the military results will be negligible—that this escalation, like others before it, will be matched by equal escalation on the other side. Ever since February of 1965 we have been bombing North Viet Nam in order to interdict the support of Viet Cong and South Viet Namese forces in the south. The objective has not been achieved; the infiltration rate is greater today than it was when the bombing began. Why should any different results be expected from the new strikes at the major cities?

As for diplomatic results, Administration officials in the past have acknowledged that bombing the cities might well end any hope of negotiations. We hope they were wrong. But in view of the record of 18 months of air attacks it must be granted that, as Senator MANSFIELD says, the new scale of the war makes a peaceful settlement more difficult rather than less.

It is a curious coincidence, if nothing more, that every American escalation of the war has appeared to come at a time when Hanoi was sending peace feelers, or international efforts for peace negotiations were afoot. A "Citizens' White Paper," as reported in last Sunday's Post-Dispatch, called attention to this fact, and naturally one wonders whether history is repeating itself.

In recent days President De Gaulle, UN Secretary General U Thant and Pope Paul VI all have reiterated the world community's plea for peace. A Canadian ambassador visited Hanoi on a special mission and brought back information which must have been important, since the Administration sent Assistant Secretary of State William P. Bundy to Ottawa for a personal report. A Romanian deputy premier, after visiting Hanoi and Peking, called in the American ambassador in Bucharest reportedly to explore the possibilities of a negotiated settlement.

What if anything has been going on the public has no certain way of knowing. The State Department dismissed both the Canadian and the Romanian contacts with the perfunctory statement that they showed no change in Hanoi's position. But U Thant, who may be a more detached witness, was reported last week to feel that there was hope for peace talks if the United States would accept his recommendation for an indeterminate suspension of air attacks on North Viet Nam.

Instead, the air attacks are expanded and escalated.

The American position is that we will consider ending the bombing only if Hanoi agrees to end its support of the Viet Cong. This is asking for surrender. It is asking for North Viet Nam to end its buildup of ground troops while we remain free to continue ours.

U Thant has also laid down as one of the conditions for a peaceful settlement American willingness to accept representatives of the Viet Cong at the conference table. Secretary Rusk in Canberra said this could not be done because it would give the Viet Cong a veto on a settlement. This, too, is asking for surrender. It amounts to saying that the principal beligerent on the Communist side shall have nothing to say about the terms of a settlement. Why should we be surprised at a Communist refusal to negotiate on that basis?

So the Administration's stated desire for negotiations must remain unconvincing. If you sincerely want a negotiated (which means a compromise) settlement, you do not escalate the war in ways most likely to discourage peace talks. You do not support implacably a military junta in Saigon which is undeviatingly hostile to compromise or negotiation. You do not exclude from the conference table the principal force you are fighting.

We believe the road to a peaceful settlement lies in another direction from that which the Johnson Administration is following. It has been repeatedly pointed out by U Thant, speaking as the conscience of the United Nations: first, a suspension of the air war; next, a reciprocal reduction of hostilities leading toward a cease-fire; and finally, a peace conference at which the Viet Cong shall be represented, whose object would be to restore the principles of the Geneva agreements of 1954—principles founded on the concept of military neutrality for Southeast Asia.

The new escalation does not lead in this direction and neither, in our opinion, does it lead toward some easy victory that will dispose of the Viet Nam problem once and for all. It may increase the cost of Hanoi's military operations as Mr. McNamara hopes, but more importantly it will cost the United States untold sums of good will and esteem around the world.

UNDER A STRAIN

In his farm belt speeches on Viet Nam, President Johnson showed himself to be an overwrought man. The decision to expand the air attack to Hanoi and Haiphong unquestionably placed him under severe strain. Right or wrong, he is entitled to public sympathy in his ordeal, and it must be hoped that a rest in Texas will induce a calmer and more balanced perspective on what remains an unsolved problem.

The nature of the strain is fairly clear. By delegating all the initial publicity on the new escalation to Secretary McNamara, the President sought to convey the impression that this was a purely military decision grounded solely on military considerations. By his voluble self-defense on a political fence-mending trip he acknowledges that it was in large part a political decision too—and the politics of it, abroad and at home, has him worried.

Perhaps it would help if Mr. Johnson could see the matter in somewhat less emotional and primitive terms. When he assumes that the only alternative to endless expansion of the war is a dishonorable retreat, he increases the difficulty of his choices. None of the dissenters in Congress or the country, who anger him so much, really advocates a policy of cut-and-run. The disagreement revolves around how best to attain the objective of a peaceful settlement which the President himself professes to seek with passionate concern.

It is ironic and sad that Mr. Johnson should base so much of his case on the impression that to do other than what he is doing would be to betray the hopes of free people around the world who wish to be safe from aggression. The truth is that all of the free peoples that really count both in Asia and in Europe—all the important nations except a few minor client-states—would advise a different course if asked. When even Great Britain is compelled to disassociate itself from this new escalation, it should be clear how utterly isolated the United States is. We are implacably setting ourselves against the conscience of our best allies.

Nobody here or abroad would question the nobility and necessity of a great power's keeping its word, or honoring its commitments. The question is what the commitment really is. The question is whether our obligation runs to the suffering people of Viet Nam, or to a military junta which can survive only by escalated war. The question is how our moral responsibility can best be discharged—whether by seeking a military decision or by adopting objectives and tactics that will make a peaceful settlement possible.

And when it comes to keeping one's word, a great many Americans might suggest that this honorable principle applies also to a President who ran for office on a platform of peace and then became involved in an Asian land war which many of his supporters in 1964 thought they were voting against.

HAMILTON, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge every effort keep Congress in session. Vote against escalation of war in Vietnam.

MARY N. BRAUTIGAN.

LEONIA, N.J.,
June 30, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Supporting you in any protest action against President's Vietnam policy.

LEROY and DOROTHY ELLIS.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hanoi bombing insane. We continue to support your efforts and will work to end war.

HELEN NELSON.

SARATOGA, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your courage and wisdom in continuing to ask for negotiation and peace. Not bombs napalm and destruction.

ANN AND EDGAR HEFFLEY.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully suggest you and Senator GRUENING redouble efforts to halt Vietnam insanity before escalation triggers world war three.

ARTHUR FAST.

CHARLESTON, S.C.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep trying to lessen our shame of official acts.

H. L. RICHARDSON.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding your concern about Vietnam. I support you right down the line. With you all the way.

JOHN RAGSDALE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your position on Vietnam.

JOEL LEBOWITZ.

DAVIS, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.:

My flag is upside down. Appreciate your stand more than we can say.

ROBERT MCINNES.

EUGENE, OREG.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Oppose bombings, which only prolong conflict, damage U.S. image, and obstruct efforts for world peace.

Dr. and Mrs. BARRY F. ANDERSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Copy of the following wire sent to President Johnson, Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY and Representative MAILLIARD: "I oppose bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong, all of Vietnam. Please seek peace while there's still time."

SERENA JUTKOVITZ.

NEW YORK, N.Y.
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are shocked and outraged at today's escalation of the bombing attacks on North Vietnam. We applaud and support your stand.

MARCIA and FREDERICK MORTON.

CENTRAL VALLEY, N.Y.,
June 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support you. Don't stop. You speak for us.

FRANCES and JOHN ADLER.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American people will not soon recover from the shame and humiliation of our bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. My flag like yours is at half mast.

GRACE DILLEY.

CUPERTINO, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend you on your stand against the escalation of the war in Vietnam. And support you completely in your efforts to stop the war. We are proud of your courageous stand. God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN TAYLOR.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your efforts to stop escalation of Vietnam war. We urge comprehensive withdrawal of U.S. men and material from Vietnam, reaffirm the 1954 Geneva accord.

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. CORR.
VIVIAN GEORGE.
EARL GEORGE.
THOMAS VANERMIN.
JOHN WHITTIG.
HENRY VILLADASO.
RAY JUSTICE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 2, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Is there no way to restore sanity to the action and pronouncements of the U.S. Government as it proceeds along paths of barbary and violence to achieve aims however worthy they may be. The present air war in Asia is illegal and immoral and our very destiny is in jeopardy. Where is our Supreme Court. Where is our Congress which alone has the constitutional right to declare war. What of our commitments to the United Nations. We call on you those of you of integrity and decency who are to speak out, to speak loudly, or we are all lost.

EDITH AND MYRON ARRICK.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend your position opposing bombing of Hanoi, Haiphong. Our flag half staff. God bless you.

MARGARET HORN.
JOHN HORN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your position regarding bombings of Hanoi and Haiphong.

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY D. LEVINE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply disturbed by bombing of North Vietnam and escalation of war. You have full support for opposition to this and I am pressuring New York Senators to voice their protest.

MARGARET ADAMS.

SANTA CLARA, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue fighting. You are last hope for those concerned with national integrity.

R. H. Skolman, Warren Travis, Christopher Curtis, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Wedemeyer, Meruti Achanta, Alexander Duncan, Rosa Morin, Ronald Krempetz, Kirk Frederick, Donna Steinecipher, Mr. and Mrs. Edward I. Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. Kirtwood Smith, Mr. and Mrs. David Dukes, Mr. and Mrs. Dave Williams, Terry Talley, Laurie Brooks Jefferson, Carol Pendergrast, Wm. Pendergrast, Klara Baron, Ann Balaam, Prof. Roger D. Gross, Prof. James C. Dunn, Prof. Wm. R. James.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
July 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Following is copy of telegram sent to President Johnson:

"You have led this country into a dirty little war where American boys are being killed and wounded by the thousands weekly. You have dragged our country's international reputation into the mud. You say 'well what can I do?' The answer is, as your friend the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mister Johnson let it be clear I want no part of this folly of growing war, and if you persist, no part of you in the next election. Your former supporter."

DRYDEN MORSE, M.D.,
Cardiac Surgeon.

PLAINFIELD, VT.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deplore bombing. Appreciate your protest please continue to speak.

ALAN and MARGERY WALKER.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your stand against the administration's Vietnam policy.

Prof. and Mrs. E. KERRIGAN PRESCOTT.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regarding bombing Hanoi Haiphong. Every patriotic American who loves his country should this day hang his head in shame.

JANE ERICKSON.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In times like these when the individual feels helpless and hopeless in the face of ever increasing escalation your consistent denunciation of our war madness may yet reach the minds and hearts of the American people and awaken them to the peril that confronts our shrinking world. You have the gratitude of many of your countrymen for your courageous outspokenness.

MARTIN and LILLIAN WEITZLER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Many of us members of committee for a sane nuclear policy admire your courageous stand against the bombing of Vietnam. With bombing of Hanoi danger of war with China has increased. Urge you and colleagues of similar opinions continue your utmost to bring about adherence to Geneva Convention.

CLARA CARSON.

EAST CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent, Deplore increased bombing. Urge Congress stay convened for thoughtful discussion of our Vietnam responsibility.

JOAN CULVER.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Just wired President Johnson my disgust at bombing Haiphong Hanoi please protest also.

CATHERINE ROLLINS.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please intensify your heroic project of administrations Goldwaterite bombings and tactics in Viet Nam.

MORTON RYWECK.

SANDS POINT, N.Y.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Worried about escalation I applaud your courageous efforts for peace.

Mrs. DORIS LEONARD.

DALY CITY, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your intelligent statements after we escalated the war again. Please continue to speak out. Your voice is my voice. Our boys are dying in vain in Vietnam. We must face that fact.

GEORGE MENDENHALL.

CONCORD, CALIF.
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend and strongly support all efforts to halt escalation of war; lay ground for negotiations.

MILDRED PARTANSKY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Most heartening to again hear your views on Vietnam. Thousands of us continue to support you.

Mrs. CHARLOTTE S. GRUNIG.

DETROIT, MICH.,
June 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday you spoke for us and almost everybody we know. Congratulations.

R. M. GOODMAN,
JAMES LOGAN,
MIKE LAVEN,
GEORGE BEDROSEAN,
DEAN ROBB,
Members of Michigan Bar.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for having the courage to examine the validity of U.S. foreign policy in Vietnam. We are proud to have you in the service of our country.

MEDRIC and RUTH GODBOUT.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

This war is increasingly more barbaric. Your forthright statements are reassuring sane and fully supported.

Mr. and Mrs. DALIEL LEITE.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
July 1, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We voted against Goldwater. I'm afraid we voted for Johnson, but not for dictatorship. Think.

ROBERT F. and LUCY M. STOY.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST WATER RESOURCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of great concern to the Pacific Northwest States are the problems, both natural and man-made, of water resource management.

Recently Mr. Oliver C. Larson, executive vice president of the Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce, called to my attention a resolution of June 9, 1966, adopted by the chamber on the subject of water quality control relative to the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Larson also directed to my attention an excellent article entitled "Water: Use It or Lose It," written by Mr. E. A. Higginbotham, chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the Portland Chamber of Commerce. This article deserves consideration not only by Senators of the Pacific Northwest, but by Senators representing all other States throughout the Nation. Mr. Higginbotham sets forth very convincing arguments concerning present and future needs of the Pacific Northwest for the water flowing through its streams. He serves warning as to the disastrous consequences for the Pacific Northwest and the Nation as a whole which would result from any major diversion of Pacific Northwest waters for use in other areas.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Higginbotham's article also be printed in the record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

Whereas the congress has expressed through the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, an interest in maintaining satisfactory water quality for the use and well-being of its citizens; and

Whereas such benefits can be realized through the augmentation of low flows which can be provided by multiple-purpose water resource development projects; and

Whereas in spite of large expenditures by communities and industries for adequate at-source treatment of wastes there is a need for such augmented flows; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation's Tualatin Division of the Willamette Basin Project as originally formulated includes provision for a material improvement in the quality of low-water flows in the Tualatin River as an orderly element of overall water resource development in the Willamette River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce favors the inclusion of water quality control as a specific primary function of the Tualatin Division. And be it further resolved that when water quality control benefits would be of a widespread and general nature, consistent with the wording of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and not subject to adequate identification of specific beneficiaries, the Chamber of Commerce favors its inclusion as a nonreimbursable function of water resource development projects.

JUNE 9, 1966.

EXHIBIT 2

WATER: USE IT OR LOSE IT

(By E. A. Higginbotham, chairman, Water Resources Committee, Portland Chamber of Commerce)

The people of the Northwest have long accepted the many rich benefits that nature has bestowed upon them. One of these major benefits has been sufficient water for their needs. There has recently been a growing awareness of the fact that these water resources will have to be handled with greater regard for conservation . . . that this resource is not unlimited.

Last summer, the people of Oregon became alarmed when the water level of the Willamette River dropped so low the fish life was endangered. The Bonneville Power Administration recently issued warnings that low water this coming winter may cause curtailment of some power to industry the following summer.

In the midst of all this, there was a suddenly rising clamor from the Southwest to divert some of this precious water to their dry lands.

Much of the general public, when they hear about the Southwest's wanting to take their water, simply laugh and shrug their shoulders. The whole subject is unthinkable! Water is one of the main reasons for most people living here. It is what attracted, and is attracting at an ever increasing rate industry to the Northwest.

People would naturally assume that their political leaders would simply say "No!" to any ideas of depleting their water resources.

THEY CAN TAKE OUR WATER

There is the joker in the deck! The Southwest *can* take our water. It is not *our* water. We may have to give up some of this vital natural resource. We very likely will be sending some of the Northwest's water to the Southwest in the not-too-distant future. The question is, "How much will we have to say about the amount and method of diversion?" The real danger is the apathy of the private sector of our area. They must be informed and aroused to the danger.

The Northwest can lose its water by a vote of Congress. All 50 states have a vote on what we would consider a regional problem. The Southwest states have political power for outweighing our four Northwest states.

So, then, what can we do?

The first thing is to recognize that Congress will listen to a *united* people who speak with reason and with knowledge.

The Southwest states have been fighting with each other over water for years, but they have now found a common cause. They are united. And they are being heard by Congress *today*.

We of the Northwest have yet to find a common ground on which to unite. Oregon has established a Water Resources Board and is making a five-year study of our needs. Washington and Idaho have not yet done so.

Since facts are the only weapon with which to fight, let's take a look at some of the things that affect the situation as we know it now.

Does the Southwest need our water?

There are some very potent facts to indicate that they have plenty of water. Only 10% of their water is now being used for municipal and industrial purposes. The other 90% is used for irrigation. In other words, they have a great surplus of water for drinking, for cooling, for swimming pools, and for all industry. So the question becomes, "How far is it economical to send water for agricultural purposes?"

Since it will cost the taxpayers of the nation billions (*estimates have run as high as $20 to $30 billion*) to divert Columbia River water—the most commonly spoken of source—they are entitled to know what the Southwest is doing to conserve water they now have.

In the Southwest, irrigation water is now flowing in many cases in unlined canals where water seepage and evaporation cause an estimated 50% loss. More canals are being lined, it is true, but only a small fraction of what is needed; and evaporation in their hot sun is still a great loss. When pipe is considered as an answer, they say it is too expensive—as though billions of dollars for diversion were not.

THE REAL SHORTAGE: CHEAP WATER

It would appear then the shortage is not just water but is really a shortage of *cheap* water. On some federally financed irrigation projects, farmers pay less than half the cost of delivering it to them, while industry pays high unsubsidized rates. So, while there is no shortage for industrial use, it is certainly no mystery why they would like to cheapen water, also.

So far, the Southwest has not been able to agree on the amount of water they feel they need. In discussions, the amount varies from 2.5 million acre feet to 8.5 million acre

feet with 15 million acre feet becoming a more common discussion figure.

There are dozens of bills before Congress all leading toward diversion of Columbia River water. Now, even Texas has introduced legislation that would include them in any diversion; and they feel they need *13 million acre feet as a starter*. This was met with consternation by the other Southwestern states who did not approve of someone else muscling in on the act and perhaps adding their crowning touch that would topple the whole scheme.

The Northwest need not be fooled by any agreement asking for seemingly small amounts of water; because, once a diversion system is built, it would be no problem to convince lawmakers who bought the original idea that greater amounts of water were needed. It's just like the man who convinces himself that he needs just one cocktail—the second is much easier!

THE NORTHWEST WATER SHORTAGE

Since the Northwest states have only about 6 million acres under irrigation *out of a potential 25 million acres*, wouldn't it seem more reasonable to irrigate the areas closest to the water supply to its fullest potential before *any* water whatsoever were sent over 1,000 miles to do the identical job?

Stories and photographs of abandoned home and farms in the Southwest can be matched in the dry areas of the Northwest. But the important question for taxpayers to consider is . . .

How much tax money should be used to bail out the man who goes into the wrong business in the wrong place?

One of the favorite phrases in the Southwest is that we "waste millions of acre feet of water into the ocean at the mouth of the Columbia River." Actually, our average annual discharge into the ocean is 168.3 million acre feet, but it is certainly *not* wasted. It is some of the most efficiently used water in the world—with a still greater potential for future use.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER

The generation of electricity is one of the Columbia's most valued uses. The Northwest has a voracious appetite for electric power, and hydroelectric power is the most efficient available today. Yet, within about ten years, we will have developed all the economical hydro sites. However, our needs for power will continue to double every ten years for the foreseeable future—which means we will have to turn to thermal generation of power. The most likely source will then be atomic power generating steam. Yet atomic power needs lots of cooling water; so, even after hydro development ends, we will be using Columbia River water to good advantage.

The week this article is being written, the first section of the giant Intertie to divert electricity from the Northwest to the Southwest goes into operation. Certainly, the Southwest has a very real interest in our ability to continue as a dependable source of power. The Bonneville Power Administration recently said that, in less than 25 years, 99.6% of the average annual flow of the Columbia at The Dalles will be needed for power generation.

The Northwest states were recently dropped from the list of possible sites for the atomic accelerator while California remains on the list of six remaining sites to be considered. This atomic accelerator requires large amounts of cooling water. Wouldn't it be ironic if we ended up cooling the installation—but not having it?

One point that needs to be made clear is that amounts of water flowing in the Columbia can vary. Sometimes to extremes. For example, the annual average is 168.3 million acre feet. Yet, in 1926, the flow was only 85.5 million acre feet; in 1931, it was 88.4 million; and, once every 150 years, it drops below 70 million acre feet. Such extremes will occur again.

Now, presuming we have diversion going on during such an extremely low water period, who would turn off the faucet? Would the Southwest farmer be content to do without water for that one year? I doubt it!

THE INTERNATIONAL ISSUE

There has been seemingly little attention paid to the international aspects of this whole idea of diversion from one water basin to another.

Almost one-third of the Columbia River's flow—50 million acre feet a year—comes from Canada! The principle of discussions with Canada on development of this international waterway is well established.

In 1961, the U.S. signed a rather comprehensive treaty with Canada on development of the Columbia River basin. It is headed "The Columbia Treaty"—and then says "Treaty Between Canada and The United States of America Relating to Cooperative Development of the Water Resources of The Columbia River Basin."

In Article II, Part I, it says, "Canada shall provide in the Columbia River basin in Canada 15,500,000 acre feet of storage usable for improving the flow of the Columbia River."

In 1964, under an additional agreement with Canada made a part of the treaty, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the state of Washington (Columbia Storage Power Exchange) was required to pay to Canada $254.4 million for the following storages to be built in and by Canada:

The Duncan Lake Storage, to be in operation by April 1, 1968;

The Arrow Lakes Storage, by April 1, 1969;

And The Mica Creek Storage, by April 1, 1973.

Section B of the treaty, referring to the above storage development, says:

"Under the terms of the treaty, Canada is entitled to receive from the United States one half of the annual average usable energy and one half of the dependable hydroelectric capacity which can be realized in the United States each year as a result of use of the improved stream flow on the Columbia River created by storage to be constructed in Canada."

It is, therefore, obvious that Canada and the Southwest both have a very real interest in our ability to continue as a dependable source of power.

The United States and Canada have worked closely together in determining to fully develop the Columbia River *in its natural basin*. It has been the majority opinion, in discussions between Canada and the United States, that the Columbia River could be best used within its own international watershed. *Certainly, then, in the interest of international accord, there should be no diversion of water without discussions with Canada.*

It was recognized many years ago when discussions were started on the 1961 treaty with Canada that these storage areas for over 15 million acre feet of water a year were needed to improve the water flow in the Columbia. Therefore, is it any wonder that planners meet with consternation the idea of diverting that much water back out of the Columbia stream flow to irrigate land over 1,000 miles away.

Canada has her own water problems. While she has one fourth of the entire world's storage capacity of water in her many lakes, one third of Canada's water is international! She has half again as much fresh water flowing into the ocean as all of the U.S. does.

In spite of this wealth of water, the province of Saskatchewan is a water short area—as are other Canadian areas. There are two rivers flowing in this province with a total of 13 million acre feet, yet they know they will need twice this much by 1990—and probably sooner.

Considering these facts, is it any wonder that Canada hesitates making long range water commitments until they know better what their own needs will be? However, they are seriously concerned about the needs of the U.S., and we must freely discuss with them any plans for water diversion to the Southwest.

PROBLEMS FACING DIVERSION

Clearly the question of diversion is a complex one, and the problems are many and varied. Lowering the streamflow in the Columbia basin would increase the pollution problem. Lowering the streamflow increases the water temperature; and, unless this problem can be solved—even without diversion—we are in grave danger of destroying the life in the Columbia.

Lowering the water level in the Columbia would also handicap shipping. After spending millions on a 40 ft. channel, why should we set this project back for many years?

The building of aqueducts to carry our water to the Southwest is a project estimated to take over 15 years. At today's accelerated pace in research, desalinization may experience a breakthrough at any time which would make the expenditure of billions of dollars for a diversion system a *monumental tribute to our lack of faith in modern science*.

Look at the facts! With the use of nuclear power, it is possible today to build a desalinization plant which will produce fresh water from salt water at a cost of 22¢ per thousand gallons—compared with over $1.00 per thousand only a short time ago. This is accomplished by refinement of presently known methods—not by waiting for dramatic new discoveries. And it is common knowledge that these dramatic breakthroughs may come at any time.

We, therefore, reach a conclusion. Instead of using billions of tax dollars on a diversion project which will benefit only one section of the nation, wouldn't these same tax dollars be better spent if we directed them toward the solution of the desalinization problem—which would benefit the water-hungry Southwest, the entire Eastern seaboard and, eventually, the entire world? Some of these tax dollars could perhaps be directed to weather modification, a science still in its infancy but holding the promise of many wonders to come.

POPULATION BRINGS PROBLEMS

When a person looks at California, he soon becomes filled with awe at the enormity of what has happened there in just the past generation. California is our most populous state. At the same time, it is our leading agricultural state. But, as with many states, it is faced with poorly distributed water.

Northern California has 80% of the state's water, while Southern California has 80% of the state's water need. Northern California discharges about 17 million acre feet of water into the ocean annually. Therefore, would it not be more economical to divert this water to the Southwest than it would to come all the way to Columbia River?

We in the Northwest cannot be unsympathetic toward's the Southwest's problems of booming population. We had better learn from their problems, because the Northwest is due to become the next area of booming population. We hopefully can avoid at least some of the pitfalls of unpreparedness.

Because the Northwest does not *consume* water as does the Southwest, they seemingly do not understand our almost *total use* of water for power, navigation, fisheries, recreation and natural beauty. This story must be told and retold of the havoc that could be created to our region just as it is poised to move into an era of unprecedented growth.

Let us suppose, for a moment, that diversion is a reality. The Southwest has been getting, say 15 million acre feet of Columbia River. Would their area not grow to consume and to *need* this extra water? It would—just as surely as a man increases his living standard as his pay goes up until he *needs* all he makes. Then what of the *next* 15 million acre feet that the Southwest would *need* once the previous amount becomes "just barely enough to cover necessities?"

The primary reason people and industry came to the Northwest is because we have water. After investing in homes and in industry, they have the right to assume that this natural resource will continue to be here. It may very well be true that we have not used our water to capacity—but we will! Who knows what our capacity is or will be? You may be assured that, in the future, we will be using water in ways which we have not even dreamed of at this time.

When you get right down to the heart of the situation, the Northwest owes the Southwest a debt of gratitude for making us reevaluate our precious water resource. It isn't until one is threatened with the loss of something that he truly begins to appreciate it.

SOUNDING THE ALARM

The Northwest needs a "Paul Revere type" organization to arouse its citizens to the danger facing us. We must hear from the water users, from industry, from the public in general.

It is my belief that the Portland Chamber of Commerce should accept that role of leadership. Not as an obstructionist group, but to see that Northwest interests are protected. To see that, if water is diverted, it is taken at the mouth of the Columbia and only then if such a system can be devised to protect fish and if salt water intrusion is not too great. If overland aqueducts are used, to see that upstream storage be created with enough capacity to cover the amount to be diverted in order to protect the Columbia streamflow.

Finally, we must see to it that Canadian interests are protected and that our relations with Canada are maintained at the high level of the past.

As Jack L. Meier, the 1966 president of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, said in his Blueprint for Portland's Progress . . .

"We need a definite policy on multiple water use which will serve the ultimate interests of Portland and the Pacific Northwest. All of us know that water is one of the Pacific Northwest's greatest resources. The water-hungry Southwest is casting longing eyes at our water. We should do with our water what will prove most beneficial to Portland and the Pacific Northwest. We must look ahead. We must lead and not be led."

Amen to that!

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 12, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 11, 1966:

THE JUDICIARY

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372, approved March 18, 1966.

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit, vice F. Ryan Duffy, retired.

Donald P. Lay, of Nebraska, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit, vice Harvey M. Johnsen, retired.

Ted Cabot, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372, approved March 18, 1966.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Wilfrid E. Johnson, of Washington, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1967, vice John Gorham Palfrey.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert R. Bowie, of Massachusetts, to be Counselor of the Department of State, vice Walt Whitman Rostow.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Frank C. Di Luzio, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. (New position.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Paul A. Miller, of West Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

IN THE 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 general

Lt. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton, O16960, Army of the United States (major general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Paul H. Ramsey, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

Major to lieutenant colonel

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Abbott, William H., FR36628.
Abolt, Warren G., FR35220.
Adair, Luther E., Jr., FR17299.
Adams, Donald D., FR17253.
Adams, Harry J., FR17539.
Adams, Kenneth D., FR35900.
Adams, Ranald T., Jr., FR17336.
Adcock, Roy D., FR25629.
Adcock, Walter M., FR36890.
Adden, William L., FR36333.
Ahlborn, Robert H., FR36379.
Ahrens, Herman C., Jr., FR35608.
Aldrich, Allen R., FR36314.
Alexander, James H., FR52291.
Alexander, Thomas D., FR36050.
Allard, Lionel C., Jr., FR24331.
Allen Lew, Jr., FR17342.
Allery, Kenneth E., FR36093.
Allison, John S., FR21479.
Allison, Robert M., FR52312.
Alloway, Hillard C., FR36167.
Almes, Guy C., FR36012.
Altiere, Fred J., FR36079.
Alverson, Henry A., FR37065.
Alverson, Richard C., FR36482.
Ambrose, Earle H., FR36335.
Ames, James R., FR35945.
Amos, Leon W., FR26830.
Anderson, Carroll R., FR36479.
Anderson, Donald L., FR36065.
Anderson, John B., FR36552.
Andrews, Robert J., FR52200.
Amenson, Lester N., FR52077.
Appel, Kenneth J., FR35970.
Arasmith, Lester L., FR35941.
Arentson, Robert M., FR52197.
Armer, Willis L., FR36774.
Armstrong, Lloyd R., FR36069.
Arnold, Hendrick J., FR36874.
Asher, Clifford L., FR52301.
Atkinson, Anderson W., FR17339.
Augustyn, Frank J., FR17308.
Austin, David A., FR26422.
Austin, Harold R., FR37040.
Austin, Louis C., Jr., FR36354.
Bachtell, Linford B., FR17989.
Bailey, Carl E., Jr., FR36152.
Bailey, Joseph D., FR21508.
Bain, James, FR36368.
Baisden, Orville R., FR24336.
Baker, Herman W., FR21475.
Baker, Richard D., FR36241.
Baker, Samuel E., FR36153.
Baldridge, William J., FR35996.
Ball, Harlan E., FR16694.
Ballard, James F., FR36609.
Bally, William J., Jr., FR36589.
Barker, Herbert R., FR36047.
Barker, Paul W., FR36196.
Barr, Thomas J., FR17307.
Barre, Louis A., III, FR20753.
Barrentine, Emmett S., Jr., FR27679.
Barricklow, John A., FR17370.
Barron, Thomas P., FR36554.
Barry, Russell J., FR20656.
Bartholf, John C., FR17502.
Bartlett, James B., FR52146.
Barton, Bernard H., FR36844.
Bass, Bernie S., FR36743.
Bassett, John K., FR17562.
Bates, Edgar A., Jr., FR36886.
Baumann, Lee S., FR36615.
Baxter, William D., FR17530.
Beam, John B., FR36695.
Bean, William S., FR37197.
Beane, Walter O., Jr., FR36021.
Beaumont, Charles R., Jr., FR36226.
Bechtold, Louis A., FR17259.
Beck, William J., FR36918.
Becker, William R., FR36373.
Beebe, Robert G., FR27694.
Beecham, Charles N., FR36626.
Behr, Robert M., FR21515.
Beinkemper, Elmer H., FR36513.
Bell, Donald F., FR37069.
Bell, Paul E., FR26466.
Bell, Woodrow M., FR36316.
Bellis, Benjamin N., FR17330.
Benedict, James E., III, FR36171.
Benit, Henry J., FR35982.
Bennett, Charles F., FR26666.
Bennett, Samuel L., FR37016.
Bennington, Lewis R., FR36850.
Benschine, Edward, Jr., FR36932.
Bensey, Clyde S., FR36579.
Benton, Ernest L., FR36608.
Berge, Truman K., FR17376.
Berneburg, Lavern L., FR36342.
Berry, John J., FR35830.
Berry, Waldron, FR17480.
Bieber, Robert W., FR17739.
Bilyeu, Hiram P., FR36204.
Birdsall, Alan H., FR17429.
Birkland, Robert K., FR35971.
Birtwistle, Owen G., FR52295.
Bishop, Robert M., FR35940.
Bjorgen, Leonard L., FR17270.
Blades, Leo L., FR17250.
Blanton, Clarence F., FR36336.
Blanton, Dwight W., FR36070.
Blanton, Eugene T., FR36526.
Blanton, William J., FR17553.
Bledsoe, Carroll H., FR22682.
Blessley, Rowland C. W., Jr., FR16929.
Bloom, John P., FR36713.
Bogo, Robert K., FR52287.
Bogan, Robert J., FR52287.
Boland, Thompson S., FR36595.
Bombyk, Stanley, FR52238.
Bordeaux, Lyle B., FR52268.
Boswell, Marion L., FR17719.
Bowman, Robert L., FR37096.
Boyce, Robert E., FR36157.
Boyd, Charles W., FR36505.
Boyd, Harwell L., Jr., FR37047.

Boyle, William F., FR17729.
Bozman, Dale A., FR36286.
Bradburn, David D., FR17335.
Bradford, Joseph E., FR36560.
Bradley, Richard W., FR37053.
Branch, Robert, Sr., FR36598.
Brant, Edward L., FR36023.
Brasseux, Emmett L., FR37072.
Brechwald, Edward J., FR17363.
Bresett, Charles K., FR51887.
Brewer, Harry E., FR36808.
Brewer, Martin M., FR36929.
Brewster, Ernest J., FR36351.
Briarton, Henry R., FR52321.
Bridge, Charles F., FR36804.
Briggs, John A., FR35959.
Brink, James N., FR36362.
Brock, George W., FR36950.
Brock, James E., FR35997.
Broderick, William P., FR36709.
Brookbank, William C., FR36523.
Brooks, Glenn L., FR36428.
Brothers, Will W., Jr., FR17359.
Brown, Cortez C., FR36654.
Brown, Elzie C., Jr., FR36008.
Brown, Frank B., FR35933.
Brown, Gordon S., FR36799.
Brown, Richard A., FR64409.
Brown, Russell J., FR36897.
Brownlee, Francis L., FR36967.
Bryan, Donald W., FR17302.
Buchanan, Allen E., FR36516.
Buckingham, Charles E., FR17483.
Buckley, James W., Jr., FR35460.
Buckley, Robert C., FR17352.
Buckner, James C., FR26763.
Bullock, Frederick E., FR52286.
Bunge, Howard T., FR17567.
Burcham, Lee A., FR17305.
Burda, Theodore A., FR36605.
Burger, Robert J., FR36914.
Burgess, Leon M., FR37019.
Burgess, Richard B., FR17353.
Burke, Arthur R., FR36324.
Burke, Robert O., FR17453.
Burkett, Daniel L., FR17571.
Burkhart, Morris C., FR36536.
Burkle, Henry, FR36999.
Burnett, Maurice G., FR52047.
Burnham, Robert E., FR37034.
Burnham, Welbon D., FR22640.
Burns, John J., FR28203.
Burns, Joseph, FR23334.
Burrell, Harry R., FR36384.
Burriss, Richard C., FR22641.
Burtenshaw, Edwar C., FR36164.
Butler, Thurman B., FR36951.
Caldwell, John W., III, FR36131.
Calfee, Fred H., FR36969.
Call, Clair R., FR36198.
Callahan, Charles, FR35762.
Calmes, William P., FR 25519.
Cameron, Carl C., FR 36832.
Cameron, William, III, FR39758.
Campbell, Harvey H., FR37105.
Campbell, James M., FR36195.
Campbell, Julian R., FR64399.
Campbell, Milton A., FR36624.
Caram, John C., FR52079.
Caramia, Dominick J., FR 36527.
Carbine, James T., Jr., FR17445.
Carey, Hobert L., FR36736.
Carlisle, Jason J., FR37086.
Carlsen, Carl R., FR36630.
Carnwright, Richard G., FR17455.
Carpenter, William W., Jr., FR26458.
Carper, Morris E., FR36210.
Carroll, Thomas L., FR17313.
Carson, James S., FR52255.
Carter, Jack E., FR36242.
Carter, Ray I., FR36263.
Caruthers, Marion F., FR 36145.
Casey, Maurice F., FR36992.
Castelli, Joseph R., FR76525.
Castle, Johnny R., FR17445.
Casto, Dayton C., Jr., FR36990.
Catching, Robert M., FR36525.
Cathcart, Charles E., FR17300.
Cerny, Louis C., FR36062.
Chambless, William F., Jr ., FR36114.
Champion, William H., FR36057.
Chandler, Van E., FR26427.
Chandler, Vernon L., 36449.
Chapman, Kenneth R., FR17362.
Chappell, William R., FR52056.
Charpilloz, Kenneth L., FR36346.
Chastain, John W., FR35907.
Chatfield, James D., FR17515.
Cheever, Charles T., FR36034.
Chille, Peter J., FR17231.
Chrisco, Sam D., FR36439.
Christensen, Keith L., FR22639.
Christian, William E., FR36436.
Chronis, George H., FR36645.
Clancy, Orville W., FR36620.
Clapper, Robert E., FR36910.
Clark, Carlton H., FR36122.
Clark, Charles R., FR36088.
Clark, Philip S., FR52264.
Clary, Barney H., FR36325.
Clemenson, Robert C., FR17365.
Clement, Lewis S., Jr., FR25820.
Cocks, Samuel W., FR36903.
Cogburn, Charles S., Jr., FR28190.
Coghlan, Jack V., Jr., FR36163.
Cohlmia, George V., FR36393.
Coke, Paul E., FR25500.
Cole, Frank E., FR17338.
Cole, James R., FR52256.
Coleman, James A., FR36617.
Colladay, Martin G., FR17344.
Collins, Billy C., FR36877.
Commins, Robert E., FR26672.
Conelly, Arthur B., FR36549.
Connor, Roy J., FR25624.
Connors, Arthur F., FR37157.
Cook, Harold L., FR35952.
Cook, William R., FR36350.
Coombs, Robert P., FR36849.
Cooper, Howard M., FR36553.
Corrao, Nicholas A., FR37109.
Cothern, Billie R., FR36861.
Cothran, Harold R., FR35913.
Cottrill, Ronald M., FR36255.
Counts, Dave, FR24718.
Covington, James C., FR37093
Cox, Joe C., FR35906.
Craner, Darrell S., FR22758.
Crawford, Cecil C., FR35856.
Crawford, Tom H., FR36445.
Creveling, Louis G., FR17318.
Crisman, Marcus B., FR24704.
Crisp, Harold N., Jr., FR17310.
Crook, Eugene M., FR52319.
Cross, Floyd E., FR36545.
Crowder, Lucien G., Jr., FR36518.
Crowley, Jerry N., Jr., FR35162.
Crutchfield, Silas M., Jr., FR35899.
Crysler, Richard D., FR36044.
Cunningham, Carl E., FR36181.
Curry, Ralph J., FR18245.
Curtis, Andrew R., Jr., FR28218.
Curtis, Philip E., FR36107.
Dahlem, Walter E., Jr., FR36115.
Dailey, Cole N., FR36543.
Dalferes, Georg L. J., FR48786.
Daniel, William T., FR36066.
Daniels, Robert W., FR22860.
Darmstandler, Harry M., FR36641.
Davis, Lawrence L., FR36786.
Day, Richard D., FR36257.
Daye, Thomas M., FR17518.
Dean, Orien G., Jr., FR36892.
Deatrick, Eugene P., Jr., FR17371.
Debord, Robert M., FR35512.
Deen, Grover C., FR36301.
Degenaro, Guy J., FR36311.
Delaney, Charles E., FR52285.
Demoody, Harold C., FR36042.
Deniston, Dale R., FR36901.
Denniston, Clyde R., Jr., FR17437.
Denny, Donald A., FR36870.
Denton, Edward P., FR36594.
Depaolis, Thomas A., FR36035.
Dewolf, James G., FR36390.
Dexter, Harry R., FR32709.
Deyhle, Roger E., FR36413.
Dickens, John W., FR36059.
Dickey, Philip A., Jr., FR36876.
Dillon, Leonard T., FR36715.
Dingeldein, Robert, FR17568.
Dipiero, Phil M., FR36733.
Disalvatore, William J., FR36696.
Disharoon, Jerry B., FR17230.
Dishuke, Jerry W., FR36692.
Dixon, Christopher P., FR52252.
Dixon, Von H., FR16727.
Dobbs, Charles E., FR20708.
Dodson, Robert W., FR16776.
Doherty, Albert M., FR36614.
Doll, George A. J., FR28321.
Dollar, James W., FR35912.
Doolittle, John P., FR17402.
Dorman, George S., FR17411.
Dosh, Robert N., Jr., FR17382.
Doswell, John P., FR25822.
Dotterer, Richard T., FR36735.
Doty, Erceal V., FR36752.
Downer, Charles P., FR36080.
Doyle, Donald R., FR36220.
Dragnich, Stanley W., FR36948.
Drake, Clarence H., FR36017.
Drake, Francis R., FR36687.
Draper, Russell C., FR17245.
Dreiseszun, Abraham J., FR36902.
Drenguis, John W., FR36885.
Drew, Adrian E., FR37125.
Driver, Loren F., FR52046.
Dukes, James L., FR52325.
Dulaney, Arthur A., Jr., FR35802.
Dulion, William E., FR37037.
Dunaway, Glendon K., FR69707.
Dunlap, John V., FR20723.
Dunlap, Lloyd L., Jr., FR17380.
Dupont, Forrest R., FR36273.
Duquette, Norman C., FR35523.
Durham, Ernest J., FR36587.
Durham, Nathan B., Jr., FR22770.
Duys, Dirk, FR36232.
Dwyer, George T., FR25512.
Dye Rufus, Jr., FR36943.
Dyer, Kenneth L., Jr., FR20717.
Easley, Frank, FR36317.
Eckhardt, Malcolm M., FR37045.
Edge, Robert L., FR17565.
Eichelberger, William R., FR17244.
Eisen, Charles K., FR36202.
Eisenhart, William E., FR36971.
Eklund, Robert G., FR27700.
Elbert, Edward A., Jr., FR52123.
Elliot, James S., FR37095.
Elliott, Michael B., FR23796.
Ellis, Patrick N., FR52231.
Ellis, Richard H., FR36867.
Ellis, Wood, FR36694.
Ellison, Paul R., FR35989.
Ellison, Thomas W., FR36452.
Elstun, Maurice, FR36278.
Elizroth, Nerlin S., FR36092.
Ensberg, Stanford A., FR35992.
Eskridge, James W., FR36936.
Evans, William J., FR17355.
Evans, William L., FR36453.
Evely, Clyde P., FR23738.
Everette, John B., FR17559.
Farady, John T., FR64420.
Farnsworth, Robert A., Jr., FR37058.
Farrell, Robert M., FR36648.
Fedele, Frank, FR48799.
Feeney, Dean R., FR36681.
Feibelman, Max M., FR17478.
Felger, Ralph W., FR36964.
Felices, Salvador E., FR17377.
Fels, Leslie R., FR25801.
Ferrato, Theodore P., FR22713.
Fiene, Walter W., FR36450.
Fink, John B., FR36156.
Finnie, William L., FR36182.
Fisher, Harry C., FR35157.
Fisher, Paul H., FR36862.
Fisher, Robert O., FR36159.
Flansaas, Glenn A., FR17261.
Fleek, Thomas A., FR36200.
Fletcher, Avon L., FR35461.
Flint, Cecil R., FR36330.
Flowers, Idus R., FR36253.
Floyd, Charles M., FR64421.
Fordham, Joseph T., FR35951.
Forsythe, Thomas H., FR36815.
Fortin, Edmond L., FR35927.
Foster, Everett E., FR37000.
Foster, Thomas G., FR36880.
Fouche, Marvin E., FR37011.
Fouquette, Richard H., FR35983.
Foust, William L., FR23690.

Fowler, Lawrence A., FR36386.
Fox, George A., FR17563.
Francis, Charles E., FR36140.
Franklin, R. C., Jr., FR36845.
French, James R., FR17528.
French, Lafayette, FR37075.
French, Willis M., FR36575.
Freshwater, Robert E., FR17522.
Freudenthal, Char H., FR36399.
Froebe, Leonard R., FR36888.
Fry, Wesley L., Jr., FR36588.
Fulgham, Edwin C., FR36563.
Fulton, Fitzhugh L., Jr., FR36417.
Fulwider, Richard B., FR36577.
Fuqua, Robert P., FR37092.
Furlow, Leo T., FR35969.
Gabbert, John H., FR36471.
Gahn, John W., FR23744.
Gaines, Edmund P., Jr., FR17558.
Gall, Herbert J., FR52316.
Gallagher, Walter J., FR36427.
Gallarda, William J., FR36920.
Galvin, Donald W., FR23886.
Garlington, Arthur, Jr., FR17545.
Garoni, Aldo E., FR36322.
Garrett, Clifford E., FR36813.
Garrett, John S., FR36704.
Gauch, Eugene W., Jr., FR35961.
Gauthier, Adelbert G., FR36457.
Gavey, Thomas W., FR35327.
Geller, Walter N., FR37074.
George, Richard S., FR36177.
Gering, George W., Jr., FR36801.
Ghormley, William G., FR26442.
Gibson, John S., FR36792.
Gibson, Ralph D., FR17284.
Gibson Winfield S., FR36407.
Giel, William G., FR37154.
Gilbert, Raymond H., Jr., FR18092.
Gilbert, William W., FR20738.
Gill, Gerald B., FR25797.
Gimmi, Richard F. B., Jr., FR21517.
Gippert, Winfield S., Jr., FR35931.
Giraudo, Joseph L., Jr., FR36639.
Giuli, John F., FR36933.
Gledhill, John W., Jr., FR36685.
Glen, Robert E., FR37094.
Glessner, James L., Jr., FR36778.
Glover, Kenneth B., FR36285.
Goldin, Sarah, FR21349.
Gonzalez, Santiago, FR36289.
Goodman, Joseph N., FR36356.
Goodnight, Elmer K., FR21495.
Gordon, Lawrence N., FR17467.
Gorman, Robert T., FR17361.
Goss, James L., FR36661.
Gottschalk, Dovre, FR35199.
Graalfs, Edward H., FR36465.
Graham, Sam, FR37057.
Grant, Harold E., FR36288.
Gray, Thomas A., FR64419.
Graybill, Harold L., FR28222.
Green, Jesse E., FR17447.
Green, Paul L., FR36168.
Greenwade, Paul V., Jr., FR37102.
Greenwood, Guither G., FR37099.
Greer, Orson P., Jr., FR37152.
Greget, Tony M., FR35946.
Grieder, Orville E., FR36722.
Griffard, Robert M., FR18264.
Griffin, Robert J., FR52304.
Griffith, James A., FR37090.
Griffith, Rolla E., FR36800.
Griffith, Weston F., FR37100.
Grimes, Daniel D., FR36432.
Grisson, Thomas R., FR36192.
Groons, Ray M., FR36944.
Gross, Kenneth E., FR18289.
Grossman, Frank H., FR52279.
Grossmiller, William J., III, FR17311.
Grosso, Gerard M., FR36717.
Grow, John W., Jr., FR36887.
Gulledge, Tom W., FR36749.
Gunvordahl, John W., FR36418.
Gustin, George, FR36865.
Guthrie, Bobbie G., FR27683.
Guthrie, Harold E., FR36444.
Guthrie, Keith R., FR49301.
Guynes, Joseph B., FR20743.
Gwynn, Robert W., FR37051.
Hackney, Donald I., FR17374.
Hafer, Frederick L., FR17341.
Haggard, Samuel R., FR64401.
Haggerty, Walter E., FR36292.
Hairston, Guy E., Jr., FR17432.
Hairston, Robert, III, FR36186.
Hale, Carl F., Jr., FR26787.
Hall, Clarence, Jr., FR35934.
Hamel, Robert E., FR20728.
Hamilton, James W., FR36578.
Hamilton, Percival B., FR48791.
Hamilton, Robert S., FR36381.
Hamm, William A., FR37193.
Hammer, Edson G., FR36490.
Hamner, Albert P., FR36209.
Hampton, Luther L., Jr., FR36691.
Haney, George W., FR35784.
Hanna, Keith C., FR22642.
Hannum, Robert R., FR36937.
Hardcastle, Frank L., FR23693.
Hardie, Robert L., FR36052.
Harding, Warren W., FR22685.
Hardy, Alan H., FR36738.
Hargarten, Richard A., FR36345.
Haring, Frederick C., FR36956.
Harkins, George F., FR36789.
Harmon, Carlos B., FR36313.
Harron, Russell A., Jr., FR37130.
Harris, Claude E., Jr., FR36806.
Harris, Edgar S., Jr., FR17505.
Harris, Robert M., Jr., FR36199.
Harris, Roy L., Jr., FR17560.
Hart, William M., FR37084.
Hartenberger, Edmund K., Jr., FR36089.
Hartman, Roy E., FR52118.
Hartzell, Richard A., FR17547.
Hawkins, Edward D., FR36271.
Haworth, Gordon C., FR36938.
Hayes, Louis W., FR36367.
Hayes, Thomas G., FR36916.
Haynes, Joseph V., FR36446.
Hays, Ralph M., FR36669.
Hazel, John H., FR36856.
Hazzard, Robert F., FR36305.
Head, Vernon L., FR36425.
Heath, Robert C., FR25813.
Hebert, Kenneth G., FR36029.
Heiberg, Harrison H. D., Jr., FR17368.
Heiberg, Lloyd C., FR52300.
Heine, Julian C., FR35450.
Helser, Loren E., FR52250.
Henderson, Fred H., Jr., FR36262.
Henderson, Joseph C., FR37114.
Henry, Harold F., Jr., FR37063.
Heyboer, Gerald T., FR36398.
Hicks, Arlie H., Jr., FR17531.
Hicks, Joseph W., Jr., FR36986.
Hicks, Robert D., Jr., FR36663.
Hildebrandt, James E., FR17351.
Hildebrandt, Oliver F., FR35357.
Hiley, James H., FR36438.
Hill, James E., FR20741.
Hill, Robert L., FR37115.
Hindsley, John A., FR36135.
Hines, Donald M., FR52283.
Hinson, Pat N., FR21494.
Hinton, John R., Jr., FR20691.
Hissem, Alan H., FR36939.
Hitchcock, James W., FR36566.
Hoerter, George J., FR35942.
Hoffs, Henry, FR36071.
Hogan, William H., FR36032.
Hoh, John E., FR36415.
Holladay, Robert L., Jr., FR35269.
Holmes, Robert E., FR36060.
Holton, William J., FR52274.
Holtorf, Arthur M., FR17279.
Holtz, Lorenz P., FR36500.
Holway, Orlando, III, FR16862.
Homich, George E., FR36320.
Honchul, Delbert, FR36698.
Hood, James D., FR37121.
Hopkins, James R., FR37029.
Hopkins, Philip B., Jr., FR17504.
Hopman, William F., FR36841.
Horne, Raymond E., Jr., FR20735.
Horton, Clarence F., Jr., FR17486.
Houck, John R., Sr., FR64411.
House, Charles D., FR36326.
Howell, Homer H., Jr., FR25783.
Howell, Philip V., Jr., FR17534.
Hoyer, Richard G., FR35915.
Hoyt, Thurber L., FR17233.
Hubbard, Charles H., FR36904.
Hubbes, Robert E., FR36302.
Hudiburgh, Sydney C., FR36478.
Hudlow, Richard J., FR17550.
Hudson, James D., FR24370.
Hudspeth, Edwin G., FR28223.
Hudspeth, Roy R., FR17472.
Huffer, Frank M., Jr., FR36054.
Huffman, Wallace E., FR36358.
Huggs, Edward C., FR36828.
Hughes, Jack L., FR36921.
Hughes, James D., FR17468.
Hulett, Charles E., FR36643.
Hunsberger, Harold D., FR36026.
Hunt, John H., FR36928.
Hunt, Merwyn A., FR36930.
Hunt, Ralph M., FR36538.
Hunt, Samuel R., FR36592.
Hunt, Senour, FR17405.
Hunter, Cedric V., FR17290.
Hunter, Guy N., FR37127.
Hunter, Willia J., Jr., FR36095.
Hurn, James L., FR17294.
Hutchins, Lavern C., FR24363.
Hutchinson, Raymond P., FR36376.
Hutchison, Thomas J., FR22801.
Hutchison, William C., FR36197.
Hutto, Merl G., FR17433.
Hyde, James R., FR17260.
Immig, Richard G., FR17309.
Inman, Benjamin F., FR37005.
Israelsen, Orson A., FR36469.
Jackson, Bush M., Jr., FR36061.
Jackson, Calvin W., FR49300.
Jackson, John W., FR17517.
Jackson, Lawrence, Jr., FR36291.
Jacobs, Albert, FR36281.
Jacobson, Bertram, FR48796.
Jacobson, Hilding L., Jr., FR36683.
Jacolick, Harvey T., FR36889.
James, Arthur H., FR52306.
James, Charles M., FR36401.
Janson, Alfred P., FR36604.
Jarmek, Edmund J., FR36481.
Jaudon, Robert H., FR36266.
Jeanes, Bill F., FR36239.
Jeffries, Jess E., FR36909.
Jewell, Harold R., FR17297.
Johnson, Dale A., FR37021.
Johnson, George A., FR24341.
Johnson, Ivan D., FR36010.
Johnson, Mark R., FR37057.
Johnson, Ralph W., FR36366.
Jolly, Warren M., FR25604.
Jones, Arthur M., FR17286.
Jones, Dale M., FR22781.
Jones, David M., FR36019.
Jones, Henry I., Jr., FR24368.
Jones, John P., Jr., FR37070.
Jones, Muller L., Jr., FR37044.
Jones, Murray O., FR36472.
Jones, William M., FR36151.
Jorgensen, Richard I., FR52181.
Joseph, Adolph D., Jr., FR17301.
Kaempfer, Robert E., FR36112.
Kaiser, Henry A., FR35938.
Kalb, Robert D., FR36879.
Kalessa, Russel R., FR36519.
Kaminski, Edward J., FR35972.
Karol, Joseph, FR36231.
Kartun, Milton R., FR35204.
Kasten, Nelson, FR22714.
Kasun, Nicholas J., Jr., FR36015.
Kaynor, Donald D., FR36451.
Keeter, Tom E., FR36300.
Keir, Robert E., FR64405.
Keith, Jack L., FR36073.
Keller, Floyd E., FR23712.
Kelley, Gordon L., FR36343.
Kellogg, Richard A., FR17431.
Kelly, Edwin E., FR64413.
Kelly, John K., Jr., FR35944.
Kelly, Thomas G., Jr., FR36723.
Kemp, Eugene A., FR36065.
Kendziora, Franklin C., FR37061.
Kennington, Joe T., FR36718.
Kent, James L., FR35702.
Keogh, Curtis R., FR36424.
Keriakou, Paris N., FR25511.
Keuthan, Charles H., FR24699.
Kienlen, Rodney T., FR36063.

Kilian, William F., FR52266.
Kimball, Jack Q., FR17426.
Kimball, Wesley D., FR52302.
Kimble, Robert C., FR26754.
King, Neil E., FR52064.
Kinney, Robert W., FR36129.
Kirby, Elwin G., FR23714.
Kirkland, Henry O., Jr., FR36132.
Kirkpatrick, Herman L., FR23853.
Kleber, Raymond B., FR52265.
Klein, Walter J., FR36783.
Klinger, Ralph R., Jr., FR17247.
Knapik, Delores M., FR21359.
Knowlton, Harold B., FR36369.
Kohn, Norman R., FR36327.
Kolb, James R., Jr., FR35974.
Koltz, Roger H., FR52315.
Korinek, Warren J., FR36118.
Korpanty, Leo S., FR24354.
Koshatka, Raymond, FR36090.
Koumdundouros, Nikolaus N., FR36596.
Kozelka, Paul, FR36795.
Kraker, Eddie C., FR36875.
Kramer, John C., FR36458.
Krauska, Thomas J., FR23186.
Kresge, Cletus C., FR36965.
Krieger, Thomas B., FR17538.
Kuhn, Coleman D., FR37031.
Kuntz, Scott A., FR16948.
Kutarnia, Robert P., FR36790.
Kutsch, Hubert A., FR36064.
Ladd, Herbert W., Jr., FR36884.
Lake, William J., FR36397.
Lake, Willis M., FR36125.
Laliberte, Robert C., FR36750.
Lamb, Charles M., Jr., FR17273.
Lamb, Thomas E., FR25495.
Lantz, John A., FR36190.
Lapping, Sherwood F., FR35914.
LaSalle, Louis W., FR36412.
Laseter, William H., FR36180.
Lavender, Emory C., Jr., FR17240.
Law, Jot B., FR48783.
Lawrence, August R., FR64415.
Lawrence, Keith L., FR36248.
Lebell, Jonah, FR19786.
Lecce, Albert J., FR36814.
Leibel, Louis L., FR36968.
Leighty, Claude C., FR35988.
Lembeck, Edward A. II, FR17451.
Lengnick, Roger H., FR17326.
Leonard, John H., FR28161.
Lester, Frank G., FR17367.
Leuchthann, Robert L., FR17564.
Lewis, C. J., FR28022.
Lien, Maurice L., FR36039.
Ligon, William C., FR36649.
Lillie, William H., Jr., FR36812.
Lindeman, Jack R., FR17314.
Lindow, Kenneth R., FR24371.
Lindsey, Paul N., FR36637.
Linn, John S., FR36802.
Little, Samuel J., Jr., FR37077.
Littlejohn, Don W., FR36217.
Loar, Matthew E., FR36583.
Lobdell, Harrison, Jr., FR17360.
Lock, Philip A., FR36847.
Lockee, Archie S., FR36104.
Lockhart, Charles L., FR35932.
Lockridge, Claren R., FR18298.
Loeffler, Robert M., FR36504.
Loftus, Marshall J., FR36353.
Loggins, James C., FR35975.
Lomax, Everit B., FR37113.
Lonsdale, John K., FR36411.
Loos, Raymond E., FR35963.
Loveless, William C., FR36078.
Lovett, John M., FR36489.
Lowry, Robert M., Jr., FR17420.
Lowry, Thomas J., Jr., FR36881.
Luby, Edward W., FR36855.
Lucas, Charles W., FR36221.
Ludeman, Roger B., FR36081.
Luebbert, Herman E., FR37013.
Luther, Joseph G., FR36989.
Lyles, Luther W., FR36097.
Lynn, Raymond H., FR36864.
Macia, James H., Jr., FR36621.
Mackie, Francis M., FR36570.
Maclellan, Donald, J., FR36006.
Macquesten, Frederick G., Jr., FR36510.
Macwilliams, Malcolm M., FR17396.
Madison, John E., FR24725.
Magers, Norman P., Jr., FR36805.
Magnan, Marn W., FR25204.
Magness, Gaylord W., FR36672.
Mahon, William J., FR25537.
Mancus, John R., FR36893.
Mand, Robert, FR36433.
Mankin, Alfred P., FR36830.
Mann, Frank W., Jr., FR36067.
Mansfield, John, FR36361.
Marinkovich, Obrad, FR36555.
Mark, Sherwood A., FR36076.
Marker, Stanley N., FR28329.
Markey, James R., FR52296.
Markowitz, Israel B., FR36751.
Markussen, Orlin H., FR36866.
Marquardt, Elden G., FR24262.
Marrkand, Paul J., FR36460.
Marsh, Wesley C., FR23007.
Martin, John A., FR17507.
Martinez, Cesar J., FR36127.
Marx, Albert B., FR37006.
Mason, Arno R., FR35965.
Mason, William H., FR17508.
Massey, Harold, FR35219.
Masters, Allen A., FR52310.
Mathews, Hughie E., FR36934.
Mathewson, Tracy B., III, FR36690.
Matthew, Harry L., FR36702.
Mauck, John F., FR36629.
Maxwell, Joseph B., FR36526.
May, Edward S., FR18301.
Maykut, Edward S., FR36084.
McBain, Gordon D., Jr., FR36714.
McBride, Benjamin R., FR17424.
McBurney, Raplee Y., FR36700.
McCain, William M., FR36600.
McCann, John G., FR36205.
McCary, Benjamin C., Jr., FR36747.
McCleary, George C., FR17735.
McClelland, Clifton A., FR36708.
McClinton, James L., FR36147.
McCormick, Howard E., FR20744.
McCormick, John C., FR35386.
McCormick, Thomas W., FR36495.
McCracken, Robert L., FR36344.
McCrea, Gerald D., FR36707.
McCreary, Harry A., FR36416.
McCullough, Willi N., FR52323.
McCully, Robert H., FR18274.
McCurdy, Norman R., FR17556.
McDaniel, Ralph E., FR37068.
McDannel, William W., FR36660.
McDonald, Robert J., FR36260.
McDowell, Gildas D., FR36511.
McEwen, Dale R., FR36705.
McGee, Horris W., FR36872.
McGovern, Francis J., FR36935.
McGrew, Gale I., FR56541.
McGuire, Harold J. A., FR36043.
McKamy, James H., FR36150.
McKinney, Joseph T., FR17323.
McLain, Herbert W., FR37030.
McMann, Ira H. S., FR36447.
McManus, Leonard M., FR36146.
McMichael, Julian A., Jr., FR37064.
McMillan, Cornelius, FR17492.
McMillan, Edward H., Jr., FR35904.
McMillin, Charles L., FR35515.
McMullin, Joseph B., FR32405.
McPherson, Daniel E., Jr., FR17907.
McRobbie, William A. D., FR36502.
Mead, Bobby J., FR52135.
Means, Harwood F., FR36561.
Meehan, Thomas F., FR36030.
Mejaski, Joseph W., FR36454.
Melendez, Michael J., FR17252.
Memminger, Charles G., FR17499.
Mendenhall, Keith S., FR36820.
Merz, Charles F., FR35956.
Meserow, Joseph T., FR36720.
Messer, James T., FR36565.
Messher, Eugene J., FR17289.
Metcalf, James D., Jr., FR36048.
Meyers, Harold B., FR35750.
Meyers, Roy L., FR17264.
Michaelis, Donald R., FR35984.
Michell, Irvin E., FR36619.
Mikkelsen, Jack A., FR36051.
Millard, Howard W., FR36911.
Miller, Charles E., FR36408.
Miller, Clement K., FR36267.
Miller, Donald D., FR36086.
Miller, Edward W., FR36409.
Miller, George K., FR52308.
Miller, Jerome L., FR36837.
Miller, Julius D., FR64407.
Miller, Winston G., FR64400.
Mills, Bruce E., FR64391.
Mims, John W., FR37046.
Minnich, E. Scott, FR17462.
Minor, John M., FR17415.
Mitchell, Jerry, Jr., FR64412.
Mitchell, John O., FR36550.
Mitchell, Robert V., Sr., FR36603.
Mock, Theodore E., FR22724.
Moebius, Homer N., FR36942.
Moffatt, John S., FR36499.
Molchan, John E., FR17391.
Mold, David T., FR36878.
Molesworth, Frank, FR35897.
Molnar, George, FR36149.
Moody, George W., FR48795.
Moon, Howard E., FR36461.
Moore, Arthur R., Jr., FR17475.
Moore, Elbert L., Jr., FR36448.
Moore, Harry Z., FR52263.
Moore, James A., FR36477.
Moore, Marvin F., FR36769.
Moore, Maury K., FR36983.
Moore, Raymond P., Jr., FR51951.
Morgan, John P., Jr., FR36188.
Morin, Ernest N., FR37020.
Morris, Dryden E., FR36556.
Morris, Edward D., FR36279.
Morris, George H., FR25776.
Morris, Jack B., FR24326.
Morris, Thomas W., FR36900.
Morrison, Charles M., FR36148.
Morrow, James H., FR36113.
Mortensen, Eldon D., FR52289.
Morton, Oakley K., II, FR36143.
Moser, Willie R., FR36277.
Mosier, Perley L., FR36972.
Moulton, Ralph R., FR36601.
Moye, Russell D., FR36540.
Mueller, Delbert L., 36842.
Mulcahy, William J., FR22798.
Mulddon, Dennis, FR36303.
Mull, Glen D., FR52269.
Mullen, Everett J., Jr., FR36355.
Murphy, Arthur B., FR37010.
Murphy, James S., FR37080.
Murphy, Robert B., FR36456.
Murphy, Robert D., FR17526.
Murphy, Walter S., FR36611.
Murphy, Warren G., FR36191.
Murphy, William J., Jr., FR22681.
Mutch, Alex Y., FR17295.
Nadon, Norman C., FR28207.
Nakis, George M., FR36810.
Naleid, Jerome F., FR17334.
Naler, James D., FR37038.
Neal, Perry W., FR36679.
Neal, Windell W., FR36656.
Nealon, John F., FR35995.
Nedbal, Charles F., FR36382.
Neff, Benjamin G., FR17280.
Nelsen, Raymond Z., Jr., FR36506.
Nelson, Alfred J., FR35947.
Nelson, Beryl E., FR17112.
Nelson, George J., FR17491.
Nelson, Michael S., FR36730.
Nelson, Milton E., FR26782.
Nelson, Omer C., FR35935.
Nelson, Thomas O., FR17242.
Nemetz, Albert M., FR17414.
Newby, Warner E., FR37082.
Newell, Richard G., FR17484.
Newfield, Lou K., Jr., FR36462.
Newhouse, Norris H., FR36124.
Newson, Thomas L., FR23882.
Nichols, Joseph C., Jr., FR20699.
Nicholson, Gilbert D., FR28205.
Nickelson, Marvin F., FR52260.
Nicol, Thomas E., FR37122.
Nixon, Alva E., FR36194.
Norris, Paul M., FR17510.
Norwood, Billie J., FR17525.
Nostdal, James O., FR36988.
Novy, James S., FR35965.
Nuessle, Harry C., FR37004.
Nunes, Arthur R., FR35894.

Nunez, Raul, FR23751.
Nyhous, Gordon B., FR36896.
Obarski, Stanley J., FR36371.
O'Connell, William F., FR48782.
O'Connor, John T., FR36761.
O'Connor, Theodore J., FR36165.
O'Connor, Thomas F. X., FR36372.
Odenthal, Warren M., FR26764.
Oechsler, Robert H., FR26438.
Ohmann, Duane F., FR36824.
Olds, Roger H., FR52326.
O'Leary, James P., FR36405.
Oliver, Jeptha D., Jr., FR36243.
Opfer, David H. E., FR36869.
Osterhus, Peter C., FR35909.
Osver, Sam L., FR37003.
Oswald, Louis A., FR36970.
Ottem, Gerald A., FR36868.
Ouder, Melvin L., FR23010.
Overton, Thomas L., FR36955.
Owens, Kenneth A., FR35699.
Owens, Merlin R., FR35896.
Pace, John D., FR36613.
Pace, Robert E., FR22710.
Paige, Leroy D., FR24724.
Palenscar, Alexander J., Jr., FR48787.
Palmer, William R., FR36632.
Pappas, Antonio S., FR36455.
Paradise, Alfred A., FR36174.
Park, Paris D., Jr., FR36250.
Parker, John M., FR36475.
Parker, Levin W., Jr., FR26460.
Parr, Ralph S., FR28206.
Parrott, William H., FR36732.
Parry, Thomas B., FR36791.
Parsons, Charles H., FR17514.
Paschall, James E., FR17427.
Pasenhofer, Arlo H., FR20696.
Pasqualicchio, Robert P., FR36766.
Pate, Ernest W., FR35898.
Patrick, Harold L., FR36725.
Patrick, James T., FR36827.
Patterson, Charles L., FR52275.
Pattison, John D., FR36406.
Payton, Harold J., FR37014.
Pear, Charles E., FR36251.
Pearson, James N., FR36184.
Peck, Waldo W., FR36395.
Pendergraft, Wesley L., FR18242.
Penix, Guymon, FR35118.
Pennington, Charles E., FR36531.
Pennington, Ralph H., FR62091.
Perkinson, Julian E., FR36223.
Perks, William R., FR36984.
Perris, Walter H., FR36987.
Perry, Clyde A., FR51994.
Perry, Jack R., FR36787.
Perry, Norman F., FR36503.
Perry, Robert E., FR36082.
Peterson, Charles H., FR37120.
Peterson, Harry W., FR18275.
Peterson, Robert D., FR36212.
Petty, Cecil E., FR64417.
Pfeffer, Frank A., FR36819.
Phelan, James, FR36496.
Picarelli, Rudolph R., FR36420.
Pine, Forrest S., FR24323.
Pittaway, James W., FR36846.
Pitts, John E., Jr., FR17406.
Planinac, John W., FR26318.
Plank, David H., FR17417.
Planta, Edward A., FR36560.
Plowden, William M., FR36676.
Poe, Bryce II, FR17393.
Pohl, Nelson O., FR23709.
Pool, Sam J., FR36247.
Popp, Russell A., FR36771.
Portaluppi, Charles J., FR36387.
Portt, Glen A., FR52311.
Posselt, Gale V., FR36533.
Post, Gerald J., FR24707.
Potter, Davis B., FR36003.
Poutre, Rex L., FR36535.
Powell, Wade N., FR35910.
Prestin, Carl B., FR48773.
Preston, Charles F., FR36272.
Prevost, Herbert L., FR36760.
Prieve, Donald G., FR23743.
Prince, Tony, Jr., FR35925.
Provencio, Juan J., FR36547.
Pruett, Murphy A., FR37083.
Pugmire, Glen L., FR36119.
Purdy, Robert F., FR36532.
Putman, Earl E., FR52305.
Ramsey, Charles E., Jr., FR37111.
Rankin, Allan P., FR36068.
Ransel, Alfred S., FR36871.
Ransom, Jerald J., FR36421.
Rapley, Herbert J., FR36520.
Rapp, John W., FR25726.
Readdut, Clifford H., FR36329.
Reding, John A., FR36599.
Reed, George M., FR36977.
Reed, Junior B., FR36109.
Reed, William P., FR17454.
Reese, Harold E., FR35130.
Reeter, William E., FR36991.
Reeves, Alton P., FR37132.
Reeves, Merrit A., FR36360.
Reinhard, Charles W., FR36033.
Reinhart, Arthur S., FR36319.
Reisinger, William J., FR36782.
Remaklus, Theobol G., FR35993.
Rentschler, Victor R. T., FR36779.
Revel, Russel J., FR36502.
Reynolds, Robert R., FR36925.
Rhoades, Maynard R., FR36094.
Rhodes, Dome S., FR36005.
Riach, John B., FR36169.
Riave, Lionel L., FR41289.
Rice, Franklin C., FR36403.
Rice, John G., FR36394.
Rice, Warren H., FR36139.
Richards, Marion R., FR17430.
Richards, Paul M., FR36908.
Richardson, Vernon B., FR36265.
Richardson, William G., FR37534.
Ricketts, James E., Jr., FR17543.
Ridgway, Clifton S., FR36959.
Ridler, George E., FR36002.
Riess, Donald A., FR28333.
Riggs, Charles E., Jr., FR36941.
Ritchason, Alfred C., FR36770.
Ritchie, Nelson C., FR36467.
Ritter, Elvador E., FR36528.
Rivenbark, Thomas H., FR35953.
Robb, Francis J., FR36607.
Roberson, John F., FR36706.
Robinson, Noel K., FR36310.
Robinson, Ray A., Jr., FR23528.
Rochelle, Joseph B., Jr., FR27106.
Rockwood, Charles L., FR36863.
Rockwood, William P., FR36716.
Roeder, Victor H., FR36544.
Roffinoli, Louis J., FR36072.
Rogers, Walter W., FR25527.
Rogers, William J., FR36138.
Rohlfs, Robert D., FR52267.
Romero, James E., Jr., FR36213.
Romey, William R., FR17503.
Rose, Alvin S., FR36014.
Rose, Jesse L., FR36077.
Rose, John M., Jr., FR24398.
Rosenow, John J., FR35994.
Ross, Herbert E., FR36339.
Rossing, Arthur T., FR26436.
Rothwell, Ian D., FR36728.
Rottmann, Carl W., Jr., FR36486.
Rouse, James L., FR36193.
Rowdon, Earle J., FR36668.
Roy, A. J., FR36731.
Roy, Carl W., FR17572.
Ruggiero, Charles, Jr., FR17487.
Ruley, Charles H., FR36757.
Runyan, Jack E., FR35921.
Ruoff, Edwin E., FR21492.
Russell, Durward B., Jr., FR51941.
Ruth, Cecil, FR36442.
Sachanen, Felix, FR36809.
Sadek, Louis C., FR37042.
Sadler, Robert E., FR17561.
Safford, Philip R., FR17439.
Salmon, Donald K., FR52281.
Sanders, Henry G., FR37026.
Sanderson, Robert W., FR36541.
Sandin, Edward E., FR36106.
Sargen, Charles N., FR52297.
Saunders, William F., FR36739.
Saurer, Richard H., FR36905.
Sauvage, Russell E., FR36404.
Saylor, Warren D., FR20637.
Schaefer, Raymond P., FR36363.
Schafer, Seymour N., FR36658.
Scherler, Arnold E., FR23697.
Schiess, Francis C., FR36606.
Schmitt, John J., Jr., FR17470.
Schneiderhan, William J., FR36612.
Scholz, Nicholas J., FR36501.
Schoonover, Orville G., FR17238.
Schreiner, Joseph B., FR37056.
Schrom, Robert C., FR36476.
Schuh, Robert C., FR36402.
Schulz, Richard G., FR36689.
Schwab, Samuel G., FR36557.
Scott, Elgin W., Jr., FR36836.
Searle, Joseph W., FR36546.
Sears, Phillip F., FR36238.
Seay, Richard W., FR36038.
Seccomb, Milo L., Jr., FR36833.
Seeman, Ralph T., FR36234.
Self, David A., Jr., FR17151.
Senkbeil, Edwin A., FR37133.
Senter, Lee R., FR36825.
Sexton, Roy D., FR26677.
Shackley, George G., FR36982.
Shamblin, Austin L., FR36840.
Shanahan, Roger T., FR36599.
Shannon, William E., FR21802.
Sharkey, Howard C., FR36201.
Sharkoff, Eugene G., FR71067.
Sharp, Paul E., FR37091.
Sharp, Paul H., FR36233.
Sharp, Savell L., FR36559.
Shattuck, Jack B., FR37009.
Shawe, Hamilton B., Jr., FR17395.
Shay, Francis S., FR36764.
Shearer, William D., FR52248.
Sheehan, Danie J., Jr., FR16675.
Sheppard, Harry A., FR36101.
Sheppard, Walter L., Jr., FR36777.
Sherrell, Walter J., FR36422.
Sherrill, Alvan C., Jr., FR35917.
Shinn, Homer R., FR37110.
Shockley, Gene W., FR36230.
Shrawder, Gerald R., FR36729.
Shriner, Frederick F., FR36781.
Shuler, Lucien B., FR20768.
Shupe, Bennie A., 17241.
Sielbeck, Lloyd W., FR35977.
Sigman, Isiah, FR36657.
Silva, Anthony, FR35374.
Simmons, Don E., FR36590.
Simmons, Herschel E., FR52002.
Simmons, James A., FR17282.
Simonson, Clifford W., FR52328.
Sinsabaugh, Robert M., FR35987.
Skaggs, Alvin D., FR23931.
Skladzien, Thaddeus S., FR17460.
Slaughter, James M., FR36120.
Sleeper, John, Jr., FR36678.
Smedberg, Renwick W., FR37156.
Smith, Carl D., Jr., FR64416.
Smith, Cecil L., FR36551.
Smith, Charles A., FR17276.
Smith, Clarence R., FR36684.
Smith, Forrest L., FR36753.
Smith, Gilbert A., Jr., FR36794.
Smith, Harry B., FR20727.
Smith, James S., FR37035.
Smith, Paul A., FR36997.
Smith, Robert C., FR36530.
Smith, Stanley C., FR36664.
Smith, Walter A., Jr., FR17574.
Smithson, Daryl P., FR17267.
Snyder, John W., FR36027.
Snyder, Robert W., Jr., FR36256.
Sonderman, Clarence H., Jr., FR35908.
Soucie, George E., FR35949.
Sowell, Jesse D., FR36207.
Sowers, Robert L., FR52273.
Spain, DeWitt S., FR36000.
Spalding, John R., Jr., FR36711.
Spencer, William R., FR36392.
Spicer, Garland H., Jr., FR25789.
Staley, Ray C., FR20742.
Starker, William A., FR36697.
Starr, William R., FR64501.
Steele, Leonard H., FR20740.
Stees, Hubert S., Jr., FR17513.
Stein, Milton, FR36329.
Steiner, Floyd D., FR36219.
Steiner, Philip, FR22844.
Stepanian, Stephen, FR36831.
Stephenson, Or W., Jr., FR36821.
Stephenson, Ralph, FR64402.

Sterling, Raymond N., FR36699.
Stern, Nathan, FR36912.
Stevens, David B., FR24572.
Stevens, Jack D., FR20679.
Stewart, Emmett F., FR36282.
Stewart, Robert B., FR17322.
Stillwell, Howard A., FR52294.
Stippich, Robert C., FR37041.
Stockton, Lyle E., FR17275.
Stoddard, Loren A., FR36616.
Stoesser, Robert E., FR52088.
Stoneberger, Harold W., FR23699.
Strain, Bailey T., FR17320.
Strand, John H., FR22858.
Strate, Sterling J., FR36307.
Strating, Robert E., FR52261.
Strickland, Bunyan D., Jr., FR36848.
Strickland, Joseph M., FR36573.
Stringer, Elbert M., FR17423.
Strom, Edwin W., FR36569.
Stroud, Roy W., FR42071.
Studak, Joseph W., Jr., FR36274.
Studer, William F., FR17332.
Sugerman, Leonard N., FR36666.
Sullivan, Joseph M., FR52196.
Sullivan, Mervin R., FR36096.
Sullivan, Michael W., FR36963.
Summers, Thomas L., FR37054.
Susskind, Harold A., FR52298.
Sutherland, Edward A., FR36954.
Swan, Harry C., FR36383.
Swank, Ellery E., FR20733.
Swanson, Arthur K., FR37131.
Swanson, William A., FR16695.
Sweeney, Francis J., Jr., FR36784.
Sweetnam, Richard W., FR36052.
Swift, John J., FR52277.
Swift, Mayland D., FR36667.
Sworn, Douglas L., FR36746.
Syester, Robert R., FR36388.
Tallman, Kenneth L., FR17337.
Tarr, George P., Jr., FR37036.
Tarrant, Edward W., FR17237.
Tauer, Otto S., FR36001.
Taylor, John H., FR52280.
Taylor, Robert L., FR20736.
Taylor, Robert W., FR26838.
Temple, Robert J., FR17248.
Temple, William A., FR17319.
Terry, Willard R., Jr., FR48790.
Theus, Lucius, FR18270.
Thomas, Charles P., FR36529.
Thomas, James M., FR37118.
Thomas, John E., FR52318.
Thomas, Onial A., FR23758.
Thompson, Clay E., Jr., FR36214.
Thompson, John D., FR26770.
Thompson, Leslie S., Jr., FR36494.
Thompson, Robert J., FR36772.
Thompson, Webb, FR52307.
Thompson, William D., FR20711.
Thornton, Ellison E., FR36767.
Thoson, James M., FR36859.
Thurman, George D., FR36625.
Tieman, August, FR36633.
Tinney, Jack R., FR36677.
Toburen, Robert D., FR37097.
Tony, Nicholas, FR21464.
Toolan, Frank J., FR36807.
Toon, Thomas A., Jr., FR36211.
Torvestad, Robert J., FR24268.
Tracey, John C., Jr., FR36304.
Trammell, James C., FR36237.
Trexler, David H., FR17527.
Trexler, Ernest J., FR36087.
Tribolet, Robert W., FR17404.
Trigg, William B., FR36378.
Trigg, William J., FR36178.
Trimble, Robert J., Jr., FR36410.
Turbyfill, Carl M., Jr., FR25518.
Turner, Arthur R., FR36252.
Turner, Gordon L., FR35905.
Turner, Joseph H., FR17537.
Turner, Richard H., FR18060.
Twitchell, Alvin, FR76841.
Tyndall, Joseph M., FR22803.
Uhalt, Joseph H., Jr., FR52317.
Umphress, Robert C., FR36298.
Underwood, Roberts L., FR64406.
Vancura, Arthur T., FR36780.
Vanmatre, David F., FR36024.
Vanpelt, Warren W., FR26429.
Vansickle, Earl R., FR17516.
Vargo, John H., FR36688.
Varney, Thomas S., FR35943.
Vega, John W., FR18250.
Velde, Theodore M., FR36305.
Ventres, Robert L., FR17234.
Vernon, Sheldon I., FR36703.
Vice, Carl R., FR363388.
Vidmer, Richards, Jr., FR17544.
Vik, Leonard F., FR36468.
Villone, Victor J., FR36203.
Vincent, John H., FR37017.
Voll, John J., FR22754.
Voss, John B., FR36811.
Walding, William H., FR22611.
Wale, Elmer G., FR36883.
Walker, John E., FR37007.
Walker, William L., FR37126.
Walsh, James H., Jr., FR52272.
Walsh, Robert A., FR17459.
Walters, Clarence D., Jr., FR28024.
Waple, Charles G., Jr., FR52290.
Ward, Dale B., FR36216.
Ware, Reuben M., FR37028.
Warndorf, James P., FR36981.
Warner, Paul A., FR52313.
Warren, Foster G., FR17566.
Washington, Fielding L., FR25603.
Wassner, William R., FR36340.
Watkins, Charles T., Jr., FR36013.
Watkins, Marvin M., FR17742.
Watson, Allan R., FR17258.
Watts, William G., Jr., FR23857.
Wayne, Robert E., FR17397.
Weatherford, Ross H., Jr., FR17288.
Weaver, Arthur D., FR36155.
Weaver, Horace A., FR35466.
Weber, George F., FR36245.
Weber, Marvin O., Jr., FR17461.
Wehrle, Joseph H., FR52329.
Weigelt, Winfred H., FR17278.
Weinbrenner, George R., FR36374.
Weingand, Paul G., FR36839.
Weishan, Gerald P., FR36227.
Weitner, Walter L., FR36765.
Weldon, James J., FR48768.
Werbeck, Donald L., FR18290.
Werlich, John D., FR36662.
Wesighan, Arthur E., FR35911.
Weston, Robert L., FR36759.
Weyhrich, Melvin P., FR23700.
Wheaton, Harry P., Jr., FR36187.
Wheeler, James I., FR23717.
Whistler, Charles F., FR37235.
White, Charles R., FR17533.
White, Jack E., FR36945.
White, Richard T., FR17418.
Wienecke, Edward R., FR23002.
Wilkinson, Stanley, Jr., FR36675.
Williams, David O., Jr., FR36634.
Williams, Durwood B., FR23750.
Willis, Richard G., FR36756.
Willis, William T., Jr., FR52286.
Willoughby, David J., FR36521.
Wilson, Clarence D., FR52104.
Wilson, Robert M., FR36308.
Winn, David W., FR36646.
Winsor, Willia J., Jr., FR37103.
Witt, James R., FR36437.
Witzel, Robert B., FR36744.
Wolf, Horace G., FR36680.
Wolf, Ray D., FR35930.
Wood, George D., FR37104.
Wood, Robert S., FR36644.
Woodrum, William C., FR36618.
Wortman, John J., FR17281.
Wright, Jerome D., FR37059.
Wright, Robert K., FR17348.
Wright, Robert W., FR36254.
Wrinkle, Jack H., FR36318.
Wyrosdick, Charles R., FR37234.
Yancey, William B., Jr., FR17476.
Yaw, Robert H., FR36754.
Yawn, Henry C. III, FR22735.
Yep, George, FR48789.
York, Charles J., FR37039.
Young, Kendall S., FR36493.
Youngblood, Winston S., FR36172.
Younger, Clyde W., Jr., FR22719.
Younger, Dale J., FR37232.
Younk, William E., FR36160.
Zaniewski, Felix, J., FR26685.
Zeh, Theodore G., Jr., FR17421.
Zeine, Donald A., FR25725.
Zemitis, John M., FR35957.
Zengel, John F. P., FR36952.
Zierden, Eugene H., FR52052.
Zutter, Leroy P., FR16525.
Zuppan, Lawrence L., Jr., FR17523.

CHAPLAINS

Alt, Eugene R., FR23202.
Bonner, Harold W., FR21865.
Brian, Sam E., FR48605.
Christensen, Morley W., FR55116.
Clemens, Eugene M., FR48606.
Delos, Bernard M., FR70979.
Dubose, Wilds S., Jr., FR48803.
Finneran, Michael J., FR20859.
Gaffney, Conrad J., FR48604.
Gilchrist, Frank J., FR48602.
Hoop, George E., FR21861.
Jellico, Thomas M., FR24681.
Levitan, Kalman L., FR23204.
Mulligan, Edward B., FR20860.
Prokopovitsch, John E., FR48601.
Puseman, Edmund A., FR21864.
Ray, Erwin, R., FR56411.
Saul, Laurence E., FR21862.
Shelton, David K., FR21863.
Shinn, Benjamin J., FR24680.
Shoemaker, William L., FR55114.
Spiewak, Stanley W., FR48600.

DENTAL CORPS

Buchholz, Robert E., FR27982.
Calomeni, Alexander A., FR23179.
Chappell, Robert P., FR26635.
Cornyn, John, FR27632.
Crouse, Vance L., FR26735.
Dirlam, James H., FR21765.
Freeborn, Carl H., FR32354.
Hayden, Max W., FR49699.
Hooker, Southern P., FR32353.
Julius, Loy L., FR23071.
Mahan, Charles J., FR24678.
Metts, Dewey H., Jr., FR26695.
Morris, Charles R., FR21852.
Prejean, Edward J., Jr., FR29277.
Riley, William D., Jr., FR26358.
Roy, Edward W., FR24676.
Sachsel, Arthur J., FR29278.
Salentine, Russell J., FR22407.
Schwatka, Charles T., Jr., FR21768.
Shuttee, Thomas S., FR23590.
Smolen, George, FR32570.
Snider, J. Martin, FR29651.
Stern, Roger O., FR29652.
Varrin, Rene D., FR25481.
Woodward, Hubert W., FR22977.

MEDICAL CORPS

Bralliar, Max B., FR25468.
Burba, William H., FR24212.
Cerha, Harry T., FR26693.
Chesney, Murhpy A., FR29808.
Digidvanni, Anthony J., FR25477.
Gipson, Edgar N., FR25646.
John, Joseph J., FR27975.
Peniston, William H., FR25636.
Smith, Milton J., FR29770.
Spada, Frank J., FR23067.
Staples, Pelhan J., Jr., FR23064.
Webster, John G., FR25658.
Wells, John C., Jr., FR26732.
Woltjen, Myron J., FR55905.

NURSE CORPS

Amton, Juliet M. D., FR22056.
Blount, Janice M., FR22040.
Carle, Martha, FR21145.
Chandler, Etta, FR22034.
Duplease, Margaret L., FR21180.
Emigh, Ona M., FR22054.
Erdmann, Marjorie B., FR21162.
Fornara, Josephine E., FR22020.
Garvin, Sara E., FR21045.
Guitrau, Genevieve D., FR26655.
Hedrick, Florence D., FR21166.
Hyatt, Delores I., FR21178.
Jones, Inez L., FR21164.
Lawrence, Evelyn N., FR22075.
McCloskey, Blanche A., FR22004.
Michelitsch, Anna V., FR21020.
Milroy, Lyla P., FR22069.

Pace, Lora J., FR21063.
Raglin, Alice H., FR22039.
Seaudt, Valeska B., FR21151.
Shefud, Rose M., FR22065.
Taylor, Bernice V., FR21112.
Wickstrum, Mary K., FR51566.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baker, Wesley A., FR48953.
Cahill, Daniel P., FR48944.
Cox, Sidney D., Jr., FR21875.
Crabb, Kirkham V., FR48948.
Dibona, Philip, FR21641.
Dykes, Leroy C., FR48942.
Haigler, Steven V., Jr., FR21638.
Herold, Paul A., FR48945.
Hilty, Eugene A., FR48956.
Liberson, Samuel, FR48946.
McChesney, Lambert W., Sr., FR48955.
McMahan, Philip E., FR48954.
Park, Arthur W., FR23077.
Payne, Carl N., FR48947.
Plock, William L., FR21639.
Shaw, John R., FR48941.
Snyder, Edward E., FR48943.

VETERINARY CORPS

Grau, William H., Jr., FR23073.
Griffin, Thomas P., FR23217.
Lang, Charles V., FR27530.

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Bodycomb, Joyce, FR20847.
Ellis, Mary C., FR49737.
Peterson, Robert L., FR48950.
Smith, Francis S., FR36854.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 11, 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on April 20, 1966, of Carl Cleveland to be postmaster at Quinhagak, in the State of Alaska.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Vice President Pays Tribute to Rev. Richard E. Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to submit for the RECORD a letter from Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in tribute to the late Reverend Dr. Richard E. Evans of the old Labor Temple, formerly located at East 14th Street and Second Avenue in New York City, which is part of my congressional district.

Vice President HUMPHREY's letter has been laminated and has been affixed in a place of honor in the Reverend Richard E. Evans Interfaith Meditation Room of the J.F.K. Library for Minorities, Inc., which is dedicated to the Nation's immigrants in the spirit of the book "A Nation of Immigrants," written by the late President John F. Kennedy.

The letter follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, May 25, 1966.

Mr. J. P. SOMMER,
Director, J.F.K. Library for Minorities, Inc., Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SOMMER: Please convey my greetings and congratulations on the dedication of the Reverend Richard E. Evans Interfaith Meditation Room. Its location is so very appropriate in the Library for Minorities which bears the immortal name of our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy. Dick Evans would have been so pleased to be remembered in this meaningful manner—which serves the cause of God and of human brotherhood. As Dick Evans' friend, as one who admired his humility, his spiritual dedication, his devotion to the Family of Man and to the cause of liberty and good will, I join with his many other friends and admirers in commending this fine occasion.

One of the greatest success stories in all the world consists of the contributions to our nation by immigrants of every background, every race, creed and color. By giving the foreign-born the opportunity to rise individually to their highest potential, America has enriched itself beyond measure—in intangibles as well as tangibly.

It is a fact—all too unfortunately, that at times in our history, America has not been fully true to its own ideals. There have been unhappy times of bigotry and intolerance. The door of discrimination has often been slammed in the face of many innocent people—native or foreign-born—merely because of the color of their skin, the temple of their worship, the land of their father's birth. Fortunately, our nation has turned the corner. Most of these regrettable situations have now been changed for the better. More corrective action is still to be taken. As you pause for prayer in this Interfaith Meditation Room may you—may all of us—take renewed strength from Dick Evans' great values. May you—may all of us—proceed to fulfill the highest principles of our respective faiths. By putting our creed into our daily deed, we will demonstrate our true devotion to the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. We will thus carry on in Dick Evans' inspiring memory.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Radio Station KLOL in Lincoln, Nebr., Honors Vietnam Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 4, 1966, KLOL radio in Lincoln, Nebr., devoted the entire broadcast day to saluting officers and men of the U.S.S. *Tortuga* and the armed helicopter detachment, Sea Wolf, of the 145th Aviation Battalion, operating from the flight deck of the *Tortuga*, both serving with the 7th Fleet along the coast of Vietnam. This special broadcast was recorded and rushed to the U.S.S. *Tortuga* and played back over the ship's public address system.

The *Tortuga*, a specialized Navy ship equipped with a flight and well deck, is stationed in the maze of river mouths where the Mekong River meets the South China Sea east of Saigon. The *Tortuga*, along with Sea Wolf, assists Vietnamese forces in the control of Communist river traffic.

All of the officers and men of the *Tortuga* and Sea Wolf were individually recognized during KLOL's special July 4 broadcast with many of the midwesterners receiving specially recorded messages from home. Officials of the various branches of the armed services and State and local government personalities also participated in this special recognition.

We, the people of Nebraska, invite all Americans to join us in paying tribute to the gallant men who represent our armed forces in war-torn Vietnam.

The Feast of SS. Cyril and Methodius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, as we mark the feast of SS. Cyril and Methodius, it is fitting to consider also the observance of Slovak independence. These two apostles of the Slavs in introducing Christianity in Slovakia in the middle of the ninth century, also brought in the idea of freedom to Slovakia. Since then, these brave and industrious people have clung as tenaciously to the tenets of Christianity as they have to the idea of freedom and independence. The Christianity thus preached in Slovakia by these two Byzantine missionaries became, in the course of centuries, the principal binding force among the Slovak people, the very core of their spiritual unity.

In the course of their turbulent history the Slovaks have preserved this spiritual unity. Unfortunately, however, they have not been as successful in retaining their national political freedom and unity. At the end of the First World War they united with the Czechs and formed the Czechoslovak Republic. In 1939 when the Czechoslovak Republic was broken up, then Slovaks proclaimed their independence, only to fall under the oppression of Nazi Germany. Since the end of the war they were once more united with the Czechs and today they enjoy some form of autonomy in the People's Republic of Czechoslovakia.

All loyal and patriotic Americans of Slovak descent have maintained some spiritual ties with the land of their Slovak forebears. Here in this great Republic they have appreciated the opportunities offered to them, and they have made the best of these opportunities. They have numerous welfare, educational, and philanthropic organizations, all of them rendering invaluable services