United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah and a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we come before Thee today in a time of great peril and difficulty which covers all the earth and affects all Thy children in it.

Because we in this Nation have a tremendous added responsibility given to us by our power and our wealth, we pray for wisdom to use that responsibility wisely. We pray for insight which will enable us to penetrate the fog of misunderstanding, of ignorance, of selfishness, and of every other evil thing, to the simple truths that are the essence, the gospel of truth. We pray for wisdom to apply those truths to these problems.

Most of all, we pray for courage to face up to the problems—the same kind of courage that rides with two wonderful Americans far above the earth at this time and that lies in the hearts of those unfortunate Americans who lie in prison, in an enemy's hands, pawns in his game of international power.

We ask a special blessing for them, and we ask that we may be blessed with courage to match theirs, with faith to follow the precepts that we know in our hearts are the essential keys to success; and do it in the name of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 20, 1966, was dispensed with.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, July 21, 1966, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 822. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in Wyoming to Clara Dozier Wire; and

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 19, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2999) to amend section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965; 79 Stat. 1068).

### WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Michael Kuzma to be postmaster at Columbus, Pa.

### REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of the Geological Survey of that Department concerning areas outside the national domain, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1966, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary-treasurer, American Federation of Musicians, transmitting a copy of a recommendation adopted by that organization, praying for the ratification of the international convention relating to the protection of performers' rights as respects recorded music, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### "PESTICIDES AND PUBLIC POLICY"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1379)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 27 of the 88th Congress as amended and extended by Senate Resolution 288 of the 88th Congress, I hereby submit a report entitled "Interagency Environmental Hazards Coordination—Pesticides and Public Policy," and ask that it be printed. The report was unanimously agreed to on July 19, 1966, by the full Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. President, this report is based on the findings and conclusions of the Committee on Government Operations after 2 years of hearings on the use of pesticides held by its Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization. The report is an effort to summarize the state of knowledge, analyze the public policy issues, and present a course of further study and action relating to pesticides. In conducting these hearings and preparing this report we found it much easier to deal with and understand the strictly technical questions than the broader implications—the questions of balancing the benefits and risks to our environment in a chemical age. And the ultimate question, the supreme interest, is hardest of all to answer: What is the total effect of a man-induced change in the environment on the quality and quantity of our civilization?

This ultimate question is what most concerned the late Rachel Carson. Pesticides are only one aspect of the problem of environmental pollution. As Miss Carson told the committee shortly before her untimely death:

> I have pointed out before, and I shall repeat now, that the problem of pesticides can be properly understood only in context, as part of the general introduction of harmful substances into the environment.

During the heated controversy over the use of pesticides in 1963–64 this broader concern often was overlooked. When asked if she would stop the use of pesticides—as her detractors had accused—Miss Carson told the committee:

> It would not be possible, even if we wished to do so, to eliminate all chemicals tomorrow. A great deal of the discussion of "Silent Spring" and of the issues has, as you say, been placed on an all-or-none basis, which is not correct. This is not what I advocated, sir. . . . What I have advocated is not the complete abandonment of chemical control. I think chemicals do have a place. In fact, I have cited with great approval the coordination of chemical and biological controls such as is applied in the apple orchards of Nova Scotia. . . . I think that instead of automatically reaching for the spray gun or calling in the spray planes, we must consider the whole problem. We must find out first whether there is any other method that can be used. If there is not, then we should use chemicals as sparingly and as selectively as we can, and we should use them in such a way that we do not destroy the controls that are built into the environment.

That is the ecological point of view of pest control, stated as simply and yet eloquently as only Miss Carson could. It is a point of view I share and it is toward the attainment of this broadened view of pest control that this report is directed. It is, then, more than a report on pesticides. It goes beyond the question of whether they are good or bad, beneficial or harmful and attempts to define the central public policy issue of the pesticide problem rather than rehashing all the technical issues. After all, it is the public policy question which ultimately must be decided by the people and their elected representatives. The technical questions are settled by the technicians.



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

What is that central issue? Stated simply it is how willfully to change our environment for the greatest good, for our society now and in the future. The concern of the hearings and this report is with the irony that for all their good, pesticides also constitute a potential hazard to individual health and are capable of contaminating our environment. Chemical pesticides kill pests because they are toxic, and because they are toxic some are also capable, in excessive dosages, of causing illness, even death, in people and wildlife. The problem is how to kill pests without endangering other forms of life.

The first question, then, was whether the present use of chemical pesticides constitutes a hazard to human health or to the productivity of our environment. The almost 4,000 pages of printed record is replete with evidence of harmful effects on fish, wildlife, birds, and beneficial insects. But what of humans? The committee concluded that no significant human health hazard exists today when the great benefits of disease control and food production are weighed against known hazards.

However, this raises the second question: Will the future increasing requirement for pest control constitute a hazard? The committee found that too little was known of the possible chronic effects of chemicals on man or other organisms. Future pest control, we concluded, must be accomplished with many alternative weapons, applied strategically in an integrated manner, as Miss Carson suggested in her testimony. The fact that no significant human health hazard has been detected to date does not constitute adequate proof that hazards will not be encountered in the future. No final answer is possible now but we must proceed to get the answer and we must proceed to strengthen some existing weak links in the pesticide management process if we are to avoid a "Silent Spring" in the future.

What are some of those weak links the committee found? We concluded, for instance, that the safe and proper application of chemical pesticides cannot be fully assured by "when used as directed" labeling. As pointed out in the report:

> There seems to be considerable opportunity for misapplication when the pesticide is used by the housewife, gardener, hired man, or when the user is illiterate or careless. In this case it is not up to the crop producer, it is up to the food inspector to detect the contamination. With 1 percent of the interstate food shipments being sampled, there is a reasonable chance that gross violations, extending over a large crop or for a period of time, will be discovered. But no FDA inspector stands between the consumer and the roadside market, the rose garden spray drift, and the kitchen insecticide on eating utensils. It has been well proven that the general public does not read the label before using economic poisons and is guided only by vague impressions picked up from safety tips on the television or whatever commonsense can contribute. The high mammalian toxicity of some common pesticides means that a really awesome responsibility is thrust on the amateur purchaser. This poses a grave challenge to safety education and suggests that in some cases, especially pesticides for non-food-crop use in the home, further restrictions on sale should be considered. There is a limit to the amount of information which can be put on a label. There is a limit to the degree which the writer of safety instructions can concoct directions which when followed will not allow a hazardous situation to develop. It seems excessive for Government and industry to say "It's up to you."

Another serious problem is the mobility of pesticides after they are applied, or from faulty waste disposal. As pointed out in the report:

> To label all incidents of contamination and pollution as accidents, mistakes, or ignorance of instructions may be technically correct but presents no solution to the problem. The mobility and stability of toxic chemicals combine to present serious hazards when they are placed in the environment uncontrolled or unknowingly . . . (Therefore we see) the desirability of using, insofar as possible, chemicals which have short lives and disappear through a decomposition route soon after accomplishing their purpose.

In addition the committee found that the changing pattern of application of economic poisons in modern life has resulted in a public health problem which transcends the use of these chemicals in agriculture, and that the diversity of application points, training of operators, label deficiencies and difficulty of detecting residues suggest that improved and uniform State laws will be needed in the future. For instance, the committee found:

> The efficient distribution of chemicals to control large, widespread populations of insect pests is made possible by the airplane . . . About half the States have laws of varying rigidity, but, in general, the aerial sprayer depends on county agents and farmers to tell him what and where to spray while he simply flies the airplane. It is quite a different matter when pesticides are dispensed from aircraft over a populated area, and the testimony was virtually unanimous that widespread community spraying should be eliminated except for well thought out public health purposes and even then only in an emergency. Such spraying may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy in the first place. More importantly it is extremely difficult to take into account the effect on persons weakened by age, illness or allergy. The risks to human life may be too great. Aerial spraying in urban areas should be drastically curtailed and allowed only under strict supervision by skilled ground personnel and pilots.

The committee concluded that any excess of pesticides over the minimum amount necessary to do the job must be avoided. As pointed out in the report:

> The hearings show there is much to be learned about the optimum amount of pesticide to apply, even when measured strictly in terms of economic value. Pesticides may be given undue credit for crop yields in certain cases. It is extremely difficult to ascribe a particular percentage to the prevention of insect damage. Weather still plays a principal role in determining crop yields * * *.
>
> The farmer may spray for protection against a certain insect only to have another pest, which is immune to the specific treatment used, do considerable damage. We need more knowledge in order to avoid "spraying by the calendar" or preventative pest control regardless of pest appearance * * *.
>
> Substantial pressures are on the side of excess application. Pesticides should only be applied when pest populations approach the level where significant crop loss will occur, the economic threshold.

Another weakness is that the sampling and analysis of 1 percent of interstate food shipments by FDA may not prove to be adequate in the future. As a matter of fact, the entire sampling and tolerance-setting system needs scrutiny. As pointed out in the report:

> If a certain concentration causes a barely noticeable effect in the test animal, then one hundredth of that dosage is adopted as the threshold in humans. This arbitrary arithmetic is the basis for establishing tolerance for pesticide residue in food. The hearings related animals differ in their susceptibility produced considerable evidence of the inadequacy of this technique. Some closely to the same agent by factors of 25 to 100. Also assessment of human differences due to illness, age, or allergy is very difficult.

These weak links in the pesticide management chain led the committee to additional questions and issues. What, for instance, can research do to provide better future pest control methods? The quantitative knowledge of the risks must be improved through expanded studies of human pharmacology. Public policy cannot be based on unknown risk, for too restrictive an approach will hamper agricultural economy and too lax regulation might lead to human tragedy. Research in ecology, performed in concert by many scientific disciplines, should be undertaken to reveal weaknesses of pests lending to new control methods; effects on nontarget organisms; consequences of environmental manipulation; and improved agricultural practice. As the committee pointed out:

> Human ecology is a major part (but only a part) of the research to be done. Our genetic makeup is fixed, but the effects of environment are subject to control and modification. Mankind is a very adaptive species, but there may be limits to our ability to respond and we should certainly know much more about the interplay of surrounding forces. Chemical contamination is just one of a group of factors which may exact an increasing toll on our society, individually and collectively. The effects of noise, crowding, and bright lights, along with radiation, automobile exhausts, and chemicals, are just as important to civilization as medicine and molecular biology.

Another question involves the role of the Federal Government in ecological management. In the United States the marketplace has been the historic test of the worth of products and ideas, even the sophisticated ones of advancing technology. However, such potent factors as ionizing radiation, pharmaceutical drugs, and chemical pesticides have long been recognized as beyond the ability of the individual to evaluate. Industry, even in its most enlightened phase, cannot be expected to have broad interests and responsibilities corresponding to the effects on our entire environment of these new factors. Government must preserve the environment and its resources and must protect its citizens. Also, 550 million acres of public land are administered by the Department of Interior. The Federal Government's role is apparent when hazardous or damaging environmental effects move widely throughout the country. Also, water and air pollution, and interstate food shipments, require sur-

veillance and regulation from Federal agencies. Furthermore, in the case of pesticides, the Federal Government, through its responsibilities to agriculture, public lands, recreation, and wildlife, is a developer and user of pesticides. Thus, when manmade disturbances spread across the country, only the Federal Government has sufficient jurisdiction to form policies in dealing with the effects.

The question of how much Federal control of chemicals is needed was considered. Governmental regulations deal with efficacy, safety in application, and surveillance against unexpected residues in the environment. The committee believes Federal controls should continue to seek to prevent misapplication and excessive use of potential environmental hazards; they should monitor the routes of ingress to humans to detect contamination. Federal agencies should advise individuals and institutions in planning the best management of chemicals, from manufacture through use to eventual removal from the biosphere. However, it is vital that regulations should not inhibit research or the application of new advances which may be beneficial in the light of future scientific judgment.

The hearings examined closely the question of what federally funded research is needed. Ecological management requires detailed knowledge in many fields, available in a time scale corresponding to the economic demand for new environmental manipulation. Federal funds are required to stimulate the research to acquire this capability and to coordinate the work, especially in the present period of overall limitations of scientific competence, funding, and facilities. Government research is needed to provide the basis for administration of pesticide laws, and for planning future Federal ecological management. Only at the Federal level can this be done. As the report states:

> The industry naturally was sensitive to the caricature devised by some of its critics. The chemical companies felt that industrial research had been tremendously successful in discovering cheap, effective pesticides and in working with the Department of Agriculture to enhance the economy of food and fibre production. Their testimony in the hearings dealt mostly with these accomplishments and there seemed to be little recognition of ecological problems.

Whether the Federal forces operating to change the environment are well coordinated was closely examined. This question of coordination is paramount in all current national programs which involve parts of the missions of several agencies and various sciences. Some form of interagency organization with more than advisory functions is necessary. Budgetary control is an efficient means of coordination. Reorganization or reassignment of some missions is indicated. Coordination of the research itself achieves better operational programs.

The analysis of these issues and questions, then, led the committee to two fundamental conclusions. First, despite the reassuring finding that the benefit-risk equation is presently in balance, the committee was also impressed by the fact that our large store of knowledge regarding the risk of chemical pesticides will have to be broadened and refined considerably in order to provide clear-cut answers to questions that will be raised by the increased need for pest control in the future. The conclusion drawn from the testimony is that the magnitude of the future risk is uncertain in many important areas. While some of the more gloomy prophecies that had been made could not be supported by hard scientific fact, it is also true that science could not and still cannot prove that some of these prophecies are untenable.

Second, the public debate over pesticides is but one facet of a wider debate which reflects a greater sensitivity to the fundamental questions raised by the continuing and accelerating pace of man's modification of his total environment. Pesticides are but one factor and we are increasingly aware that our environment is being altered even more dramatically by air and water pollution, atomic fallout and the population explosion. These are manifestations of the great issues of our time—man's relationship to the world around him. As we come to appreciate more keenly the significance of this vast, accelerating, irreversible alteration of our environment we recognize the need for stocktaking and the necessity of endeavoring to take into account all the multitude of complex relationships between man and his natural and artificial surroundings.

The committee also concluded that certain new laws and some changes in the administrative regulations and interagency coordination are needed.

The major legislative recommendations contained in the report would strengthen the present pesticide regulatory system and develop a more adequate basis for future national policy in environmental management.

Any doubts about the need for stronger regulation were dispelled by the Mississippi River fish kill case. Despite its scientific inadequacies that case pointed up the need for such regulation. The scientists may still be arguing about what killed the fish but the public policymaker must go beyond that discussion and ask himself: Are we doing all we can to prevent the contamination of our environment? The answer is obvious. We are not. For instance, a Department of Agriculture survey of the Mississippi River Delta revealed the following operations were common to most formulating and manufacturing industrial concerns handling the insecticide endrin and associated chlorinated hydrocarbons:

> Burning of used fiber chemical cartons adjacent to the plant or at municipal dumps which were located near a stream.
>
> Except in one case, no attempt was being made to neutralize plant effluent which might contain pesticides.
>
> Disposal of used metal drums, each containing a small amount of chemical, to cooperage companies where they are cleaned of chemical substances and sold for use in building floats, houseboats, and for other purposes in the delta.
>
> In addition, it was discovered that many drums were sold by the formulating plants to individuals for various uses; that drainage from waste dumps emptied into nearby streams; that many of the dumps were on the Mississippi River side of the levee; and that a basic pesticide manufacturing company emptied waste containing endrin into an industrial sewer system which flowed into a river leading to the Mississippi; wash water or solution from drum-cleaning operations entered into a city sewer.

The USDA report concluded that the "practices observed constitute a significant factor in the contamination of the Mississippi River with pesticides." Yet does the Department of Agriculture or any agency of the Federal Government have the power to inspect any of these plants? The answer is no. A plant manufacturing aspirin would be subject to such inspection, but plants producing some of the most toxic materials known to man are immune from Federal inspection.

The committee recommends that Congress enact legislation to prevent contamination of the environment by unintentional release of hazardous substances through industrial waste disposal, used containers, mislabeling, or faulty application. Such legislation should include registration with the Secretary of Agriculture of facilities for pesticide manufacture, compounding, processing or packaging; assurance of good operating practice and product quality control by factory inspection, sampling and analysis; provision for deeming misbranded any pesticide made in an unregistered or substandard facility; and Federal court injunction authority and penalties for enforcement of the law.

Such legislation is now pending before the Senate in the form of S. 2470 which I introduced last August. It is the administration's bill—suggested by the President, transmitted by the Secretary of Agriculture, supported by conservationists, civic groups and many others, and opposed—unequivocally they say—by the pesticide industry. I say it is time we passed such legislation. And that regulation of the pesticide industry be updated. We are operating under laws passed in 1947. It is time they were strengthened.

Another key recommendation is to establish, within the appropriate science based executive agency, a program to accumulate factual knowledge on the present and future status of the environment. As pointed out in the report:

> The clearest proof that man is intimately linked to other organisms and cannot be isolated from the ecosystem may be the response to the plight of birds and animals affected by the onrush of civilization. Pesticides bring up not only this threat but other serious considerations of how to conserve the beauty and usefulness of roadsides, parks, wilderness areas, and recreational facilities.

But we do not know the answers to these problems because they have never been viewed in their totality. A bill, S. 2282, introduced by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] would fill this void. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program of research, study and surveys, documentation, and description of the natural environmental systems of the United States for the purpose of understanding and evaluating the condition of these systems and to provide information to

those concerned with natural resources management.

In concluding the presentation of this report, Mr. President, let me say as an individual Senator that we live in a time of unusual, continuing change. The revolution in technology has produced new chemicals, new techniques, and new pollutants of our environment. The time is long past when we could be casual or unconcerned about the effect of our civilization and the growth of technology on our environment. All over the world, nations are beginning to encounter new phenomena—and new evidence that the very nature of Nature is changing. We must answer the basic question: Will man leave a scourge on this planet—or will he be a force for good? Only constant vigilance will safeguard our heritage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, because he is absent on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a brief summary prepared by Senator PEARSON concerning the report "Interagency Hazards Coordination—Pesticides and Public Policy," which has been filed today by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organization of the Committee on Government Operations, Senator RIBICOFF.

The report, which members unanimously approved, is an able summary of the hearings that the subcommittee began in the spring of 1963. Its objectives were to determine how effectively Government agencies coordinate regulation of the use of pesticides and to assess the balance between benefits obtained from this use and any environmental risks which society accepts in using them.

This is a well-balanced report. It says in essence that the benefit from pesticides clearly justifies continuing use, but it warns that we do not fully understand certain environmental changes resulting from this use.

Hence the report recommends greater care in application of pesticides. Further, it recommends that we pursue vigorous research both toward learning how best to apply pesticides so as least to endanger the environment and toward better understanding of their long-term environmental effect.

I want especially to congratulate the chairman [Mr. RIBICOFF] and Senator PEARSON, whose contributions were particularly outstanding. They conducted hearings during a period of notable public anxiety over any unintended effects of pesticides on human beings and wildlife and over the adequacy of Government safety regulations.

It is a credit to the subcommittee that these Senators conducted a thorough inquiry and subsequently were able mutually to assess the present role of chemical pesticides.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEARSON

The exhaustive investigations of the Subcommittee conclusively established that the present use of chemical pesticides do not constitute an environmental health hazard. Despite these reassuring findings as to present regulation and use of pesticides, however, the Committee concluded that the increased need for pest control in the future will require an expanded research and information exchange program to guarantee future balance of the benefit-risk equation and to assure continued public confidence.

At the same time, the study serves as a forceful reminder that without chemical pesticides, American food supply would be far less abundant, more expensive and of poorer quality than we now enjoy. There are also benefits from chemical pesticides in the eradication of disease carrying insects.

Thus, the committee's principal conclusion is that there is no reliable evidence to suggest that the benefit-risk equation is unbalanced in any significant way. The Committee found no evidence that chemical pesticides presently constitute a hazard to human health or that animal life has been significantly jeopardized.

In this connection, the Committee found that the quantity and quality of available empirical information as to both the benefits and risks of chemical pesticides is far more extensive than was generally recognized. Thus, many of the sweeping generalizations of impending disaster, that have been sincerely advanced by some commentators aroused great anxiety, not because there was insufficient information available to disprove these prophecies, but because the public was not sufficiently aware of the existence of this information.

One of the greatest contributions of the Committee study will be to allay public concern that may have developed as to whether or not pesticides are being used by farmers and regulated by Government in such way as to prevent potentially harmful contamination of our environment.

As to the administrative regulations and interagency coordination of chemical pesticide management, the Committee concluded that there is a need for some changes. However, for the most part, the responsible individuals and Government agencies have responded quickly and effectively to correct past deficiencies.

The Committee made four basic sets of recommendations. First, to strengthen the present regulatory system, the Committee recommended: the enactment of uniform indemnification to farmers whose products have been removed from the market for containing pesticide residues where the contamination is in no way the fault of the farmer; improved safety standards in pesticide production; grants to states encouraging uniform training, methods and equipment in monitoring pesticides; encouragement of international agreements on chemical pesticide use and management.

Second, to improve coordination of Federal chemical pesticide management programs, the Committee recommended: that the mission and activities of the Federal Committee on Pest Control be given legislative authority, and that agencies be required to register programs with the Science Information Exchange.

Third, to help further assure protection of human health from possible harmful exposure to environmental contaminants, the Committee recommended: greater emphasis within HEW on environmental health programs, greater research in human pharmacology, acceleration of the development of non-chemical pest control methods, and an expanded public educational program as to the possible dangers from the improper use of chemical pesticides.

Fourth, to develop a more adequate basis for future national policy in environmental management the Committee recommended: the establishment of a program to accumulate factual knowledge on the future status of the environment, an acceleration of the interpretation of science to the public, and increased Congressional oversight of the administration of the regulatory programs dealing with activities capable of affecting the environment.

## BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 3632. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

## NATIONAL GUARD—RESERVE BILL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators SYMINGTON, TOWER, and BYRD of West Virginia, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen and upgrade the status of the Army and Air National Guard, the Army and Air Force Reserve, and other Reserve force programs in the military services.

This bill affects the Reserve of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and Coast Guard.

It is similar to a bill being introduced in the House. While some of the provisions of this bill will require modification, it outlines the general principles which I think should be followed in strengthening and improving the position of our Reserve forces.

This bill rejects the idea of a merger of the Army Reserve into the National Guard and establishes minimum strength levels which I feel are required. It also provides that our Reserve forces must be fully supported from every standpoint, including personnel, technicians, equipment, training, and in all the other essentials of a well-trained and Ready Reserve force.

I have always felt that the National Guard and Reserve forces have been a very necessary and vital part of our military preparedness program. Recent developments have very forcefully pointed out the necessity of making our National Guard and Reserve forces as strong as possible.

Also I feel that we get more for the military dollar that is spent on Reserve and National Guard forces than perhaps in any other part of our military program. For instance, a national guardsman can be trained and maintained at an almost completely combat-ready status for one-sixth of the amount required for a Regular Army soldier. It cost about one-half as much to train and maintain a combat-ready Air National Guard squadron as it does a Regular Air Force squadron.

I recognize that the Regular services must have preference and first priority. However, the importance of our Reserve forces is emphasized by the fact that as small a combat operation as we face in Vietnam has created a situation in our

Regular forces so serious that on three separate occasions the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended a callup of Army Reserve and National Guard units.

The air transport squadrons of the Air National Guard are currently flying more than 200 missions monthly on a voluntary basis in support of our operations in southeast Asia. They are also flying very essential aeromedical missions in the continental United States and offshore in support of the Regular Air Force. The air reserve transport squadrons are currently flying many missions monthly in the United States, thus relieving Regular Air Force planes to fly more missions to southeast Asia.

A recent investigation of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee revealed that the operations in Vietnam have depleted our tactical fighter forces so badly that we could not meet another sizable emergency without a callup of the Air National Guard.

An investigation recently completed by the subcommittee disclosed that the Army National Guard and Reserve forces are badly lacking in equipment and other essential items required to put them in a desired combat-ready status.

For these and other reasons, it is absolutely necessary that we place more emphasis on our Reserve forces of all the services and give a higher priority to meeting their needs. This bill is designed to put them in a better position where they can effectively obtain the support necessary to attain and maintain the combat readiness condition necessary to the national security.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3632) to amend title 10, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in sponsoring this bill to upgrade the status of the Reserve force programs. As chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee he is known as a master of military policy and law. We in the Senate know him as a man who is not awed by glamour, who is not beguiled by power, who is not intimidated by the powerful—but a man who makes his judgment for the paramount interest of his country.

The bill now before us is very definitely in the paramount interest of our country. Last year, this body clearly rejected the Reserve merger plan, or at least thought it had. Apparently the Department of Defense did not interpret our action that way, for the Secretary of that Department has proceeded to do by executive mandate what he could not do by legislation—weaken the Reserve program of this country.

I will not at this time go into the many sound reasons for rejecting the merger plan. If the only harms resultant from the plan were those which we exposed last year, we might be content to simply bury it again and hope that the Defense Department will return to its job of strengthening our national security rather than continue upon its present course of weakening it. However, the revival of the merger plan has such a damaging effect upon the morale and readiness of the Reserve that we cannot be content to merely indicate our present disapproval of it. We must emphatically reject the plan once and for all and make it unmistakably clear that we do not intend to allow the Reserve program to fall into a sort of Defense Department limbo of doubt. How can we honestly expect a dedicated and prepared Reserve when its members do not know from one day to the next if there will even be a Reserve?

Every day the mail brings me letters from fellow Texans seeking clarification of the status of the Reserve. These veterans of World War II, Korea, and the Berlin callup do not even plead the case of the Reserve, they merely wish to know its status. These men deserve to know where they stand. We are not just dealing with units on paper or with machines, but with the hearts and minds of thousands of dedicated reservists. These men are needed by their country now as they have been needed so many times in the past. This bill will let them know this and it will let the Defense Department know it. It deserves and demands our wholehearted support.

## UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce the appointment of Senators GORE and AIKEN as congressional advisers to attend the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are operating under the rule of germaneness. I am attempting to speed up the consideration of the pending bill; and until the Senator arrives who is to offer the amendment to be proposed, I certainly would object to anyone being given unlimited time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have two matters, one of which is relevant to the issue, and will take about 10 minutes. The other is for a very brief insertion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator withhold the relevant issue until we are on the issue with an amendment or other relevant matter?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall do that.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 1 minute.

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

## CLAIM OF WATER WASTE IN SOUTHLAND REFUTED

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in few areas of the United States are Americans as conscious of the value of water as in southern California, where the Nation's most dynamic population growth has occurred in a virtual desert region. Only the resourcefulness of the residents and their willingness to invest hundreds of millions of their own dollars in water development projects have enabled factories to grow, farms to produce, and people to enjoy the finest climate in the country.

Yet criticism from other parts of the country continues over alleged extravagant uses and flagrant waste of water. I certainly would not contend that we have reached the peak in water conservation practices or that we can rest on our laurels, but I do challenge any other region of the United States to show that it has as active and successful a program to make the best possible use of water. Our universities, our water agencies, our cities, our industries, and our State government have taken important steps to use this precious resource much more efficiently.

Mr. President, I ask that an article written by Mr. Ray Hebert, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of July 3, 1966, entitled "Claim of Water Waste in Southland Assailed," be printed in full in the RECORD.

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

CLAIM OF WATER WASTE IN SOUTHLAND ASSAILED—METROPOLITAN MANAGER POINTS TO METERING OF SYSTEMS, BUILDING OF UNDERGROUND SUPPLIES

(By Ray Hebert)

Semi-arid Southern California's cities and farms use billions of gallons of water a day but very little is wasted, contrary to charges

it is squandered and used unwisely. Most supply systems are metered and recreational swimming pool and golf course demands are negligible, officials here have replied to critics alarmed by the Southland's far-ranging search for more water.

Furthermore, it is unthinkable for Southern California to break up an affluent society and force its population to go where water is plentiful, as some critics have suggested.

"Doubtless a claim could be made in regard to excessive use to satisfy an affluent standard of living, but these trends appear irreversible," a water leader here said.

COLUMBIA RIVER PLANS FOUGHT

Charges of wasteful practices and water losses have come from other regions, notably the Pacific Northwest where concern is growing for proposals to tap the Columbia River as a new source of water for Southern California, Arizona and other Colorado River Basin states.

A long-range study which could lead to the diversion of water through a 1,000-mile-long aqueduct is included in legislation before the House Interior Committee.

To Sen. HENRY JACKSON (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, the vast water transfer plan could mean "total disaster" for the Pacific Northwest.

Actually, he says, there would be no need even to consider diversions from the Columbia if Southern California, Arizona and other Pacific Southwestern states made better use of their water.

His fellow Senator, Sen. WARREN MAGNUSON (D-Wash.), is just as emphatic.

Washington, he says, cannot permit its resources to be depleted "by those people . . . who waste their own water and then look to the Columbia for relief."

Specifically, complaints of poor water practices in urban areas and agricultural communities have followed three general themes:

Wastefuness caused by old or unmetered systems; objections to the use of water to sustain economically unjustified activities which might be conducted elsewhere, where water is plentiful, and the discharge of large quantities of water—to the sea or underground—after a single use.

FOUR PUBLIC AGENCIES

Responsibility for distributing most of the water used in Southern California rests with four large public agencies whose sole source now is the Colorado River.

The Colorado supplies about 50% of the water used in the crowded coastal plain, the area served by the Metropolitan Water District. The rest comes from underground reserves and the High Sierra. For Southern California as a whole, which includes the region's heavy water-using inland agricultural valleys, the Colorado accounts for roughly 80%.

Of the nearly 5 million acre-feet of water the agencies draw annually from the Colorado, about 1.1 million—1 billion gallons a day—goes to Metropolitan for nearly 10 million people in its Ventura-to-San Diego service area.

Robert A. Skinner, Metropolitan's general manager, says there is relatively little basis for criticism of water losses and unjustifiable uses in Metropolitan's populous six-county region.

Almost complete metering prevents it, unlike New York where a lack of meters was blamed for part of the city's heavy drain on water supplies during last year's emergency drought.

Furthermore, according to Skinner, any water which does escape here sinks into the ground to mingle with underground reserves which are pumped out later.

As for water to fill Southern California's swimming pools and keep its golf courses green, he said an investigation shows these uses are relatively minor.

In Los Angeles, which has 65,000 pools, for example, it takes an estimated 1.3 billion gallons to fill them once a year. This amounts to .008% of the city's total water use.

The city's golf courses require more water, about 14 billion gallons a year, but this is only .08% of the water used by Los Angeles' 2.7 million residents.

Skinner noted that nearly $200 million a year is spent on gardening supplies and lawn maintenance in Southern California. The amount of water consumed by gardens and lawns is extensive.

"But this must be accepted as a justifiable part of the current mode of living," he said.

At the same time he noted suggestions that future water shortages here could be prevented if water were used only for the "highest and most justifiable" purposes.

This raises a question about the practicability of producing goods here which cause a heavy drain on the region's water supply but nevertheless contribute heavily to the area's economic development.

Since this water cannot be totally replenished by local sources, critics have questioned whether its depletion confers a right on the population here to expect replacement water from other distant sources.

"We hear repeated many times the assertion that people should be forced to move where water is plentiful rather than expect to have water imported to supply their needs," Skinner said.

"But the well-being of vast segments of the population is at stake, as well as the survival of great economic developments. There are also significant interrelationships in the areas of national interest and security."

With particular reference to the discharge of water to the sea after it has been used only once, Skinner said this is being given increasing attention.

Some domestic sewage, after treatment, is being percolated into the underground for later use in the Los Angeles basin.

But Skinner said problems involving chemical quality and subsequent treatment methods to dissolve solids could put the cost of reclamation virtually in the same category as desalination.

In Southern California's inland agricultural areas, meanwhile, water-saving practices have been in effect for many years and others have been adopted recently to enforce even stricter controls.

For example, the Imperial Irrigation District, Southern California's largest user of Colorado River water, is in the third year of an extensive program to concrete-line lateral canals to prevent seepage.

The smaller Coachella Valley County Water District points out that its entire system is based on the conservation of land and water. The Coachella Canal is completely concrete-lined.

A recurring complaint from the Pacific Northwest involves waste water which drains into the Salton Sea from Imperial Valley farms.

This water, so-called agricultural sewage, amounts to 1 million acre-feet annually. Much of it is attributable to the leaching necessary to cleanse the farmlands of heavy salt deposits left behind by the highly mineralized Colorado River water.

Although water officials here are certain the Pacific Northwest's complaints will continue to grow, Skinner believes the determining factor in the Southwest's search for more imported water will be the region's own ability to pay.

Assuming that it does not infringe upon the rights or welfare of other areas, he pointed out, it will be up to prospective water users in Southern California and Arizona to decide how much they are willing to pay "to fulfill a preferred way of life."

---

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session, to consider a nomination on the calendar.

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

---

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Di Luzio, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this nomination came from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It came to the Senate unanimously. May I say, not simply for myself, but also for the members of the committee, that Frank C. Di Luzio is uniquely qualified to handle the specially skilled responsibilities that come to his office, and I shall vote for his confirmation with enthusiasm.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on July 20, the Interior Committee held a public hearing on the nomination by President Johnson on July 5 of Frank C. Di Luzio to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. At the conclusion of the hearing, the full committee voted unanimously to report to the Senate Mr. Di Luzio's nomination.

Mr. Di Luzio's position is a new one, having been created by section 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1966. This plan, which became effective April 29 of this year, transferred the functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to the Department of the Interior.

Among the duties of the new Assistant Secretary of the Interior will be the administration, under the Secretary, of the water pollution control program and the performance, in the words of the plan, "of such other duties as the Secretary shall from time to time prescribe."

As of the time of the nomination hearings, the Secretary had not prescribed any "such other duties," although an Interior Department press release dated July 7 on Mr. Di Luzio's nomination stated:

> "Transfer of the Office of Saline Water, now under Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development Kenneth Holum, and the Office of Water Resources Research, which now reports directly to the Secretary, to the area to be supervised by Mr. Di Luzio is under consideration," Secretary Udall said.

It was the sense of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that Secretary Udall should act promptly in bringing those activities under Mr. Di Luzio's administrative responsibility, together with such other duties respecting supplies and quality of water in the United States as will be in the interests of efficiency and sound administration.

On behalf of the committee, I call upon the Secretary to take appropriate action.

Mr. President, it has been my good fortune to know Mr. Di Luzio well over a period of years. For some time he served and lived in my State of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement I prepared for the hearings on Mr. Di Luzio's nomination, together with biographical material on him, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the biographical material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ANDERSON AT OPEN HEARING OF SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE ON NOMINATION OF FRANK C. DI LUZIO TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JULY 20, 1966

I have known Frank Di Luzio for 20 years. The Committee has a copy of his biographical sketch which will become part of the Record, but in presenting him to the Committee, I wanted to touch briefly on a few personal experiences.

I first became acquainted with Frank when he was Manager of the Los Alamos Community for the Atomic Energy Commission. Running a community to support the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory was no easy task. Frank is a civil engineer by training, but at Los Alamos, which has attracted many of the world's most distinguished scientists, he also had to be a skilled diplomat.

There is the story about Frank and Enrico Fermi, the brilliant physicist, who had come from Italy to escape Fascist persecution. Fermi had played a leading role in the development of the first atomic bomb. After the war Professor Fermi used to come back to Los Alamos regularly during the summer months to teach and do research. He had a cottage and the maintenance people were upset because Professor Fermi was not cutting the grass around the place, but no one would approach the great man about the grass. Finally Frank, who was born in Rome, went over to the Fermi cottage one day and asked Fermi if he wanted special privileges. Fermi assured him he did not; the only problem was that he had no room in his car—filled with books and papers—to haul a lawn mower back and forth each year to Los Alamos. "We'll let you borrow one," said Frank. And the small crisis was over. I think Frank's tact, good humor, and common sense were valuable in that situation. I think they will be very useful in the period that lies ahead.

When I became Chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I asked Frank to join the Committee as Staff Director. He did an extremely effective job and earned the respect of the officials of the National Aeronautical and Space Administration, the Department of Defense and the members of the Committee, both Democrats and Republicans. He brought a high degree of professionalism to the operations of the Committee.

In the midst of the work of the Space Committee, Alaska was shaken by a disastrous earthquake on Good Friday, 1964. President Johnson asked that I take over the chairmanship of a special relief and reconstruction commission. We had to borrow staff from government departments. I asked Frank to become my special assistant in that work—without taking off his hat as Staff Director of the Space Committee. I am indebted for his fine assistance in the Alaska reconstruction program. When we started up the work of the Alaska commission, Frank informed me that he had a license as a civil engineer in Alaska. I think that is typical of the many facets of this man.

Frank didn't stay with the Space Committee as long as I would have liked. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior discovered his qualifications and abilities and asked me to let him move over to head the Office of Saline Water. Reluctantly I agreed. The result has been some very fine work in desalination processes that will pay great dividends not only in the United States but in the arid regions of the world as well.

I think Frank will bring to his new post a broad understanding of water problems for he is quite sensitive to the interlocking of these problems, seeing them in their totality. I think this is the approach we need—viewing the water problem on a regional basis, rather than just as a local matter.

It will be no easy task to reverse the tide of apathy, half-effort, intergovernmental controversy, and myopia which have afflicted our streams and river basins. But I think Frank Di Luzio can measure up to the assignment.

---

PERSONAL HISTORY RÉSUMÉ: FRANK C. DI LUZIO

Address: 9504 Barroll Lane, Kensington, Maryland, Telephone: 949-1345.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Date of Birth: September 2, 1913.
Place of Birth: Rome, Italy.
Marital Status: Married, 2 children.
Height: 5'6½".
Weight: 150 lbs.
Citizenship: U.S.
Security Clearance: Military DOD—Top Secret; U.S. Atomic Energy—"Q".

*January 25, 1965 to Present*

Title: *Director*—Office of Saline Water. Completed formulation of and placed into effect an aggressive and accelerated program for economically feasible means of desalting sea and brackish waters. Instituted short, medium, and long-range programs leading to increased emphasis in engineering for practical application of desalting techniques.

*April 20, 1963 to January 25, 1965*

Title: *Staff Director*—Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, United States Senate.

*October 15, 1962 to April 20, 1963*

Title: *Vice President & Director*—Fairbanks, Morse & Co., Hydraulic and Special Projects Division. In charge of engineering design, applications engineering, sales, and project administration. Responsible for the management and coordination of English Electric and Vickers-Armstrong, London, England—license agreements covering their hydraulic products. Served as member of R & D Committee, and Management committees of both Fairbanks, Morse & Co., and Fairbanks Whitney Corp.

*October 1, 1961 to October 15, 1962*

Title: *Vice President*—Engineering, Fairbanks, Morse & Co., Beloit Division. In charge of all product and special engineering, reporting to Vice President, Group Executive. Products consist of motors, diesel engines, pumps, magnetos, compressors, etc. Engineering organization has a staff of approximately 325 professional and sub-professional people.

*January 1, 1961 to October 1, 1961*

Title: *General Manager*—Albuquerque Research Center, Fairbanks, Morse & Co., reporting to Vice President Government Products. In addition, was also assigned as Assistant for Research and Development to President of Fairbanks, Morse & Co. Coordinated R & D corporation-wise, served as Chairman of R & D committee, and evaluated engineering proposals related to national defense programs.

*May 19, 1957 to January 1, 1961*

Title: *Deputy Manager*—Atomic Energy Commission, G. S. 18, Albuquerque Operations Office, assisting Manager in performance of executive duties, covering all functions assigned to ALO. Directly responsible for the evaluation, coordination, and taking appropriate action regarding performance of functions assigned to the operating divisions in the areas of research, development, manufacturing and quality assurance on atomic ordnance. Directed activities related to storage operations, nuclear materials, management and security administration. Upon special assignment from the Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. executed programs for AEC headquarters organizations other than the Division of Military Application. Coordinated for the AEC-Division of Military Application the exchange of weapons technology between the United States and United Kingdom Atomic Energy establishments at Aldermaston and Harwell, England.

*January 15, 1956 to May 19, 1957*

Title: *Asst. Manager for Manufacturing*, AEC, G. S. 17, Albuquerque. Directed and coordinated Albuquerque Operations Office development and production complex in design, development, and manufacture of nuclear and non-nuclear weapons and weapons components. Developed from broad DMA directives detailed ALO Directives and Planning Schedules, allocating responsibility and establishing delivery requirements, time schedules, and procurement authorizations for the several contractors involved. Coordinated plans for all major changes in existing or new development or manufacturing facilities and equipment resulting from mission or programmatic changes. Planned and directed the execution of ALO programs and policies designed to effectively coordinate design activities with the manufacturing processes; planned and coordinated program reporting needs of the Manager and the preparation of periodic consolidated progress summaries and program statistics. Coordinated weapons development, testing and production with Armed Forces Special Weapons Command—Defense Atomic Support Agency for military weapons input.

*August, 1952 to January 15, 1956*

Title: *Manager*, G. S. 16, Los Alamos Area office of AEC. Administered assigned programs in the field of research and development of atomic weapons and in this capacity administered AEC's contract with the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. Planned and executed a comprehensive program for construction and maintenance of technical and other project facilities. Provided supervision of all contract operations, including Architect-Engineer, and construction and supply contracts.

*April, 1950 to August 1952*

Title: *Director*, Community Management Division, AEC, G. S. 15, Los Alamos. Participated as a member of Area Manager's staff in the continuous review of the assigned Los Alamos Office program and all community facilities and activities. Responsible for the following general areas of activities: (a) Administration of the contract of operating contractor (The Zia Company), (b) Maintenance and operation of community properties and facilities within Los Alamos County.

*April, 1946 to April, 1950*

Title: *Director Engineering and Construction Division*, AEC, G. S. 14, Los Alamos. During this period assumed positions of progressively greater responsibility. Initially responsible for overall negotiations and renegotiations of Architect-Engineer and construction contracts. Responsible for overall supervision of engineering and construction work, coordination, and inspection of all construction. During this period had direct and primary responsibility for a total construction program involving design and construction of technical facilities and transformation of Los Alamos from a temporary

project to a permanent community involving the expenditure of approximately $248,000,000.

*July, 1944 to July, 1946*

Title: *Civil Engineer*, Military Service and P. 6, U. S. Army, Los Alamos. Assigned to Manhattan Engr. District, which was charged with the responsibility of constructing facilities for the production of the atomic bomb. Charged with the responsibility of negotiation and renegotiation of all Architect-Engineer contracts, and construction contracts, and preparation of plans and specifications. Assisted the Chief Engineer in engineering problems of a complex nature.

*October, 1941 to July 1944*

Title: *Engineer*, P. 5, Corps of Engineers, Ravenna, Ohio. Assigned important duties during the construction of (a) Ravenna Ordnance plant, Ravenna, Ohio; (b) Lordstown Ordnance Depot, Warren, Ohio; (c) Keystone Ordnance Plant, Meadville, Pa.

Title: *Engineer*, Corps of Enginers. Assigned as Chief Enginer and Assistant Resident Engineer during the construction of Mosquito Creek Dam, Warren, Ohio. The dam was an earth-filled structure, reinforced concrete spillway and water intake tower.

*September, 1940 to October, 1941*

Title: *Engineer*, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Parker Dam, California. Field inspection of Power Plant (one shift), checked field changes in construction, steel setting, construction details and procedures.

*March, 1938 to Sepember, 1940*

Title: *Jr. Engineer*, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, assigned to Coulee Dam, Washington. Field Engineer inspection of placing of concrete, setting reinforcing steel, and installation of power plant equipment and drum gate mechanism.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

International Association for Hydraulic Research Association for Applied Solar Energy, Scientific Member, Tempe, Arizona.

National Society of Professional Engineers.

Professional Engineer New Mexico Registration No. 3252.

Professional Engineer Alaska Registration No. 859–E.

Professional Engineer Maryland.

American Geophysical Union, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.

Seismological Society of America.

SELECTIVE MEMBERSHIP

Member, Rivers and Harbors Congress (New Mexico Advisory Board) 15 years—1948–1962.

Member, Economic Development Commission. State of New Mexico (Water Resources Development & Utilization) Resigned 1962.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

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

---

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislation business.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair as the Presiding Officer.)

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were permited to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how long does the Senator wish to proceed?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

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

---

## WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT JESSIE STEARNS WRITES ABOUT TWO KANSANS IN USIA

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Jessie Stearns, a native Kansan, and a foreign and Washington correspondent of long standing has written two byline stories of interest about U.S. Information Agency and the two top officials who run it.

I have known Mrs. Stearns for many years. She has broad experience of reporting from the Far East and within the United States.

Having reported from China before Nationalist China was forced to leave the mainland, she has firsthand knowledge of the information agency that disseminates news abroad.

For the past 3 years she has been the Washington correspondent for the three Topeka newspapers owned by Oscar Stauffer; namely, Topeka Daily Capital, Topeka State Journal, and the Topeka Capital Journal.

Robert Akers, Deputy Director of the U.S. Information Agency, is a Kansan and one of our outstanding citizens. He was born in Topeka. His mother, Mrs. Everett Akers, still lives there. He has been rendering outstanding service in his new assignment.

There have been excellent articles written about his work by Jessie Stearns.

Jessie is known for her integrity, reliability, accuracy in reporting. She is always seeking the truth and the facts which entails long hours of work.

The entire Kansas congressional delegation and other Members of the U.S. Congress hold her in high esteem.

The other article relates how Leonard Marks, Director of USIA is aiding the Vietnamese, and the other article highlights Kansan Robert Akers, editor of all media for the Government news agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles written by Jessie Stearns, one entitled "Marks and USIA Help To Educate Vietnamese" and the other entitled "Topekan USIA Leader" 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 Overseas Press Bulletin, May 28, 1966]

MARKS AND USIA HELP TO EDUCATE VIETNAMESE

(By Jessie Stearns)

WASHINGTON.—Even if there were no US troops in Viet Nam to assist in the war effort, Vietnamese school children and illiterates could still be grateful to the US becaues of Leonard Marks and the United States Information Agency, which he has directed since September.

It is an organization with a $178 million budget (1966-government year ending June 30) that is a major broadcaster, a huge publisher, a vast distributor of printed material, an immense library and an educational institution.

The former radio and television attorney sent 500 23-inch television sets to Saigon which started to receive programs last February. He had two airplanes rigged up as TV transmitters. One flies daily above the war capital. The purpose of these broadcasts is "to provide education and information to the Vietnamese people."

The sets are in public schools, libraries, pagodas, police stations, and public meeting halls. Five days a week, from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., the "airborne transmitter" brings TV broadcasts to the classrooms.

One hour a day the South Vietnamese who plans and produces the classrom programs use the facility for announcements, which contain information about agriculture, education, economy, care of children, sanitation, etc. Marks says this element of instruction will decrease the illiteracy rate.

*Richard Critchfield*, Asian correspondent for the *Washington Evening Star*, reports that a rickshaw driver and laborers watched the meeting of President Johnson and Premier Nguyen Cao Ky at the *Honolulu* conference over a public television set in a market place in Saigon. Because of what the rickshaw driver saw he is going to help with the social revolution in his country.

Armed Forces radio uses the "flying transmitter" two hours daily bringing news, movies and network shows to the American troops stationed in the Saigon area.

The reaction to television is so great another 500 sets are being shipped to Saigon to be placed in public places.

He says a recent survey indicates that 25,000 TV sets can be sold in one year to private industry in the war capital.

The director of the huge enterprise that speaks to the world for America dislikes the term "propaganda". He says the easiest and best way to present America's objectives overseas is to tell the "truth." Continuing, he said, "The US has nothing to hide. Our people enjoy freedom. Our principal job is to explain to the world how we live, our progress and our aspirations."

Marks speaks glowingly of another achievement of his Viet Nam operation, the dropping of "safe conduct passes." They are red, white and blue slips of paper about the size of a baseball ticket featuring the Stars and Stripes and the Viet Nam flags and dropped over Viet Cong territory. These passes have been found hidden in shoes and clothing.

He says from 1,500 to 2,000 passes are presented to US forces monthly. The great fear of the Viet Cong is that they will die and be buried outside of their villages.

Presently US military obtains the names of the Viet Cong killed in action and their names are broadcast over radio.

In addition, colorful and interesting leaflets are dropped in Viet Cong territory. Other material such as newspapers, magazines, and films are found in USIS libraries.

The Viet Nam staff includes 126 Americans and 390 Vietnamese.

The public affairs staff briefs, billets and provides transportation for the 380 foreign correspondents including 220 correspondents for US publications.

These services in Viet Nam and others provided by the agency during the government year ending June 30 cost $6,078,000. With the war escalation and increase in troop personnel, only $377,000 more has been requested for Viet Nam operations in 1967.

Other worldwide services provided by the agency directed by Marks are: Voice of America, which broadcasts 838 hours a week in 38 languages; publishes 85 magazines; produces 600 films a year; transmits daily 10,000 words to 115 US posts plus all official statements including Presidential press conferences; publishes two million books a year; offers TV film services to 87 countries; teaches 300,000 students English by radio and TV in classrooms; published over 50 million cartoon books in Latin America the last five years, picture books; exhibits in Eastern Europe and other countries.

As far as Marks' tenure as USIA chief, he says the President's commission says he will serve during the pleasure of the President "for the time being." He finds the assignment exciting and doesn't plan to research the meaning of "time being."

TOPEKAN USIA LEADER

(By Jessie Stearns)

WASHINGTON.—Two men who worked together in private life for 15 years are now a public team disseminating information abroad.

Robert "Bob" Akers, born in Topeka, educated at Washburn University and University of Texas and retired in 1964 as editor-in-chief and director of the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise and Journal, is now deputy director of the U.S. Information Agency.

DIRECTOR NAMED

President Johnson appointed Leonard Marks in July, 1965, as director of USIA. Before Marks was the attorney for radio and television stations owned by the Beaumont Enterprise and Journal.

Akers, who was appointed Sept. 1, is editor-in-chief of all media for the government news agency. When Marks is away, Akers is acting director.

He is responsible for daily transmission of 10,000 words to 115 U.S. ports abroad plus all official statements including presidential press conferences; Voice of America broadcasts of 838 hours a week in 38 languages; publication of 85 magazines; production of 600 films and two million books a year, and television film services to 87 countries.

Marks sent to Saigon in February 500 23-inch television sets. He had two airplanes rigged as TV transmitters. One flies daily above the war capital. Purpose of these broadcasts is "to provide education and information to the Vietnamese people."

The sets are in public schools, libraries, pagodas, police stations and public meeting halls. Five days a week, from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., the airborne transmitter brings broadcasts to classrooms.

One hour a day, South Vietnamese who plan and produce classroom programs, use the facility for announcements, with information about agriculture, education, economy, care of children and sanitation.

Armed Forces uses the flying transmitter two hours daily bringing news, movies and network shows to U.S. troops in the Saigon area.

Another 500 sets are being shipped to Saigon to be placed in public locations. Marks said a recent survey indicates 25,000 TV sets can be sold in a year in Saigon.

The USIA issues 1,500 to 2,000 "safe conduct passes" to U.S. forces monthly. Colorful leaflets are dropped in Viet Cong territory.

The public affairs staff of 126 Americans and 390 Vietnamese briefs, billets and provides transportation for 380 foreign correspondents including 220 correspondents representing U.S. publications.

Akers visits his mother, Mrs. Everett Akers, Brewster Place, Topeka, whenever he passes through Kansas City on overseas trips.

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. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

## "A NEW BENCHMARK FOR EDUCATION"—AN ADDRESS BY HAROLD HOWE II, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, night before last, at the Mayflower Hotel, Mr. Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, made an excellent speech on the subject, "A New Benchmark for Education" before the members of the National Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged.

Mr. President, this speech is full of substantive content. I hope that every Senator will read it before we take up some of the problems connected with education legislation—secondary, elementary, and higher education—that will be before the Senate in the not too distant future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the very able speech of Commissioner Howe be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

A NEW BENCHMARK FOR EDUCATION

(An address by Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I am here tonight to thank you for your time, your interest and your creative contributions to this conference. I am also here to try to take an honest look at perhaps the most demanding challenge confronting American elementary and secondary education—the challenge of helping the schools do more for those students who come to the classroom with a built-in disadvantage.

As we go about this exercise of looking at our problems, it is important to keep a decent perspective, lest we seem to be saying that nothing is good about American education. We all know that much of the activity in our schools is first rate. I think it is entirely accurate to say that the United States provides more education to more people than any other Nation in the world.

Remarkable advances are taking place in many of our schools. Some communities have taken positive and successful steps toward providing equal opportunity for all children and toward introducing promising innovations in teaching methods and tools. Consolidation of the schools in many States is providing a richer education for hundreds of thousands of children. The general public interest in improving education has reached unprecedented levels during the past ten years, and the actions of our President and our Congress have made us an education-conscious nation.

But as we take pride in these achievements, we must recognize that innovative education and high quality education and equal educational opportunity are not available to many of America's children. And we must recognize also that the children who are least served by the new push of the last ten years to improve the schools are those who are most in need of special help: the minority group children—the Negroes, the Puerto Ricans, the Mexican-Americans. Add to them the children of those we call "poor whites" and you have about 20% of America's school-age young people, those between 5 and 17. It is because of these children that we have Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And it is because of them that you and I are here in Washington tonight to share our ideas on how to make better use of the magnificent opportunity this act gives us as educators.

As we consider next steps to improve what we are doing with Title I funds in the service of disadvantaged children, we have the benefit of new insights into our problem of providing equal educational opportunity. These insights come from a scholarly study of the status of our efforts in desegregating the schools, in upgrading the education offered to disadvantaged children, in giving these youngsters a sense of their own worth in the national community.

The study I speak of is summarized in a 33-page booklet published by the Office of Education and entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity." My feeling is that the data lying behind this publication will have—and most certainly should have—a deep and lasting effect on American education. I would like to discuss the report this evening because it bears on the subject of our conference.

The booklet presents the preliminary findings of an undertaking instigated by the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Congress directed the Commissioner of Education to survey "the lack of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions and the District of Columbia." The full 700-page report is expected to be off the presses by the end of this month.

The project ultimately involved some 60,000 teachers and 645,000 pupils in 4,000 schools across the Nation and in its territories.

So far as I know, this is the largest, most comprehensive and scientific look that has ever been given to the schools—and the school children—of the United States. We asked some straightforward questions, and we assume we got straightforward answers.

I stress the fact that the findings I shall refer to tonight need further interpretation. It will be many months before the data collected in a survey of this magnitude can be fully evaluated, so that firm recommendations for public policy can flow from them. I stress, too, the fact that the information on which the report is based was gathered last fall—before any Title I projects really got launched. So, although the survey was not made with Title I in mind, I think it may provide a reliable baseline for measuring the impact of the various Title I programs now underway.

The survey is in effect an effort to describe statistically the extent of educational

opportunity which exists through the country for the minority groups as compared to the white majority.

In the months and years ahead the Office of Education staff, aided by advisors from the educational community throughout the country, will be studying how the survey findings can sharpen our current programs and what implications they have for future directions.

But the study does not belong to the Office of Education. It belongs to the Nation, and I would encourage other groups, public and private, to explore it carefully. In particular, I invite the attention of those of you here tonight. Challenge the survey, hypothesize from it, learn from it. I especially ask for your cooperation because I think that in many ways the survey's implications and the applications of Title I are complementary.

Now, let's take a look at what we have found so far—and what the survey might seem to suggest to the States and the local school systems most of you represent.

We found that for all practical purposes, American education can be labeled as segregated.

Over two-thirds of all Negro pupils in the first grade go to schools that are 90 to 100 percent Negro; only a handful of the Nation's Negro first graders are getting the benefit of desegregated education. In the light of the 1954 Supreme Court ruling, the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, and the further finding of this survey that segregated education is likely to be of lower quality for minority group children than for the majority, these facts should give us pause.

Turning to the general characteristics of schools, in one part of the survey we measured such matters as the age of the school building, the average number of pupils per classroom, whether there was a library, a cafeteria, a chemistry laboratory. We asked about accreditation, accelerated curriculum, use of the track system, salaries of principals, debate teams and bands, teacher tenure.

Next we turned to the classroom and asked questions of the students themselves. Some of the questions were designed to give us an index of socio-economic factors; others, an academic achievement rate of verbal and mathematical results.

Among other things we found that many of the obvious differences among schools do not have a major bearing on differences in student achievement. Within that finding, however, it was also clear that achievement of disadvantaged pupils does depend to a statistically significant degree on the schools they attend—considerably more than for children of the white majority.

Put another way, advantaged students are less affected one way or the other by the quality of their schools. It is for the most disadvantaged children that improvements in school quality mean the most.

This finding obviously has significant implications. It seems to say, for example, that a program like Title I can make a difference if we are skillful enough to use it effectively. But before I jump to this or any other conclusion, I want to offer you the same caveat I offered my staff when we first discussed the survey. I think we must steadfastly refrain from reaching for quick, simplified conclusions. I believe we all need to spend considerable time with the full report—all 700-odd pages of it—before we can make plans for special projects and programs based upon it. We have to insert a step between implication and application, and that step should involve very careful study—not just speculation.

Next, let's take a look at the teachers we surveyed . . . sixty thousand of them.

We sought information about how much they earn, what they majored in at college, years of teaching experience, average scores on a verbal test, and so on.

The results were not especially surprising. In some ways—though by no means all—they were reassuring. The figures indicate that the quality of teachers defined in terms of the factors I have just listed bears a much stronger relationship to student achievement than does the quality of the school. Furthermore, a good teacher's impact on students appears to be greatest at the higher grades. And third, teacher quality seems to be significantly more important to the disadvantaged boy or girl than to the advantaged student.

These facts have interesting implications too, particularly when they are put against other information that emerged from the study—information which shows that disadvantaged students tend to wind up with the least capable teachers. We must, then, link this fact with the finding that it is the disadvantaged child who most needs a good teacher and who can gain the most from him. Parenthetically, it seems to me worth noting that Congress wisely pre-guessed these survey findings by forming the National Teachers Corps. This new enterprise is the only effort on a countrywide basis to train high quality teachers specifically for working with disadvantaged children.

Now that I have suggested some implications concerning schools and teachers, let us turn to the children. We asked 145,000 of them to take an achievement test, designed to measure verbal and mathematical skills that are most important in our society for getting a good job, moving up to a better one, and keeping on top of an increasingly technical world.

We also touched upon such matters as student attitudes and aspirations in the survey. And in the process we came upon one pupil attitude that appears to affect achievement more than all other school factors together. I refer to the exent to which the individual student feels he has some control over his destiny—over the possibility of his own success or failure. Far more than the average youngster, the disadvantaged boy or girl feels that his future lies in the lap of the gods—that whether he succeeds or fails will be determined primarily by blind chance rather than by his own efforts.

Such findings raise interesting questions about what schools can do to build confidence and self-assurance—qualities characteristically lacking in a great many disadvantaged pupils. We must explore the implications here for counselors in the schools, for school organization, and for the human relationships which exist between pupil and teacher.

The survey also demonstrated that when the disadvantaged child walks in the schoolhouse door for the first time, he scores lower on standard achievement tests than his advantaged peers. And by the time he reaches the 12th grade, the gap has widened considerably. Whatever may be the combination of nonschool factors which put minority children at a disadvantage when they enter first grade—poverty, community attitudes, low educational level of parents—the schools have not only failed to make up the difference: they have let these youngsters slip further away from the mainstream of our national life.

This fact presents a sobering challenge to American education. The survey report is full of such challenges. And thus our schools have—for the first time, to my knowledge—a benchmark. Against that benchmark, in the next two or three years, we can measure the impact of programs like the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the schools.

One more item from the survey about students: The findings strongly suggest that perhaps the most significant element in creating opportunity for disadvantaged pupils is to put them in schools with children who are not disadvantaged. I want to emphasize that the educational effectiveness of a mixture of children from different backgrounds does not refer only to racial integration. It also refers to economic and social integration. It means that if you put a small group of disadvantaged Negro children in a class with a large group of white children from middle-class homes, the Negro children will profit appreciably by that association almost without regard to the quality of the school. And it means that if you put white children from an urban slum in a classroom with middle-class children—white or Negro—the disadvantaged white children's school work also will improve. On the other hand, if you took two groups of disadvantaged children—some Negro, some white—and put them in the same classroom, neither group would receive the kind of stimulation for added learning achievement that our survey findings reveal. Such integration would perhaps improve the social attitudes of both Negro and white children, but it would not necessarily produce intellectual stimulus.

Finally—on this matter of students stimulating other students—our survey findings indicate that the integration of children from different social and economic backgrounds helps the disadvantaged without harming the education of the advantaged.

The major point to remember is that when we are talking about public policy and placing youngsters of varied backgrounds in school together to create the best learning situation, we are talking economic and social factors every bit as much as racial factors.

The report also says this to us—that the neighborhood school concept is going to be subjected to considerably more study and debate, much of it doubtless heated. I think we must all agree that neighborhood schools have served us well and continue to do so in many areas of the Nation.

But the extraordinary population shifts taking place in our country make it necessary that we take a close look at what the meaning of the word "neighborhood" has come to include. To a disturbing degree it has come to mean the polarization of families according to the size of their split-level homes or the size of their welfare checks. We are faced with the fact that we are becoming a Nation of plush suburbs on one hand and mid-city slums on the other. Economically and socially, and in the ability of millions of American citizens to achieve their aspirations, the two show signs of becoming separate and even antagonistic continents.

The schools in the suburbs teach children who live in a world of wall-to-wall carpeting, pleasant back yards, and summers at camp. The parents demand quality education, and they have the political muscle and the capacity to tax that make this demand stick.

But they also have the capacity to forget that their neighbors in the central city have children who play in alleys and live six to a room. These people share the suburbanite's interest in quality education, but they can support it only with their spirit, not their pocketbooks.

Let me emphasize here a fact that often gets lost in our discussions on civil rights: Deprived children come in assorted colors. When we talk about the "disadvantaged" we are not speaking only of Negro children. Nor are poverty and want strictly urban afflictions. There are rural enclaves—in Appalachia and in the Ozarks, to mention just

two—where Anglo-Saxon Americans still live in tarpaper shacks and cannot read or write or earn a decent living. And there are pockets of poor whites within the boundaries of our industrial cities.

These are the reasons why we will have to re-appraise where the boundary lines of neighborhoods should be drawn when we speak of "the neighborhood school." It is essential that we give youngsters a glimpse of American life as Americans of every strata actually live it. Among other things, this means operating our school systems in a fashion that encompasses the rich social, economic, and cultural diversity that distinguishes our Nation.

None of us is sure what changes should be made in school policy and organization. But we are rapidly developing a useful shopping list of ideas for experimentation. States and local school boards will have to determine what approaches best fit their particular situations. Certainly they can be helped by Title I funds as they make changes of a variety of kinds.

Learned Hand once observed that "it is well enough to put one's faith in education, but the kind makes a vast difference." I suspect that in the surge of faith in education that has characterized the last few years, too many Americans have neglected to pay enough attention to what kinds of education we are talking about—what standards of quality we have in mind and how universal we believe quality education should be. I congratulate all of those here tonight who have taken on the responsibility of leading the drive to give *all* our children the best education that money, talent, training, and initiative can provide.

Your success in providing that leadership and marshalling the good will and resources of the American people toward the achievement of equal opportunity will provide the final comment on the survey I have been reviewing tonight. Your actions in the next 12 months and the next decade will determine whether the report on Equal Educational Opportunity becomes a plan for progress, or whether it remains nothing more than an interesting, well-documented diagram of inequalities which exist in 1966 and will continue to exist in the years that follow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this speech Mr. Howe speaks about a study that Congress requested the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make in relation to title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In the course of the speech he said:

As we consider next steps to improve what we are doing with Title I funds in the service of disadvantaged children, we have the benefit of new insight into our problem of providing equal educational opportunity. These insights come from a scholarly study of the status of our efforts in desegregating the schools, in upgrading the education offered to disadvantaged children, in giving these youngsters a sense of their own worth in the national community.

The study I speak of is summarized in a 33-page booklet published by the Office of Education and entitled "Equality of Educational Opportunity." My feeling is that the data lying behind this publication will have—and most certainly should have—a deep and lasting effect on American education. I would like to discuss the report this evening because it bears on the subject of our conference.

The booklet presents the preliminary findings of an undertaking instigated by the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Congress directed the Commissioner of Education to survey "the lack of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions and the District of Columbia." The full 700-page report is expected to be off the presses by the end of this month.

The project ultimately involved some 60,000 teachers and 645,000 pupils in 4,000 schools across the Nation and in its territories.

So far as I know, this is the largest, most comprehensive and scientific look that has ever been given to the schools—and the school children—of the United States. We asked some straightforward questions, and we assume we got straightforward answers.

He makes this statement following the lapse of some time since the passage of the civil rights bill.

He continues:

Now, let us take a look at what we have found so far—and what the survey might seem to suggest to the States and the local school systems most of you represent.

We found that for all practical purposes, American education can be labeled as segregated.

Over two-thirds of all Negro pupils in the first grade go to schools that are 90 to 100 percent Negro; only a handful of the Nation's Negro first graders are getting the benefit of desegregated education. In the light of the 1954 Supreme Court ruling, the requirements of the Civil Rights Act, and the further finding of this survey that segregated education is likely to be of lower quality for minority group children than for the majority, these facts should give us pause.

Mr. President, this is typical of the substance of this fine speech. It also points out what the great survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has found, which should be of help to us in realizing the importance of enacting legislation this year to provide whatever sum of money will be needed in order to meet the school crisis.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I serve notice on the floor of the Senate, as I have in committee, that I shall not give support to any attempt by the administration, in the name of economy in Government, to deprive the schoolchildren of this country of the needs that they are entitled to have provided, as brought out by the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Let me suggest to the Secretary of HEW and his associates that, in my judgment, they will make a great mistake if they ask for any cut in the budget beyond the point in which the money can be justifiably spent in carrying out the needs presented by the Department's own report.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] may speak for 3 minutes. I think that by that time the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will be in the Chamber to offer his amendment.

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

## THE 1966 TAX INCREASES ALREADY COOLING OFF ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our economy is gradually slowing down, contrary to the view of some persons who are still advocating that we need a tax increase designed to be an anti-inflationary measure.

Yesterday, I presented the most recent available data on our gross national product and the index of industrial production. This data indicates beyond doubt that such a slowdown is taking place.

A tax increase would accelerate this slowdown and possibly we would find ourselves in a position similar to the late 1950's with a recession on our hands and prices still going up.

Those who argue that a tax increase is needed seem to be unwilling to accept the fact that this slowdown is taking place. They also seem to forget that we have already had some substantial tax changes this year that have had a substantial dampening effect on the economy.

I am referring to the increase in social security taxes that went into effect the first of this year, and the accelerated collection of personal and corporate income taxes that went into effect in May.

The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation have estimated that an additional $1,645,000 was collected in social security tax payments during the first half of this year. The committee staff estimates also that $1,130,000 additional revenues was provided by the accelerated collection of the income taxes.

Together, then, these tax measures meant that $2.775 billion in added taxes were collected. This was a substantial amount and it undoubtedly has played a major role in cooling off the economy.

Those who want additional tax increases now should realize that the impact of these measures are just beginning to be felt.

The Tax Adjustment Act did not have its full effect in the first half. Only a small amount of the $1.1 billion came from excise taxes on automobiles, and the effect of telephone excise taxes has not been felt because of the normal lag in collections.

It is estimated that revenues due to the Tax Adjustment Act will rise to about $2 billion during the second half of calendar 1966; and to about $3 billion in the first half of calendar 1967.

Mr. President, the full impact of the fiscal restraints we have already provided is yet to be felt. I suggest that these restraints have already helped slow down the pace of the economy. We now have to be on guard that it is not slowed down too much.

One area that has really felt the pinch of monetary measures designed to curb our economic activity is the housing industry. It is one sector of the economy that has truly slowed down. As I said yesterday, it is time we began seriously

to consider loosening the monetary restraints that have caused this situation—but to move cautiously and not precipitously.

I ask unanimous consent to have information from the Department of Commerce and the Survey of Current Business showing the plight of the housing industry, and a table on new housing starts, printed in the RECORD.

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

RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY

The increased stringency in credit conditions apparent this year has introduced considerable uncertainty into the outlook for homebuilding activity for the rest of 1966, despite the continued strong flow of consumer income. This uncertainty follows a period when housing starts in a number of large metropolitan areas were reduced to correct overbuilding, particularly of apartment houses and especially in the Southwest and along the West Coast.

OUTLAYS LEVEL OFF THIS SPRING

So far in 1966, current-dollar outlays for private nonfarm residential structures have fluctuated within the relatively narrow range evident since the spring of 1964. Outlays rose $1 billion in the first quarter of this year to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $27.6 billion but appear to have leveled off this spring.

Construction costs have shown some signs of accelerating this year. In the first quarter, costs were some 4 percent above those a year earlier, as compared with increases of about 3 percent during the 2 previous years. Constant-dollar residential outlays, which make allowance for higher costs, also appeared to show a pickup in the first quarter and a leveling this spring. However, in contrast to the current-dollar expenditures, real outlays have been in a moderate downtrend over the past 2 years or so; private nonfarm starts rose to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1.55 million units in the fourth quarter of last year and fell back to a rate of 1.49 million in the first quarter. The first quarter rate was about the same as the rate for 1965 as a whole and some 10 percent below the first quarter 1964 peak. Starts have declined somewhat more than real expenditures because of the trend toward units of higher quality and cost.

Starts edged down from March to April and dropped sharply in May. Data on housing permits, which normally lead starts slightly, suggest a developing weakness in homebuilding since seasonally adjusted permits this April and May were some 9½ percent below the first quarter 1966 average.

REGIONAL PATTERNS DIFFER

Regional figures have shown diverse trends in housing starts over the past 2 years or so (chart 3). Through the end of 1965, starts rose in the two northern regions, decreased slightly in the South, and showed a sharp and prolonged decline in the West.

The overall strength of the economy, especially the durable goods manufacturing sector, was unquestionably important in sustaining housing activity in the heavily industrialized Northeast and North Central regions throughout 1965. In addition, these areas have witnessed considerable demolition of older dwelling units, especially urban apartment and tenement buildings, for which replacement structures have been erected. The easing of starts in the South reflected largely a drop in apartment construction in the major metropolitan areas of Texas, after very substantial increases—apparently in excess of demand—from 1960 to 1963. Overbuilding accompanied by high vacancy rates was also an acute problem in the West; the correction that began 2½ years ago has been severe and has brought starts below their 1960 level.

This spring, both starts and permits data have shown some departure from recent trends. According to permits data, which are somewhat less irregular than starts, homebuilding activity has fallen considerably in the northern regions and has edged down a little further in the West and in the South.

TABLE 1.—*Private housing units authorized by building permits, by region, based on 12,000 permit-issuing places*

[Thousands of units, seasonally adjusted at annual rates]

| | U.S. total | Northeast | North Central | South | West |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *1963* | | | | | |
| 1st quarter | 1,258 | 236 | 222 | 377 | 423 |
| 2d quarter | 1,332 | 231 | 279 | 398 | 424 |
| 3d quarter | 1,326 | 235 | 267 | 401 | 423 |
| 4th quarter | 1,387 | 247 | 284 | 435 | 421 |
| *1964* | | | | | |
| 1st quarter | 1,372 | 254 | 313 | 410 | 395 |
| 2d quarter | 1,290 | 243 | 268 | 409 | 370 |
| 3d quarter | 1,264 | 242 | 290 | 394 | 338 |
| 4th quarter | 1,229 | 239 | 289 | 394 | 307 |
| *1965* | | | | | |
| 1st quarter | 1,257 | 264 | 301 | 413 | 297 |
| 2d quarter | 1,227 | 243 | 312 | 407 | 265 |
| 3d quarter | 1,213 | 255 | 334 | 371 | 253 |
| 4th quarter | 1,289 | 266 | 346 | 430 | 247 |
| *1966* | | | | | |
| 1st quarter | 1,249 | 275 | 343 | 398 | 233 |
| 2d quarter [1] | 1,130 | 222 | 285 | 396 | 228 |

[1] Based on average of April and May.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

HOUSING MIX FAIRLY STABLE SINCE MID-1964

From 1960 to about mid-1964, changes in multifamily housing construction accounted for most of the change in total private housing starts. Multifamily housing rose sharply until late 1963 and early 1964 and then experienced a brief but fairly substantial cutback because of rising vacancy rates. Since the middle of 1964, when constant-dollar housing activity started to show a decline, there has been relatively little change in the mix of single family and multifamily housing. Until very recently, single family starts fluctuated within a rather narrow range. Multifamily starts have been roughly stable at about 15 percent below their recent quarterly peaks but more than double their level of 1959–60.

Seasonally adjusted data on starts are not available by type of structure. To judge from seasonally adjusted permit statistics, both single family and multifamily units in the first quarter of 1966 were about the same as their 1965 quarterly averages. However, both declined this spring with the single family starts off sharply and the multifamily down only slightly.

SINGLE FAMILY HOUSING STARTS

Demographic factors are mainly responsible for the failure of single family housing starts to show any marked changes over the past 5 or 6 years. Although incomes have risen substantially over this period and mortgage funds, until recently at least, have generally been ample, the number of persons 25 to 44 years old—the most important homebuying age group—has been quite stable. Data published by the Census Bureau show that sales of single family housing erected by merchant builders have been steady at about 50,000 per month, seasonally adjusted, for more than 3 years (middle panel, chart 4). Sales showed a slight pickup in the fourth quarter of 1965 and a small dip in the first quarter of 1966.

The difficulties in accurately gaging demand have led to some mild cyclical movements in starts by merchant builders since 1960. For example, in 1963, starts increased moderately without a corresponding rise in sales; as a result, inventories of unsold new houses rose, reaching a peak around the middle of 1964. With sales about unchanged, a cutback in starts reduced unsold stocks from the second half of 1964 through the first quarter of this year. Judging by the limited experience of the Census Bureau survey, stocks of unsold homes have been quite low relative to sales since late last year, even though the first quarter 1966 ratio was slightly above the fourth quarter 1965 figure.

MULTIFAMILY HOUSING

The most remarkable aspect of the multifamily housing market is not that starts are down from their peaks of late 1963 and early 1964 but that they have held up so well. On an annual basis, multifamily starts in 1965 were only 8 percent below 1963, the recent annual high. There are several underlying reasons for the comparatively high rate of multifamily housing. Demographic factors are undoubtedly important: The number of very young household heads, who typically rent rather than buy, began to increase a few years ago and is expected to grow considerably over the next several years. Apartment house construction has been very strong in suburban areas, which have had large population growth and which up to a few years ago had shown relatively little construction of this type. Multifamily construction was comparatively low throughout the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's, and the apartment house stock was in need of a major renewal. The many new conveniences introduced in modern apartment houses have undoubtedly attracted many families and individuals.

The decline in apartment house construction from the peaks reached more than 2 years ago was dampened because cutbacks in response to increased vacancies did not occur simultaneously in all regions. While starts were being reduced in some areas, they were still rising in others, and in some areas that completed their adjustment to overbuilding relatively early, starts began to increase once again.

According to Census data, the national vacancy rate for rental units—which include a substantial proportion of single family houses for rent—was slightly lower in the first quarter of 1966 than in the corresponding 1965 period. For both years, vacancy rates were above those prevailing in early 1963 and 1964.

A more detailed view of the apartment house situation is provided by the annual FHA vacancy survey of FHA rental projects. On a national basis, the 1965 data show a small rise in the vacancy rate over early 1964, which showed a rather sharp increase over early 1963. Among the largest metropolitan areas, changes in vacancy rates from 1964 to 1965 were mixed outside of the Southwest and the West Coast, where rates were uniformly higher and at very high levels. The 1966 results are not yet available. Apartment construction has been sharply curtailed in those metropolitan areas with unusually high vacancy rates. Last year, for example, permits for apartment units declined almost 35 percent in San Francisco, about 40 percent in Houston, Dallas, and San Diego, and 50 percent in Los Angeles.

MORTAGE MARKETS TIGHT

This spring, homebuilders and home buyers have been faced with the most unfavorable credit market conditions since 1959. Even though there has been a substantial rise in yields available on home mortgage investments, rates on other types of debt instruments have risen even faster, and mortgage investments have become relatively less attractive. In previous postwar years, such a development has been associated with a reduction in funds available for construction and a cutback in homebuilding.

Until late 1965, mortgage funds were generally in ample supply and mortgage yields had shown a slight downdrift since the start of the economic expansion. At present, however, conventional mortgage rates on new houses are close to 6¼ percent, as compared with approximately 5¾ percent last fall. The maximum rates permissible on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed home mortgages have been boosted twice this year. In early April, these rates were raised ¼ of a percent to 5¾ percent, after a ¼-percent increase earlier in 1966. In secondary market trading, yields on FHA mortgages have risen to about 6⅜ percent, after staying under 5½ percent from early 1963 through late 1965.

TABLE 2.—*Vacancy rates for FHA apartments, selected areas, March 31*

| | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U.S. total | 5.4 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 6.5 |
| Northeast: | | | | | |
| New York | 2.0 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 6.0 | 4.8 |
| Philadelphia | 6.3 | 7.3 | 7.8 | 7.3 | 9.2 |
| Boston | 1.2 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 5.4 | 5.4 |
| Buffalo | 5.2 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.4 |
| Newark | 1.2 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 4.7 |
| North Central: | | | | | |
| Chicago | 1.3 | 3.3 | 2.4 | 5.5 | 2.0 |
| Detroit | 7.7 | 12.3 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 3.7 |
| Pittsburgh | 5.8 | 6.6 | 8.3 | 4.7 | 5.9 |
| St. Louis | 17.1 | 13.0 | 9.7 | 8.3 | 7.9 |
| Cleveland | 5.4 | 8.7 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 5.8 |
| South: | | | | | |
| Washington | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 2.9 | 2.8 |
| Baltimore | 2.3 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 3.0 | 4.6 |
| Houston | 18.6 | 12.7 | 10.2 | 15.7 | 15.4 |
| Dallas | 9.9 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 13.3 | 25.1 |
| Atlanta | 8.3 | 7.3 | 6.4 | 4.5 | 5.4 |
| West: | | | | | |
| Los Angles | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 8.0 | 10.9 |
| San Francisco | 6.1 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 5.8 | 8.9 |
| Seattle | 11.2 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 11.7 | 12.3 |
| San Diego | 17.1 | 4.8 | 16.7 | 14.6 | 16.1 |
| Denver | 3.2 | 5.5 | 11.6 | 6.3 | 10.6 |

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

*New housing units started by ownership, and seasonally adjusted annual rates of private starts, June 1965, and April, May, and June, 1966*

[In thousands of housing units]

| Period | Total (including farm) | | | Nonfarm | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total private and public | Private | Seasonally adjusted annual rate, private only | Total private and public | Private | Seasonally adjusted annual rate, private only |
| 1965—June | 162.3 | 155.5 | 1,566 | 159.7 | 152.8 | 1,539 |
| 1966—April | 149.2 | 147.1 | 1,502 | 146.9 | 144.8 | 1,481 |
| May [1] | 137.1 | 133.2 | 1,295 | 133.8 | 129.9 | 1,264 |
| June [1] | 130.9 | 127.7 | 1,288 | 128.5 | 125.3 | 1,264 |

[1] Preliminary.

## SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM SHOT IN ARM TO FARM SECTOR OF OUR ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, I had colloquy on this floor with my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], on the need for a tax increase. I pointed to a number of facts indicating that not only was a tax increase unnecessary at the present time but also that unemployment was up significantly.

This unemployment increase, together with the slowdown in the rate of growth of our gross national product, makes it ever more important for the administration to reverse the present heavy outflux of dairy farmers from the farm into other sectors of our economy. What a pity it is to force these efficient producers off the farm because of inadequate dairy prices only to find that after a few months of work they had to join the ranks of the unemployed. After all, without seniority, these last hired would be the first fired.

The administration has taken some new steps to improve the dairy income picture. They have increased dairy price supports to $4. They have decided to support the school milk program in its present form.

It is now up to Congress to act to reaffirm these administration decisions. For example, both House and Senate should take early action on the McGovern proposal to keep milk support prices at $4 per hundredweight through March 31, 1970. In addition, the House of Representatives should act quickly to approve the Ellender child nutrition bill, which extends the school milk program for 4 years. Finally, House-Senate conferees on the agriculture appropriations bill should meet quickly to approve the expenditure of $105 million on the school milk program in fiscal 1967.

The school milk program's impact on dairy farm income cannot be minimized. Fully 2.5 percent of the Nation's yearly milk production is used in the school milk program. By keeping the program strong, Congress can give dairy farm income a real shot in the arm and, as a consequence, alleviate low farm income. This will keep many dairy farmers from swelling the ranks of the unemployed.

## STRATTON COMMITTEE TO SAVE WEST FRONT OF CAPITOL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last month, Representative STRATTON announced the formation of the Committee of One Million To Save the U.S. Capitol. That is, to save the Capitol from the $34 million extravaganza proposed by the Architect of the Capitol.

Representative STRATTON invited Members of the Senate to join the committee as cochairmen. Several Senators, including myself, have accepted.

I am happy today to announce that the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] also has joined the committee.

As the Senator from Maryland said:

I feel strongly that Congressmen and Senators have a duty to assume the leadership of a massive grassroots drive to stop the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol from presenting the nation with a costly and esthetically disastrous fait accompli that will be resented for years to come.

I heartily endorse his views and welcome him as a cochairman of the Committee of One Million To Save the U.S. Capitol.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two excellent newspaper editorials dealing with the west front of the Capitol. One, from the Milwaukee Journal, points out that the Capitol is "a symbol of our Government" that has never been damaged except by the British and the Architect of the Capitol. The other, from the Washington Post, notes:

No proponent of this costly and wasteful project has put forward a good reason why a Government beset by budgetary crisis must undertake at this juncture an unneeded, unwanted, unnecessary and unwise remodeling of the Capitol.

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

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal]

BACKFIRE ON CAPITOL CHANGE

The plans of J. George Stewart to do more harm to the United States capitol have stirred so much opposition that they may be thwarted. However, Stewart—the capitol architect, who is a former congressman and not an architect at all—has succeeded before in flying in the face of strong opposition from outraged experts on architectural art and style.

In Europe, old buildings are kept in repair but they are not ruined by tacking on modern facings and changing their whole character. If the historic stone walls of the capitol's west front are crumbling, they should be fixed. But there is no need to extend the whole building 44 feet straight across its face and replace sandstone with marble.

The capitol is a symbol of our government. George Washington laid the cornerstone. Abraham Lincoln insisted on going ahead with its construction during the Civil war as symbolic of the nation's faith in its future. Only the British—in 1812—and Stewart have ever done it damage. The British tried to burn it. Stewart is trying to encase it in marble and redo its whole design.

His plan—unfortunately backed by such powerful politicians and artistic geniuses as Speaker MCCORMACK and Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN—has stirred anger in congress, among architects, among patriots, to whom the capitol is precious. Perhaps this time Stewart can be stopped. If the congress needs more meeting and office space, let it build another office building—but, even then, don't let Stewart do it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

WEST FRONT OPPOSITION

The Council of the Institute of Early American History and Culture has written a letter to Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK urging reconsideration of the plan to destroy the West front of the Capitol. They correctly assert that the proposed extension will "result in the destruction of all the original external architectural details which make the Capitol one of the country's historic landmarks."

The Council, membership of which includes some of the foremost historical scholars in America, acknowledges that the Capitol is not a museum but a working forum, but they describe it as a "three dimensional lesson in the history of our country."

While the scholars were appealing to the Speaker, Senator RIBICOFF appealed for an examination of the office of the Architect of the Capitol and a delay in construction until that can be completed. He rightly said the matter is deserving of the consideration of the President.

The overwelming majority of American architects and scholars and a substantial number of Senators and House members oppose the destruction of the West front. No proponent of this costly and wasteful project has put forward a good reason why a Government beset by budgetary crisis must undertake at this juncture an unneeded, unwanted, unnecessary and unwise re-modeling of the Capitol.

---

## FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 681

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the foreign aid bill at the desk and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

And at the end of the bill the following new section:

"SEC. 203. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, the authorizations in this Act shall be adjusted on a proportional basis so the total shall be no less than 10 per centum of the total funds authorized to be appropriated for United States operations in Vietnam during fiscal year 1967."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the pending foreign assistance bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations authorized a total of $2,351,762,000 for the worldwide assistance efforts of the United States. Since this bill was sent to the floor, very large reductions have been made in the amount suggested by the Senate Committee after it completed its reductions on the administration request.

Mr. President, the United Nations has recently recommended that all developed countries devote no less than 1 percent of their gross national product for the assistance of the developing world. A similar recommendation was made last summer by the White House Conference on International Cooperation. Realistic but tough-minded American bankers and experts on international development have arrived at a similar figure.

The bill now before us represents less than one-third of 1 percent of our gross national product. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] pointed out in his individual views, the United States was devoting nearly 2 percent of our gross national product to foreign economic assistance 15 years ago under the Marshall plan. That investment has come back to us many times over in the increased purchasing power of Europe and Japan, to say nothing of the increased political stability of the countries we assisted so generously.

Yet, the needs of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East are vastly more acute and urgent than the needs of postwar Europe and Japan. How can we justify in terms of our own self-interest or on grounds of broad humanitarian and political considerations the very meager approach proposed in the bill before us as reduced by various amendments offered from the floor?

Mr. President, let me say at this point that I approve of some of the emphasis in the Senate committee actions—the Senate committee report—particularly the separation of military and economic aid and the recommendation for more multilateral programs. I think that is the rationalization under which some of the members of the committee who have been strong supporters of economic and technical aid have felt it would be useful at this point to curtail our program and perhaps take another look at it next year.

While understanding that point of view, I think we have also gotten the impression from some of the discussion on the Senate floor that the basic strain on our resources is the foreign aid program, which simply is not true.

We are spending approximately $2 billion a month on our involvement in Vietnam. There is some difficulty in trying to find out what the cost of our Vietnam activities is. As near as I can judge, based on discussions with members of the Armed Services Committee and with other senior Members of the Senate, it would be perfectly right to assume that our involvement in Vietnam is costing us close to $2 billion every 30 days, which amounts to about $25 billion a year.

Mr. President, we are now spending approximately $2 billion a month on our involvement in Vietnam. As one of those who has seriously questioned the wisdom of this deepening involvement, I nevertheless do not believe that our expenditures there should be used as an excuse to reduce our investments in all the rest of the world.

The purpose of my amendment is to hold our foreign assistance programs for the world as a whole to no less than 10 percent of what we will expend on our Vietnam venture during fiscal year 1967. It would seem to me that our interest and our responsibility in the entire world ought to be considered at least 10 percent as important as our interest in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, before we further weaken our aid to the developing world, let us consider that the wealthiest nation on the face of this earth cannot live at peace in a sea of poverty. It makes no sense on either economic or moral grounds for us to devote $25 billion annually trying to put out a fire in Vietnam when we are unwilling to expend even 10 percent of that amount in the rest of the world to prevent other more dangerous fires from breaking out, fires of the same kind arising from misery and poverty in underdeveloped areas.

Let us consider, too, that 88 percent of the funds expended under the proposed bill will be spent here in the United States to stimulate American industry and agriculture and to provide jobs for Americans. Let us consider that as nations raise their standards of life, they become commercial purchasers of American products. For example, Japan, which was assisted by American food and capital in the postwar period, has now become our best cash customer, purchasing a billion dollars a year of American agricultural produce alone.

Foreign aid is not a giveaway; it is a sound economic, political, and moral investment that the United States can ill afford to neglect.

For those reasons, I offer this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Leadership on Aid," published in yesterday's Washington Post.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 20, 1966]

LEADERSHIP ON AID

World Bank President George Woods deserves wholehearted and unequivocal support from the United States in his effort to step up the flow of soft loans to developing countries. The proposal Woods is scheduled to present today to the Development Advisory Committee would mean a quadrupling of contributions by the United States and other member countries of the Bank's soft-loan affiliate, the International Development Association. But this would still entail an outlay of only $400 million by the United States as part of a projected overall I.D.A. pool of $1 billion per year. A soft loan program on this scale can hardly be considered over-ambitious against the background of an official Bank estimate that the developing countries could absorb $3 to $4 billion per year more in external capital than they are now receiving. This is especially so at a time when economists are talking of a trillion-dollar U.S. Gross National Product by 1976.

Woods has acted decisively during his three years as president to bring Bank repayment terms into line with the facts of life in the developing countries. Many of the original loans made by the Bank (and the United States) during the Fifties carried short-term repayment provisions which bore no relation to the inherently long-term nature of the development process. The result has been a pileup of debt obligations in the Sixties coinciding with what was a predictable new cycle of aid requests from still-poor countries. As an immediate palliative, the aid-givers have been driven to the anomalous recourse of allocating new aid to cover repayments on old debts and in some cases, to stretching out the terms of existing loans. Now the Bank is seeking to give new

emphasis to the I.D.A. as a major channel for its aid in an effort to meet the repayment problem head-on. In contrast to the Bank itself, which normally charges 5.5 per cent interest and now expects repayment in 20 or, at most, 35 years, the I.D.A. makes loans for 50 years and imposes only a .75 per cent service charge.

The need for increased American backing to I.D.A. in no way alters the importance of a continuing and indeed enlarged bilateral U.S. economic aid program. It is extremely unfortunate that Senator FULBRIGHT has tended to link his support for increased multilateral aid with opposition to any long-term authorization for U.S. aid. Senator FULBRIGHT and some of his colleagues have permitted their anxieties about military aid in some countries to blind them to the very great value of a firm U.S. economic aid commitment in others.

In opposing the long-term aid authorization approved by the House, FULBRIGHT originally pointed to Secretary Rusk's Las Vegas speech and other statements tracing the origins of American involvement in Vietnam partly to our long aid commitment there. Happily, however, Rusk has now all but swallowed his words, stating in a letter to Majority Leader MANSFIELD that "our aid program neither implies nor prohibits a commitment to use our armed forces in cooperation with the self-defense efforts of a foreign country."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In substance and briefly, the amendment would increase proportionately each of the allocations in an amount equal to 10 percent of what this country will spend in fiscal 1967 in fighting the war in Vietnam. Is that correct?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct. As I said earlier, it is a little difficult to know exactly what that figure is. Members of the Armed Services Committee and other senior members of the committees concerned with this question have estimated that we are spending $2 billion a month. In a rather carefully, well-done article in a recent Fortune magazine article, the cost on a yearly basis was calculated at $21 billion. So we are fixing the figure at from $2,100 million a year to approximately $2,400 million a year, which is about the figure the committee recommended.

The impact of this amendment, as the Senator has said, would be to hold the authorizations in the present bill, on a proportional basis, at not less than 10 percent of that figure, which would be approximately $2 billion a year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, the foreign assistance bill would provide moneys amounting to not less than 10 percent of what we are spending in the war in Vietnam. Is that correct?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct.

SAVING OUR FISHING FLEET

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the vessels of the American tuna fleet based in my home State of California continue to be harassed by naval vessels of South American nations claiming territorial zones far beyond the limits of reasonable international comity. Two recent incidents, one in May 1966, and one in December 1965, involved naval vessels of Peru, which claims as national waters a zone stretching 200 miles from its coastline. Protection of American tuna vessels in these waters of the open ocean is a matter of continued and recurring concern to all Americans.

The Senate has now before it the foreign assistance program. In the last session I was joined by a number of my fellow Senators, Republican and Democrat alike, in offering an amendment to provide that no aid would be extended to any country which imposes penalties on United States fishing vessels in regions beyond the equivalent of the territorial limits of the United States. Although this proposal was overwhelmingly supported in the Senate, it did not, I regret to say, find similar support in the House of Representatives. The House-Senate conferees weakened the Senate position by permitting the President to have discretion in this matter. My amendment was an unequivocating mandate. The intent of the Congress is nevertheless clear that no aid should be provided to countries which interfere with American fisheries on the high seas.

President Belaunde of Peru recently told the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner that his country's 200-mile limit has been a great rallying cause for many Peruvian political parties because it establishes a national identity, "It tells the world 'We amount to something.'"

Mr. President, it is clear that only the most severe measures, perhaps nothing short of armed force, would effect a revision of the territorial boundaries of these proud Latin American nations. Such measures are clearly too drastic for the United States, in the 20th century, though a few generations ago I have no doubt that force would have been applied.

Even as these seizures of American vessels have taken place, use of the open seas has been changing radically to the disadvantage of our traditional American fishing activities. We all agree that we must protect American fishermen against interference by foreign naval vessels on the high seas. But, now as we see Soviet factory fleets off our own shores, ravaging the spawning beds just beyond the 3-mile limits of our own coast, as other nations in Latin America join the minority claiming greater territorial limits, we are witnessing an international grab for the resources of the sea. The expanding population on this ever smaller globe is pressing to its last frontier, the high seas.

Protection of the American tuna fleet is no longer solely a matter of the protection of the vessels and their crews, but of maintaining a resource vital to the food supply and to the nutrition of our Nation.

Since the incident of May 23 of this year, I had been in active consultation with the Department of State to find a formula for a long-term solution of this recurring crisis.

There is an anomaly in international law permitting any nation, if it so decrees and determines, to claim as much of its territorial sea as it is able to protect, and to receive appropriate recognition for. I believe it is the consensus of the Senate that the United States would not claim territorial limits which would unreasonably encroach on the rules of the road or upon traditional international fishing grounds. In the time of President Eisenhower, the delegates to an international conference of the Law of the Sea in 1960 came within one vote of adopting an international agreement limiting territorial waters of each nation for fishing purposes to 12 miles from the coast. That was a pretty gloomy roll-call for maritime nations.

Some of the prominent fishing nations of the world are now seeking to mark out their dominance in the fisheries of the international seas, much in the same way that in the last century the imperialist nations carved up Africa. In this scramble America must provide leadership with firmness. She will not be greedy, but she will protect her own.

In consultation with the Department of State, I have proposed a four point program to insure the protection and preservation of our fishing activities off Latin America. I stated, earlier this year, it is essential that we establish a system of licensing whereby our fishermen may peacefully enter and fish in the waters off Latin America. No intergovernmental arrangement is possible which would recognize the egregious limits of Peru, Ecuador, and Chile.

Moreover, we cannot, by way of attempted retaliation, run our own jurisdictional claims hundreds of miles out into the sea, nor is it feasible to provide constant United States naval convoy protection for our American fishing vessels. Where we cannot provide physical security for them, we must at least give them the opportunity to protect themselves. The following proposals should be a first step toward achieving these goals:

First. I intend to introduce shortly a piece of legislation proposing a revision of the Fishermen's Protection Act, to provide for reimbursement of registration fees and a portion of the cost of fishing licenses which U.S. fishermen are compelled to purchase in order to harvest their historic fisheries. The U.S. Government should not only pay fishermen the cost of fines, as the law now provides, and of other losses involved in seizure by foreign vessels in international waters; it should pay also—as proposed by my distinguished fellow Senators from the Pacific Coast, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]—it should compensate them for at least half of the cost of the licensing fees under an equitable formula to be worked out with the industry. It is in the national interest to support a continuation of the activities at full capacity of the fishing industry, whose production is valued at an annual rate of $250 million.

I observe that this year Japan, one of the most active fishing nations in the world, paid over $7 million to compensate for fishing rights in Korean waters. The cost of the measure I propose should not run to more than $500,000 to $1 million at present rates of licensing charged

by all nations on the West Coast of Latin America likely to be concerned.

Second. The Department of State has accepted the task of facilitating licensing procedures so that our vessels, crossing from the zone of one nation into another, can conveniently purchase licenses without time wasted in bureaucratic procedures and without touching shore. It is vital that the fishing fleet be able to continue without interruption its pursuit of schools of fish as they cross artificial international boundaries in the seas and oceans.

Third. The Department of State has agreed to the establishment of a consular office in Talava, Peru, to improve its services to our fishermen in Latin America. The Department will also seek to improve licensing arrangements available to our fishermen in San Diego and other cities where our fishing interests have ready access. The Department is also considering means of implementing my suggestion of a permanent regional fishing attaché in Latin America.

Fourth. Recognizing that we must agree to disagree on the limits of our international fishing boundaries, the U.S. and Latin American nations must also recognize that we have broad mutual interests in the defense and development of this hemisphere. The Department of State has agreed to continue consultations toward resolution of these multifaceted problems through negotiations and discussion.

I call upon the fishing industry and upon my colleagues in the Senate to recognize the urgency of maintaining the American-flag fishing fleet in international waters. This problem becomes more urgent every day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me, dated July 15, 1966, from the Department of State, signed by Robert M. Sayre, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and a letter addressed to me under date of yesterday, July 20, 1966, signed by August Felando, the general manager of the American Tunaboat Association.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, July 15, 1966.*

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Prior to his departure for Central America, Lincoln Gordon asked me to report to you on the status of our efforts both in Washington and overseas to aid our American tuna fishing industry. In this connection your suggestions have been most helpful and we will make every effort to implement them.

While the United States has traditionally recognized a three-mile limit for both territorial seas and for exclusive fisheries jurisdiction, certain other nations follow different rules. The situation has given rise to numerous difficulties where the varying points of view come into conflict and has made the defense of the right of our fishermen to operate on the high seas a difficult problem. Perhaps the most extreme case is off the west coast of Latin America where certain nations claim a fisheries jurisdiction extending 200 miles from their coasts. Under present circumstances there does not appear to be an effective remedy under international law. Either we must accept such claims, attempt to impose our views, or find a negotiated position which does not prejudice either party's claim but results in a workable arrangement. As the first position is not acceptable and the second not practical, we have been attempting to find some mutually acceptable solution through negotiation. We have, in addition, investigated means of improving the lot of our American fishermen while these international questions remain unresolved.

Recognizing the difficulties that these conflicting claims present to the American fishing industry, the Congress enacted legislation which provides compensation for certain fines levied against our fishermen when they are apprehended on what we consider to be the high seas. As discussed with you, the Administration is presently considering the need for broadening the benefits now available under the provisions of this Act. These amendments could include such things as reimbursement for registration fees and fishing licenses which U.S. fishermen are compelled to purchase in return for operating on what we consider to be the high seas.

As you have pointed out, in those situations where U.S. fishermen intend to fish in waters off a Latin American country and are willing to buy licenses, the procedure should be as uncomplicated and convenient as possible. In this regard, Chile, Peru, Ecuador and other relevant Latin American countries have established consular representation in San Diego and in other cities to which our fishing interests have ready access. Certain countries permit licensing by radio when the plans of a captain change and it appears he will wish to fish in the waters off the indicated country. As you have suggested, we will explore the possibility of obtaining this facility from other countries as well. In this area, we are encouraging discussions between representatives of the fishing industry and the foreign consulates to broaden the services which are made available.

We will continue to attempt to avoid confrontations between U.S. fishermen and foreign governments and will continue to improve and broaden the services available to American fishermen when they are apprehended on the high seas and taken to foreign ports. In Ecuador, for example, our Consulate General in Guayaquil provides the necessary consular services in the port of Salinas (the port where our vessels have on occasion been taken), and attempts to provide these services within two hours or so of notification that a boat has been apprehended. This has even on occasion meant that a representative of the Consulate General has been able to be waiting on the dock when the vessel arrived in port. In Peru the principal ports where our vessels have been taken after seizure are in the northern part of the country at some distance from the capital at Lima, and our Ambassador has used the Air Attaché plane to fly a team to the site to provide assistance. This has resulted in the prompt handling of the cases of our tuna vessels and their subsequent release. We have, of course, vigorously protested these incidents to the respective host governments when such have occurred and will continue to do so as required. We will also investigate your suggestion that we find a means of establishing a consular office at Talara.

In the more difficult area of reaching an understanding with the governments concerned, our Embassies are currently engaged in an effort to explore areas of possible agreement regarding fisheries which would not prejudice the legal position of either party. We will continue to discuss these problems with you and the fishing industry, and are hopeful that we will thereby obtain further suggestions that can be helpful in these negotiations. If these proposals are mutually acceptable, we will attempt to obtain their approval by the affected governments.

In our active search for a solution to these problems the Department of State plans in the immediate future to assign a regional fisheries attaché, highly skilled in fisheries problems, to a post in South America where he will be able to serve the entire area.

I hope that the ends of the American fishing industry will be best served through the services described above and through continuing negotiations. I look forward to further cooperation with you and representatives of the American tuna fishing industry.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. SAYRE,
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs.*

---

JULY 20, 1966.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: The program you have outlined as an approach to the solution of our longstanding problem with Latin American nations in continuing our traditional tuna fisheries in that area has the support of the American Tunaboat Association. I would particularly like to commend your constructive and positive proposal to defray the costs incurred by our fishermen to harvest tuna in areas which have been recognized as traditional fishing grounds for the United States fleet, and which in many places the United States recognizes as international waters.

As you well know, the tuna industry in the United States originated in Southern California in 1903. Since that time Southern California fishermen have developed fisheries from the coast of California to Chile. These fisheries now produce approximately 190,000 tons, or over 400,000,000 cans of tuna, per year, for the consumption of the people of the United States.

Since 1950 American tuna fishermen have provided the benefits of their knowledge, including many of their trade secrets, to the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, so that the Commission may appropriately investigate the fisheries, carry out its conservation activities, and provide a basis for regulation of this fishing for the benefit of the nations of the Pacific Basin.

We recognize this fishery, not as the preserve of one nation, but as the common resource of all.

Sincerely yours,

AUGUST FELANDO,
*General Manager,*
*American Tunaboat Association.*

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, there was a previous understanding that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would call up an amendment in which he is interested at this time.

So under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Section 620, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance, is

amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(p) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any member state of the Organization of American States the government of which came into power by the unconstitutional overthrow of a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government which had been acting in accordance with its constitutional mandate, if, in consultation with the members of the Organization of American States, in accordance with applicable resolutions and agreements of the Organization of American States, the President finds that such government does not intend to take appropriate steps, within a reasonable time, for the restoration of constitutional government, the holding of free elections, and the application of human and civil rights and liberties, until (1) the President is satisfied that such government intends to take such appropriate steps or (2) the President has determined that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and reports such determination and his reasons therefor to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House within 30 days accordingly.'"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that the amendment I have called up is a mimeographed amendment. I call this especially to the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], because there is a material difference between the mimeographed amendment and the printed amendment which I originally intended to propose.

That material difference lies in the use, in the third line of the section which I propose to insert—that is, section (p)—of the word "came," in the mimeographed form, as a substitute for the words "comes into" in the printed document.

That makes a great difference. It is my desire to have included within the purview of this amendment the de facto regime in Argentina. By the use of the word "came," it is likely included. On the other hand, the use of the words "comes into" cloud also mean this, if the author of the amendment said it was the intention to deal with current de facto regimes, and of course Argentina is the current one.

I have been unable to come to an agreement with the Department of State on that interpretation. Therefore, to end any question as to what I meant, I had to change the words "comes into" to the word "came."

I shall make that explanation again when more Senators are present, but I wanted to make it clear that the amendment I have offered is the mimeographed amendment and not the printed amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to give this amendment the degree of weight and responsibility and seriousness which it deserves.

It represents a very real and a very pressing problem for us in a part of the world which, without denegating the importance of other parts of the world, is, in terms of the long-term future of the United States, the most important. Solidarity of the Western Hemisphere is the most important element or should be.

This is said, as I say, without in any way deprecating or depreciating the critical importance of anything else we do anywhere in the world.

The real problem facing us is what to do with nonconstitutional regimes, military regimes in the main, which take over generally by force, even though it may be bloodless, from constitutional governments in this hemisphere. I emphasize that the amendment relates to this hemisphere.

Mr. President, let us first be very clear as to what the amendment would do. The amendment does not deal with recognition. That is not our congressional prerogative. The amendment deals only with assistance, which is something on which we legislate.

The amendment deals with assistance to any member of the Organization of American States. That confines the amendment to 19 countries in the Western Hemisphere, excluding Canada.

The amendment relates only to governments which have come into power, so-called de facto governments, by the unconstitutional overthrow of freely elected and constitutional, democratic governments which have been acting in accordance with their constitutional mandates. The amendment would apply to that kind of a de facto regime.

To me, and this is the most critical aspect of the amendment, it would require consultation with the members of the Organization of American States in accordance with the applicable resolutions and agreements of the members of the Organization of American States.

This is the first time that an effort is being made to introduce into the motivating action of the United States the result of consultations with other American countries.

This would come about through a resolution adopted at the November 1965 meeting in Buenos Aires of the Second Special Inter-American Conference. It is Resolution No. 26. I shall describe it later. It is of critical importance to me in respect of this amendment because it is a recognition of the impact upon our policy of collective consultation with other American countries.

If my amendment is agreed to, we would stop foreign assistance—military, economic, technical, or any kind of assistance—to such a government after the consultation to which I have referred, if the President were to find that such a de facto government does not intend to take appropriate steps within a reasonable time for the restoration of constitutional government and the holding of free elections and the application of civil rights and liberties.

This is in accordance with the resolution of the Organization of American States, to which I refer. That is the exact term of that resolution.

This denial of aid is to obtain until the President is satisfied that such a government does intend to hold free elections and to apply human and civil rights and liberties, or until the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and he reports such determination and his reasons therefor to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House within 30 days.

These are the essential components of the resolution. It requires a cutoff of aid, both military and economic, after consultation with the members of the Organization of American States, if the President finds that the de facto government does not intend to have free elections or to extend human and civil rights and liberties. The resolution provides for the cutting off of aid until such time as the President advises Congress that he is satisfied that the government intends to take those steps or that, notwithstanding the fact that it does not intend to take such steps, it is still essential to the national interest of the United States to give such aid.

For practical purposes, this puts the President to his proof, and serves notice that we do not favor military takeovers, and that, as a necessary concomitant of recognition, which is within the power of the Executive, aid will not follow.

This is a matter peculiarly within the competence of Congress to say, because this is the one organ of a democratic government or a representative government which is immediately eliminated in the event of such a takeover. The first thing that goes is the legislative arm of government. So I believe that we in Congress have a right to show a special solicitude for the legislative arm of government, as an organ of the freedom of the people, by this kind of amendment emanating from us, at the very least—really, we are proceeding on the basis of "at the very least"—putting the President to his proof.

The first question that comes to mind, naturally, is, Who would be affected by the proposed amendment? What countries would be affected? Our researches and our checking with the Department of State would lead us to believe that only Argentina, which has very recently been the subject of a military takeover, would be affected.

Other military regimes are in existence in Latin America. For example, Paraguay is one, but Paraguay is approaching an election; so the President could certify a continuance of aid to that country, fully within the terms of the proposed amendment.

Bolivia has a military government, but, again, elections are scheduled for July 3; and Bolivia, too, under the proposed amendment, could qualify on certification by the President.

The same is true of Brazil, the largest country in Latin America, which also has a regime which came into power with military support. There, too, the President could certify qualification, because elections are scheduled to take place in

October and November of this year for various elements of the government.

Haiti presents a different situation, although they have a government, under their version of a constitution and processes of law, which we thoroughly disapprove of, because the President holds office for life, by a resolution of the legislative arm of the country. But I do not believe that that kind of fuzzy situation could come within the terms of the proposed amendment and bring Haiti within the terms of the amendment, which deals with unconstitutional overthrow of a freely elected and constituted democratic government. That would not fit the case of Haiti.

So when the matter is boiled down in the way I have described, the one country which would come under this amendment—except by virtue of the President's determination that aid should be continued—would be Argentina.

A good deal of opinion has been pressed upon me that the language of the original printed amendment proposed, which was prospective entirely, unless differently construed, should be the way in which I ought to present the amendment, because it would exclude Argentina, and that as we had already recognized Argentina by action of the President, there ought to be a free hand on the part of the President in respect of Argentina.

I am not opinionated on this subject, but I believe it fair to disclose to the Senate why I took the other course and made it retrospective in operation.

I first suggested, I might say parenthetically, that I would be willing, as the *author of the* amendment, to state that the words which were prospective would nonetheless include Argentina, because it was a contemporary takeover. But as the administration demurred to that interpretation, I naturally could not make it, because I could not do it unilaterally. Therefore, I went the whole way and adopted the retrospective word "came."

I did so in order to submit the case to the Senate in its full strength, which I believed was the only fair thing to—especially with the Argentinian situation facing us currently—to present to the Senate, in the first instance, at the very least, the situation with Argentina included.

Ample parliamentary means are available by which to confine the proposed amendment to its prospective operation, if I feel that that is the prevailing opinion in the Senate, in which respect I say it would still be an effective and an important amendment, but not so effective and not so important as if it did include Argentina. Then we could manage, within parliamentary means, to bring it in line with that view, if it represented some general view of the Senate.

However, in the first instance, I felt that I wished to present the matter in its pristine form to the Senate, facing the Senate directly with a decision as to whether the Argentine military regime should be included in this declaration of policy.

Mr. President, the desire on the part of the administration that this be prospective only and the reason it seeks to give itself an absolutely free hand with Argentina are understandable. Naturally, the Executive always desires to retain as much initiative in foreign policy as possible. This I understand. But I point out that my reason, on the other hand, was the unique custodianship which I feel a legislative body has in a representative government. We are the legislative body of our Nation. Legislative bodies of other nations, subject to this kind of de facto takeover, are the first to go.

I point out in respect to the Argentine regime, which I have no desire to attack, that we hear mixed views and reports about that matter, even from Argentina itself. I do not wish my words to constitute an attack on the Argentine regime specifically. I have no such intent in mind. But I do attack the concept that without some deliberation in which Congress should participate, aid may be continued solely at the will of the Executive of our own country to a military takeover government.

I point out that the first thing that was done in Argentina was the dissolving of the Congress, the Supreme Court, and all political parties. In short, all forms of representative government and of democratic government were immediately swept aside in Argentina. This is the traditional practice of a military government, no matter how beneficent.

Under my proposed amendment, even that could be done. We contemplate the fact that it could be done. But we also say that at the very least we expect good-faith efforts to bring back representative government, in order to qualify such a nation for aid from this country, which is the participation by another nation in our resources, which we in Congress have an important hand in giving.

It is not like the recognition which we have entrusted under the Constitution to the President.

(At this point, Mr. MONDALE assumed the chair.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I hold no brief for the military junta that has taken over the Government of Argentina. However, yesterday I received a letter from a man who for a period of 5 years was in the mercantile field in Argentina, a man whom I know well. He went to Argentina. He wrote to me urging that we not take any action, but that we give the new Government an opportunity to try to establish some semblance of being a good government, to give it an opportunity later to hold democratic elections so as to give the people an opportunity to express themselves.

He did state that, as we know, the Peronistas are a strong organization in that country and that it was his opinion that they had no great love for the United States.

I think that when we deal with Argentina, we must keep in mind that perhaps this is the best we can do temporarily. I hold no brief for the Government there.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to point out that in our debate we are dealing with the subject of institutions, the future of institutions, and also the encouragement of free and representative government.

In this regard, when the distinguished Senator from Kansas and I submitted our resolution on this very subject—in which he did give me the great honor of joining with me—in September of 1965, I made a statement, in presenting the resolution, which remarks run somewhat along the lines of the amendment I submitted today. That was before the Argentine takeover, and if we had adopted that resolution, it would have had a bearing on the Argentine situation:

> Such military coups have occurred in Latin America since the beginning of 1962. It may be argued very convincingly that not all of these takeovers were undesirable but it may be argued with equal persuasion, however transitional may be the military in political affairs in Latin America, that these are becoming increasingly damaging to Latin American development and should, therefore, inspire great hemispheric concern.

I am sure we all understand that one of the most upsetting aspects of government stability in Latin America is the danger of military takeover. When I was in Argentina a few months ago and saw President Illia, and looked over the situation there, the country was having serious economic difficulties.

I am sure—because it is probably true of every country in varying degrees—that the President and his administration could have run the country a lot better than it was being run. I am sure there are all knds of legitimate complaints and difficulties, but we have learned over such a long period of time that the institution is more important than the vicissitudes of an administration. When the institution goes, the people's freedom goes. They can endure the lack of success much more than the loss of the institutions.

The important point that we must remember in the Senate is that almost every Latin American government exists by sufferance of the military. There cannot be real stability in Latin America until that ends. This is a critical point for all of us to remember as we give our votes and support for hundreds of millions of dollars in appropriations.

There was widespread public information in Argentina that the military could take over the government on any afternoon that they wished. Hence, President Illia's government operated constantly under that disability.

Indeed, so pressing was this idea that when I was there a general had to issue a statement saying that he had no intention or design to take over the government, so persistent were the rumors that this was likely to happen any day.

Even in firmly established governments such as those in Chile and Peru and other countries in Latin America, one inevitably finds the people looking over their shoulders as to what the army is going to do. This has been one of the great elements of instability, and im-

perils the democratic process in Latin America.

We must do everything we can to end that kind of approach and make it clear that we do not intend to reward military takeovers, as we did with respect to Argentina. It is a great mistake to recognize the Argentine position merely because a few other Latin American countries recognize it or whatever it was before the military coups had a chance to cool off. One could get an idea of the importance of the action if it had brought enough public support to sustain the government rather than the military power, which can give an appearance of tranquillity for a period of days or weeks.

I say again that I am not assailing the Argentine regime. It may be a beneficent military dictatorship, but a dictatorship is what it is. In my judgment, we cannot as a legislature—and that is what we are—allow the idea to go abroad that we shall turn over to the President, without some participation by us, no matter how minimal—and certainly the participation I propose is minimal—some share in the decisions taken with respect to this critically important matter which is so vital to the future of Latin America.

Indeed, the real danger in these situations is that in the continued erosion of the hope and the faith of the people in the viability of democratic government and by the comparative ease with which successive coups can follow, their faith can be broken by the frequent or prolonged absence of democratic experience. See what dictatorship did to the Dominican Republic through blood baths. See what dictatorship of the military has done in Argentina itself within the last decade, since Peron left. Even he himself was the product of a military coup and fixed a dictatorship on the country for years, a dictatorship which almost broke the country's back, in economic and social terms.

See what Argentina itself has endured during the last 10 years. Its government, since the fall of the dictator in 1955, has been unable to break the strength of the Peronist movement, but has reached a compromise with it that is acceptable to the armed forces. The Government of Argentina apparently has been unable to handle the armed forces there.

So this is a very sticky wicket, as the saying goes. I have no illusions that my amendment, if adopted, will end that kind of situation; but it is high time that we began to express ourselves clearly and unequivocally upon this subject, especially in the desire to preserve representative government, which is what we as a Congress should seek to obtain.

A few years ago, a somewhat similar amendment was adopted to a foreign aid bill, but it fell in conference. I sincerely hope that the bitter experience of the last few years on this subject will enable whatever amendment the Senate decides to adopt in this field to survive conference.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The amendment which the Senator originally offered contained the word "comes" rather than the word "came."

The substitute amendment appeals to me, perhaps, as being a much more practical approach to this problem, and I am sympathetic to the Senator's purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. I know the Senator is, and I am grateful to him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am sympathetic to what he is trying to do. I only wish that by the adoption of his amendment we could be assured that it would really accomplish his purpose. He realizes that fully as well as I do.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. However, I feel that we can contribute toward alleviating an emotional situation if we do not leave the amendment as a prospective operation, since we have already, in the last few days, recognized Argentina's Government as a de jure government.

To go back now and adopt an amendment of this kind, which says that in spite of the fact that we had reason to recognize the Argentine Government officially, we now take this particular position, could have, perhaps, an effect that is not quite warranted.

So far as military governments are concerned, that does create a most confusing situation because I think we can sit down and analyze certain military coups which have occurred in Latin America over the past several years, and, at least I, could come to the conclusion that except for some of them the governments involved would be probably Communist today.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may interrupt there, that certainly was the suspicion about the two governments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There was so much evidence of that. In almost every instance—I am not so sure about Argentina now, because I do not think that has disclosed itself sufficiently—when the military has taken over in such countries as Peru, Brazil, and others—even in Argentina before this—in so many instances where the military has taken over, it has taken over with the declaration that it wants to restore constitutional government which, it says, is in danger of being destroyed in the country, and therefore they have to step in to protect what it calls constitutional government.

I do not say that is true or untrue, but I think there is evidence to indicate that that has been the case because that has been the situation.

In most of those instances, within a reasonable time, the military has carried out exactly what it said it would do. It has stepped aside when a strong constitutional government has been installed and free elections have been called for, and other things of that kind.

Now, in one or two cases I think we have had some rather serious and self-serving operations by the military which have not been quite so altruistic or so patriotic. I am not passing on the Argentine situation, as I said a moment ago, because it has not unfolded itself sufficiently yet for us to get a good picture of it; but I would very much hope that the Senator could leave his amendment as it was originally filed, largely because our Government has now seen fit to recognize the Argentine Government, although that does not necessarily mean that we approve of everything they have done, or that we will approve of everything that they have done.

I recall that we become emotional, sometimes, on these things. A year or so ago, I was very much opposed to an absolute legislative prohibition against furnishing any aid to Indonesia, for instance. Much as I disapprove of what Sukarno is doing, I took the position at that time that it was entirely possible Sukarno would not be in control of Indonesia forever, that there might be something there that would happen that we would want to move rather rapidly on, at the discretion of the President, and furnish some aid to a—hopefully—better, government controlled regime.

I did not have any crystal ball—it was not that sort of thing—however, it did turn out exactly that way. I think we are justified in the new Indonesian Government which is definitely oriented, at the moment at least, it seems; westward rather than eastward. We are justified, I think, without going through the tortured process of legislative discussion, to be able to give them a little aid in order to encourage them to go on toward the establishment of a more representative government.

I feel the same way here. I think that more discretion should be left to the President.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not mean to say that I will not vote for the Senator's amendment. That is not the point. If an amendment of this kind is adopted, I hope it will be the least abrasive of several alternatives which we might have.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is a high-ranking member on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I think on all of these matters of such delicacy in foreign policy I would be among the first to listen to him. I hope very much that we may have the views of other members, and that we will have a test vote of confidence, I might say to my good friend, the Senator from Iowa, because I understand that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is going to move to strengthen even this amendment—the amendment which the Senator from Iowa already feels may perhaps be properly modified by requiring congressional action before the President can actually give aid—which I do not require under the amendment.

It seems to me that when we get, perhaps, a consciousness of the views of the Senate through that vote with respect to strengthening even further the amendment and by perhaps a little debate afterward, we may have some idea as to what is the broadest possible support here for an amendment, or whether the way I have it now, or the way the Senator from Iowa suggested.

If the Senator has time, I should like to submit one other question to him.

I think that Argentina, incidentally, is a case where we may have a situation with the military which would be sui generis—and he is a lawyer and understands what I mean by that. For this reason: One of the interesting things about Argentina is that the whole military effort is directed toward blocking what many claim to be a majority of the people from electing a majority government which could be a Peronista government. It might be a Peronista government without Peron, which is the argument of about one-half of that movement now; or it might be a Peronista government with Peron. Nevertheless, it would be a government, perhaps, that a majority of the people—most of whom are workers and farmers—would want.

This is a profound question for us, as to what our attitude would be in this connection. I disapprove as much as does the Senator from Iowa of the extremism, the destruction, and the breaking of the back of the Argentine community, socially, and economically, which resulted from the Peron regime. We have a deep question to decide. We do not have to aid it. We can deny it aid if it became a government, but what shall we do about the processes which might conceivably bring it into being so that a military government in the Argentine may not be nearly so ready? I do not think it will be nearly so ready as the military government in Brazil would be for free elections, civil rights, and other liberties and so forth, as called for by the resolution of the second special Inter-American Conference of the OAS. Therefore, an evaluation of our posture with regard to Argentine is really a serious component of this debate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think there is a great deal to what the Senator has said. I invite his attention, however, to the fact that there have been military takeovers in the Argentine before.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those military takeovers have resulted rather speedily in a return of the government to what at least the military thought—and I think most people agree—was a constitutional concept of government.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may buttress the Senator's argument, the fact is when they were holding the election, two-thirds were Peronistas, but they elected a leader who was not a Peronista.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is true. I think they got frightened of that in one state, a few months ago. I forget what the percentage was, but I think it was approximately 2 to 1 in favor of the Peronistas in that state.

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly right.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, the Peron government was a tyrannical kind of government. It was not a representative government. I think that may be what they are afraid of. They may not be. I do not know. I cannot make up my mind about this government yet.

Mr. JAVITS. I think perhaps it would help Senators, including the Senator from Iowa, if I read into the RECORD the declaration of the Ongania regime which I think is pertinent to this debate.

I have three statements here. We have checked and tried everywhere for as much information as we could obtain on the attitude of the Ongania government on this question.

First, on July 9, 1966, when President Ongania addressed the nation at San Miguel de Tucuman, he stated in part as follows:

> To this end we shall give each citizen the opportunity to feel himself master of and responsible for his own destiny; social and political peace, making possible harmonious solidarity without petty divisions; security, so that sudden fears shall not weaken labor; justice, so that the fruit of our effort shall not be wasted in privileges and so that we may all feel united in our common labor, true freedom, in order that intelligence and enthusiasm may create without restrictions our great national future.

Then, in a subsequent statement, on July 12, he gave assurances in response to matters which had been laid before him, of the fact that he would not abide by having extremist groups in the country which do not hide their threats, thereby seeking to provoke artificial divisions in the Argentine family, thus distorting the image of the nation.

He was laying down what we in this country would call civil rights and civil liberties in that regard.

Finally, on July 13, 1966, he stated as a basis of his internal policy his desire to formulate the bases necessary for the reestablishment of representative democracy which corrects preexisting political deformations.

But in none of these declarations does the de facto president as a result of a military takeover give the assurances which are called for by the Organization of American States in resolution 26, to which we are a party, which was adopted on November 30, 1965, at the Second Special Inter-American Conference in Rio de Janeiro. I should like to read into the RECORD the pertinent aspect of that resolution, because it is so pertinent to the present discussion. I read from document No. 150 of that conference.

First I ask unanimous consent that the whole resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, document No. 150 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Doc. 150 (English) Rev.]

XXVI—INFORMAL PROCEDURE ON THE RECOGNITION OF DE FACTO GOVERMENTS

Whereas:

The various instruments of the inter-American system have established and reiterated the principle that, in order that there may be real harmony and solidarity among the American states, it is essential that the effective practice of representative democracy be exercised in each one of them;

Consequently, the overthrow of a government and its replacement by a de facto government could be dangerous to the peace and solidarity of the hemisphere, and is therefore the subject of concern on the part of all the American states;

Through Resolution XXXVI, the Ninth International Conference of American States charged the Inter-American Council of Jurists with the preparation of a draft statute on the recognition of de facto governments, a task which it has not yet been possible to carry out; and

Until such time as said statute has been drafted, it is desirable that an informal procedure on the recognition of de facto governments be established,

The Second Special Inter-American Conference

*Resolves:*

1. To recommend to the member states that, immediately after the overthrow of a government and its replacement by a de facto government, they begin an exchange of views on the situation, giving due consideration to whether or not the overthrow of the government took place with the complicity and aid of one or more foreign governments, or of their respective officers or agents.

2. To recommend that the governments member states, in the exchange of views provided for in the preceding article, consider the following circumstances:

a. Whether the de facto government proposes to take the necessary measures for the holding of elections within a reasonable period, giving its people the opportunity freely to participate in the consequent electoral process; and

b. Whether the de facto government agrees to fulfill the international obligations assumed previously by its country, to respect the human rights expressed in the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, and to comply with the commitments assumed by the signatories of the Declaration of the Peoples of the Americas and the general principles of the Charter of Punta del Este.

3. To recommend that, once opinions have been exchanged, each government decide whether it will maintain diplomatic relations with the de facto government.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Conference resolved as follows:

> To recommend to the member states that, immediately after the overthrow of a government and its replacement by a de facto government, they—

To wit, the member states—

> begin an exchange of views on the situation, giving due consideration to whether or not the overthrow of the government took place with the complicity and aid of one or more foreign governments, or of their respective officers or agents.
>
> 2. To recommend that the governments member states, in the exchange of views provided for in the preceding article, consider the following circumstances:
>
> (a) Whether the de facto government proposes to take the necessary measures for the holding of elections within a reasonable period, giving its people the opportunity freely to participate in the consequent electoral process; and
>
> (b) Whether the de facto government agrees to fulfill the international obligations assumed previously by its country, to respect the human rights expressed in the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, and to comply with the commitments assumed by the signatories of the Declaration of the Peoples of the Americas and the general principles of the Charter of Punta del Este.
>
> 3. To recommend that, once opinions have been exchanged, each government decide whether it will maintain diplomatic relations with the de facto government.

Mr. President, it will be noted that I have transposed into my amendment

precisely the condition of consultation and assurances by the de facto government which are called for by the resolution.

I should like to close this part of my direct presentation by calling attention to the fact that, in my own view, the most critical part of the amendment is the recognition of the consultative aspects in the relationships between the American states, with the dignity attendant thereon. There is now a requirement of carrying on and consulting with the other American states in a deliberate way and in arriving at whether, with respect to a de facto government, we should have relations and give it aid, or determining whether it is not a de facto government without the assurances which would warrant our giving it aid.

I think it is a tremendous element of strength in the inter-American system that we adopted this principle, no matter how we may finally work out this matter. The basic principle of calling for consultation with the other American states with respect to these matters gives strength and diginity to the Organization of American States and the other members who participate.

With that statement, I shall end my part of the debate at this time.

I think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may wish to interject his comments and deal with this amendment in the way he thinks it ought to be dealt with.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is my understanding correct that there is nothing in the act now which takes care of the situation the Senator would like to take care of?

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. This was done, I believe, a year ago. We had an amendment adopted in the Senate with respect to military takeovers, but it fell in conference. There is nothing in the act at present to take care of the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator's amendment be prospective and retroactive?

Mr. JAVITS. It is both prospective and retroactive. I have stated my reasons for it. I think retroactively that it would affect only the Argentine Government. The other countries have qualified by assurances of providing for elections or in some other way. So the retroactive aspect of the amendment would relate only to the Argentine.

I have not closed my mind to making the amendment only prospective, depending on how the matter goes in the Senate.

---

## THE AIRLINE STRIKE: A NATIONAL DISASTER WHICH COULD IMPERIL THE ENTIRE FREE LABOR-MANAGEMENT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President I reluctantly rise to call to the attention of the Senate the grave fact that after 14 days of strike no progress seems to have been made toward settling the airline dispute which has grounded 60 percent of our national air traffic.

This strike amounts to nothing less than a national disaster for our economy and for tens of thousands of workers and their employers.

The course of conduct being followed by the leaders of the International Association of Machinists' Union not only is imperiling our national economy but also is endangering the future collective bargaining posture of organized labor in general. The IAM's refusal to accept, or even fairly consider the flexible and reasonable settlement terms suggested by the Presidential Emergency Board—which recommended $76 millions in increased wages and benefits—that is a 3.5-percent increase—can only be characterized, even by a staunch friend of labor, as imprudent, unwise, and completely contrary to the public interest.

The transportation industry is and has long been critically associated with the public interest. The airline industry, which now carries 57 percent of all commercially carried intercity travelers in America, is closely controlled and regulated by Federal administrative agencies, even as to the fares the companies may charge and the profit they may earn.

I am advised by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE, who was Chairman of the Presidential Emergency Board, and who is universally considered a champion of our collective bargaining system second to none, that, in his judgment, the IAM leadership was determined from the beginning of the Board's deliberation to strike and to reject the Board's recommendations, unless they included complete acceptance of the IAM's demands, which would require a 7-percent increase in wages and fringe benefits. At no time during the proceedings of the Presidential Emergency Board, including the 8 days of public hearings, did the union leadership even retain a labor lawyer, or mediation specialist, or labor economist to present the union's case, a failure extremely unusual in major labor-management disputes.

The IAM leadership flatly refused to accept the Emergency Board's findings, which any objective and impartial observer would term fair and favorable to the union's position. These recommendations included:

First. Wage and fringe benefit increases totaling $76 million—the union demand was $130 million.

Second. Accepting the union's basic demand for liberalizing vacation and hours.

Third. Accepting the union demand to increase to eight the number of paid holidays per year by including Good Friday.

The strike of 35,000 airline employees has grounded the planes which daily carry more than 150,000 passengers to 231 cities and 23 foreign countries. The five struck airlines fly 61.5 percent of all U.S. airline passenger miles, carry 70 percent of the Nation's mail, and 73 percent of all America's airfreight.

The strike by these 35,000 employees has already led to the layoff of more than 20,000 nonstriking airline employees who have nothing to do while the planes are grounded. The strike is costing the airlines and their employees alone almost $8 million a day, every day. And this is the 14th day of the strike.

Any natural phenomenon which put 55,000 Americans out of work and cost American industry $56 million in 1 week would surely be called a national disaster. And that is exactly what this strike has already done to the airlines and their employees alone.

The strike is costing thousands of other Americans additional millions in lost wages and sales. Hotels, resorts, and the whole travel and vacation industry is suffering from the strike, which has come at the peak of the vacation season. The Florida Hotel Association reports the strike is costing the greater Miami area $400,000 a day in lost tourist business, and New York estimates its tourist loss is now running over $750,000 a day and getting worse. Layoffs of vacation industry employees have already started in Florida.

Industries all across the country are reporting production delays, because they cannot get needed parts and material by airfreight. Some plants may have to shut down production lines if the strike continues much longer. Although a number of nonstruck airlines have substantially increased their freight loads, one major freight carrier estimates the whole national airfreight traffic schedule has already been thrown a week behind by the strike.

Employers and workers who depend heavily on air freight are being especially hard hit by the strike. The Nation's three leading lobster dealers are losing $1,500 a day in lost shipments. The delivered cost of many California flowers which are shipped by air has risen 5 to 10 percent, and the flowers sometimes spoil in delayed transit.

The strike has gravely inconvenienced the American people, 150,000 of whom normally use the struck airlines every day. Businessmen cannot get to appointments, vacationers have had their vacation plans wiped out, and servicemen have found increased difficulties and delays in getting home on leave.

The first day of the strike grounded 250,000 airline passengers, stranding thousands in cities distant from their destinations.

This incalculable economic damage and enormous inconvenience the airline strike has already caused surely raises grave questions about the effectiveness of present statutory procedures for mediating, arbitrating, conciliating, and settling labor disputes within a free collective-bargaining framework. This is no private disagreement between a remote employer and his employees. This is a major shutdown of the airline industry, and such a shutdown for any reason carries with it enormous public consequences—all of them, as this strike demonstrates, costly and bad. The public has an extremely high stake in averting

such strikes, and in the conclusion of noninflationary settlements to them.

The public may be an innocent and helpless bystander to this strike, but the abrasions and damage this strike is causing the public could deal a body blow to the entire philosophy underlying our national collective bargaining framework. The American people have a remedy for intolerable wrongs; that is the power of their Congress to enact laws to protect their well-being. And this strike has every appearance of being unreasonable, unnecessary, and intolerable.

A close examination of the anatomy of the airline strike reveals not just that the statutorily sanctioned collective-bargaining process has broken down in this case, but that the responsibility for the final breakdown must be borne almost entirely by the leadership of the striking union, the International Association of Machinists. These are the facts:

The negotiations which preceded this strike dragged on for nearly a year without producing a peaceful settlement.

The President exhausted every statutory tool available to him to avert this strike, and every tool failed to prevent it.

The union refused arbitration of the dispute by an impartial Government board.

The union rejected the settlement recommended by the Emergency Board created by the President on April 21. That Emergency Board, chaired by the renowned labor-management relations expert, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], compiled a 3,000-page record during 2 months' proceedings. On that record, the board recommended a fair and basically noninflationary settlement which *the airlines* accepted and which provided for an increase in benefits of $76 million. But the union rejected that settlement almost before it even knew what the settlement proposed.

After 30 days of continued intransigence toward the recommended settlement, the union walked out on the first day the law allowed, setting in motion this disastrous strike.

I am not an expert on labor management relations, nor have I been a party to the negotiations preceding this strike. But I have studied the report of the President's Emergency Board and the statements Senator MORSE has made here in the Senate regarding the background and issues in this strike and the negotiations which preceded it, and I have examined the reports of the strike carried by the press. On that record I am compelled to agree with Senator MORSE when he said in this Chamber last week:

> The fact is that on issue after issue the union is trying to substitute its economic power for evidence.

As a Member of the Senate and the Congress, I represent neither labor nor management, neither the airlines nor the union. I, like all Senators, represent the people. And the people have so far been the real losers in this strike. Whether the union leadership in question will recognize its responsibility to the public interest in this case may very well determine whether or not the present statutory posture of our free collective bargaining system—particularly as it applies to the transportation industry—itself becomes a victim of this strike.

The entire Nation has a major stake in the rapid resolution of the airline strike on noninflationary terms. And the whole Nation has a major stake in seeing to it that the collective bargaining system is not abused by irresponsible and inflationary intransigence.

A continuation of this dangerous disruption of our Nation's economy and transportation system must compel Congress to amend the emergency dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley law to plug the loophole in the law which is becoming more and more visible with each day of the strike.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Maryland for his courage and his forthrightness in making the statement he has just made on the airlines strike. In a situation such as this, the partisans very often are blinded by the facts; and I am glad that the Senator from Maryland has been willing to speak as plainly as he has to the partisans in this case, who have a public responsibility and obligation to bring this strike to an end, and seek to return to procedures that will settle it on its merits.

I only wish to add, with respect to the Senator from Maryland, that his record is perfectly clear as to his defense of the rights of both labor and management, and the protection of their legitimate rights. That is the only obligation that we, as Senators, have any right to seek to carry out. When we find, in a situation, that labor is following a course of asking for more than its legitimate rights, then, as Senators, we must make clear that we will not support labor in that position.

I think the Senator from Maryland, as well as many other liberals in the Senate, can stand on the record that they have made over the years in fighting to protect the legitimate rights of labor.

But the last part of the Senator's argument, in which he pointed out the need for amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, is simply unanswerable. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has taken the same position. Ever since 1947, I have sought to get legislation passed that will amend the emergency dispute section of Taft-Hartley.

In this instance, we need to amend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, because the Taft-Hartley law does not apply to the workers involved in this dispute. The Railway Labor Act does.

I had hoped that the union involved would come to its senses and substitute the exercise of its responsibilities for industrial statesmanship for the use of economic power in seeking to gain for itself a settlement that, on the facts, it simply cannot justify.

Apparently there is growing doubt as to whether the expectation is justified. Therefore, there is in the process of being prepared today by legislative counsel another proposal for application to this strike. It is a proposal that, in effect, would have Congress declare that an emergency exists which jeopardizes the public interest and call upon the courts to review the situation and to take whatever judicial action is necessary to bring to an end the strike and give to the parties the safeguard to which they are entitled, to resume collective bargaining and mediation on a voluntary basis.

We have reached the point, in my judgment, at which the American people are entitled to have this strike stopped. If the parties are unwilling to work out a fair settlement by applying the volunteerism of that precious right of collective bargaining in this country, Congress has a clear duty to proceed to protect the public interest.

As soon as that legislation is prepared and has been reviewed and we have counseled about it, the senior Senator from Oregon intends to introduce it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

"CONSENSUS" APPROACH WON'T WORK ON STRIKE LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had intended to say something about this matter today. I shall say it in the presence of the Senator from Maryland because I value his interest in the situation.

I do not ask that the Senator join me in my opinion, but I was struck by the President's answer to a press conference question yesterday.

The question asked was:

> Mr. President, recalling your State of the Union promise to seek legislation to deal with strikes that threaten irreparable damage to the national interest, do you still plan to ask such legislation and might this include compulsory arbitration in something like the airline strike?

The President went on to say that he had people working on the situation. He then said:

> I must frankly say to you that up until this point we have been unsuccessful in getting legislation that the Secretary of Labor and the other members of my Cabinet felt acceptable and that we felt would have any chance of passage in the Congress.
>
> We are still searching for that answer and we would like to find a solution that could be embraced by the Administration, management and labor and the Congress. Up to this point we've not been very successful.

I do not ask the Senator to agree with me. I am speaking rather freely as a member of the opposition.

I respectfully submit that if the President of the United States is trying to find a solution to the airlines strike that will be acceptable to the administration, management, labor, and Congress, the airlines strike will never be settled. This is "consensus" government really defeating itself. I have made recommendations. The senior Senator from Oregon has some recommendations in the process of preparation. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has some recommendations.

I respect the presidential prerogative whether he is a member of my party or not. I want very much for him to send us recommendations. But I respectfully submit that if he is looking for recommendations that are the consensus of everybody, we might as well stop waiting. It will not happen. We will have to act on our own.

I would much rather that we act in concert with the President.

The statement by the President was alarming in terms of his idea and timing.

I do not say that the President is breaking his promise. He has not delivered on the promise given in January, 6 months ago.

I find it encouraging that the President is seeking to recommend new legislation in this field. But I am somewhat dismayed by the condition which the President now attaches to this course of action.

The President says he is searching for an answer which can be "embraced by the administration, management and labor and the Congress," but he acknowledges that up to now he has not been successful. That is no surprise to me. I have been studying this field for many years, and as ranking minority Member of the Senate Labor Committee I can state that this is one field where there are about as many different opinions as there are people.

If we are to wait until the administration comes up with a recommendation on which everyone agrees, we will wait forever. This is consensus government defeating itself. But there are recommendations which are fair and effective to protect the public interest. I have made one—S. 2797—and there are others which have been recommended.

We are not asking for miracles. We are asking for the President's recommendations—for the best judgment of the President and his advisers. We do not expect him to make a recommendation which every interest in the Nation will endorse. Certainly he attaches no such precondition in other legislative fields, such as civil rights.

It is high time the Congress acted in this field. If the President is to make recommendations, let him make them now. But with or without the recommendations of the administration, the time for action is now, and the Congress should act if the President does not.

Mr. President, on Monday, July 18, 1966, the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express ran an excellent editorial on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

IMPROVED LABOR LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW

Senator JACOB JAVITS who is generally recognized as a friend of organized labor is spearheading a drive in Congress for enactment of new legislation to protect the public interest in labor disputes such as the one which prevented flights by five major airlines.

The strike against the airlines by the International Assn. of Machinists is one of many walkouts which have had adverse effects on the nation's economy in recent years. In each of them, the President exhausted all the statutory powers available to him.

Senator JAVITS' proposed legislation would authorize the President, after all else has failed, to seek appointment by a federal court of a special receiver to operate the struck facilities.

Appointing a special receiver is a drastic step, one which certainly could not be taken lightly. But on the other hand, disputes which tie up vital industries also are drastic and they call for drastic remedies.

The Javits proposal, as the senator says, "has the merit of protecting the public, leaving the parties free to continue their bargaining as long as necessary to reach a settlement and avoiding compulsory arbitration."

The Javits bill may not be the best answer to the problem. But there is no question that we need an answer, one which will serve the public without giving either labor or management an unfair advantage.

Labor leaders would do well to cooperate with Senator JAVITS and their other friends in Congress to devise a law with which they can live and which will, at the same time, protect the public. If they fail to do so, they may find themselves bound by legislation which is in no way agreeable to them.

Senator JAVITS insists that "the time to act and the time for Congress to enact is now." All concerned should work together calmly and reasonably to see that what is enacted meets the need in the most beneficial way.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall yield after I answer the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I feel that the responsibility of the President is to make every effort within his Executive power, including calling together the heads of the union and of management, to settle this strike. However, I could not disagree more with the distinguished senior Senator from New York that the primary responsibility for the proposal of legislation in this field belongs with the President.

That is one of the troubles with the drift of Congress in recent years. We are always waiting for the administration to propose legislation. Congress is charged in the Constitution with the proposal of legislation. We should be proposing legislation. It is certainly far better to have presidential support. It insures and helps success. However, I think the responsibility rests here in Congress, with the Labor Committees and with the individual Senators, to propose legislation and not to wait for the President.

I think in this instance his responsibility is to call in the president of the union and the presidents of the airlines and tell them they must settle the strike. He should put the full weight of his office behind his endeavor.

I think the primary responsibility for the proposal of legislation is with Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I love and respect the Senator from Maryland, as he knows. However, what the Senator has said is not borne out by either the facts or the Constitution.

The fact is that the President has promised to send us recommendations. I did not promise that. He did. He promised that last January.

The President constantly requests legislation by special message and by his state of the Union message.

I think Congress ought to act, if the President wishes to waive his prerogative. He ought to call in management and labor and seek an end to the strike. However, that is no substitute for the power of the United States to operate or for Congress to legislate.

We are legislating in a vacuum today. Personally, I am deeply concerned about the future of collective bargaining. If, every time we get in a jam, the President uses the enormous power of his office to settle the strike, that is a very dangerous development.

I respectfully submit that the President should do his utmost to settle the strike, because there is no legislation.

I do not think that I am asking for anything improper or unreasonable. I think we have a right to say to the President: "You said last January that you are going to send us recommendations." If the President does not send us recommendations, we should act.

I shall do my utmost in my committee to see that we do act, if necessary, by calling up my own bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the wisdom and the experience of the senior Senator from New York.

I think perhaps that basically we are not too far apart. However, I still maintain my position that as much as we like to have the President's advice on the type of legislation we should enact, and as much as we appreciate his assistance, the basic responsibility for legislation rests with the Congress and not with the President.

Congress should move the initiating legislation. As a matter of fact, one of the gravest, and I think one of the most valid, criticisms of Congress in recent years, is that we too often wait for the Executive to propose things. It has been said that we should use our own initiative and we should propose, develop, and initiate legislation. I think that however you cut it, the responsibility for legislation is with Congress and not with the President.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my views are these:

This Nation cannot afford prolonged disruptions in such indispensable national services as communications or transportation, when it becomes clear that the national welfare is endangered or the national security is placed in jeopardy. In my judgment, as a citizen and as a Senator, that hazard is rapidly growing today.

It is true that some great American airlines are still flying. It is also true that their contracts are about to expire. And it is equally true that most nationwide commercial airlines are shut down.

The President of the United States has a duty. So does Congress. It is true that the President said he would send his recommendations to Congress. I urgently hope that those recommendations will now be forthcoming.

Meanwhile, I was happy to lend my name to the bill introduced a considerable time ago by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. That bill represents one approach to this problem. It is, I think, a constructive approach. A few

moments ago, the Senator from Oregon suggested that he would introduce a resolution reflecting his approach to the problem.

Leadership is required to pass fair and sound legislation in this highly controversial field. That is what we need. I seek to serve a constructive purpose today, by rising not to iterate and reiterate the tragedy of the present strike, but publicly to urge the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to begin hearings now on the problem, on what Congress might do legislatively to help cure a dangerous situation in which the American people find themselves today.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the service which the Senator is performing is a very admirable one.

I am the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I shall make a strong appeal to the chairman of our full committee and to the chairman of the subcommittee to immediately initiate hearings upon these measures—mine, that of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and of others. I think the time is overdue.

I repeat that I regret very much that the President has not yet seen fit to act, and I see no happy augury in what he said yesterday. If he is looking for a broad, general consensus, he will not get one in this field.

I hope he will yet lead. I hope that again the situation does not arise in which the moment will go by for legislation, and the President will somehow manage to settle the strike, and then we will wait for the next one to catch us as unprepared as this one did.

I applaud and appreciate the action of my colleagues in bringing this demand to the floor of the Senate, in which the Senator from California, our deputy minority leader, has very eloquently joined.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend, the Senator from New York. I echo the sentiments that the Senator has just expressed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have listened with close attention to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said. I hope that this is not a political question.

This problem, or the potentiality of this problem, has been with us for a long, long time. Members of the Senate will recall that in his administration President Kennedy submitted an emergency measure. It became involved in protracted hearings. It was debated in the Senate, and I think we rubbed roughly some people who had a tremendous antipathy to any compulsory arbitration. And that is what the bill proposed: compulsory arbitration.

As a matter of legislative history, I was the manager of that bill. I said at the time that I was advocating the passage of that bill with a heavy heart, because I believed that we had reached the point where we could be doing irreparable harm to our whole process of collective bargaining. After all, it is a keystone of our democratic process.

I believe that the idea expressed here today that we might not have been afflicted with this strike had the President done something a long time ago about sending a message has gone a little bit too far. Legislation is pending in the Senate. As the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, the primary responsibility is with Congress to make the law, and, under the Constitution, the primary responsibility of the President is to enforce the law, and the primary responsibility of the Supreme Court is to interpret the law. But, fundamentally, the responsibility to make the law is in Congress. If there has been any dereliction, if there has been any delay, the blame and the remedy repose primarily on the threshold of Congress.

I realize that something must be done, but let us not run away with the idea that had the President moved the minute that this strike was declared, we would not be in the situation that confronts us today. Realistically, something drastic must be done if negotiation fails. In the doing of this drastic thing that must be done, we shall have to listen to a multitude of people. We shall have to listen to all sides. We shall have to listen to industry. We shall have to listen to labor. We shall have to listen to the public. It will be a long, drawn-out affair, because what we would be doing, basically, would be reforming and modifying our whole process of collective bargaining. That is not something achieved overnight. That will not be an easy thing to do.

When we do get into those hearings, we will not pass any legislation in haste. It will take a long, long time.

I said yesterday—and I repeat today—that this strike is regrettable. There is a law on the books that applies to this situation, but it is not enough. The Taft-Hartley law does not apply to the railroads or to the airlines, because they come under the Railway Act. An act is in existence, and that act is being complied with. And that is all the President can do at the present time.

Senate testimony has assured us that the President has followed every part of the Railway Labor Act—that he has done everything he can do to try to get this case settled.

The President said yesterday that the administration had been working on possible proposals to submit to the Congress to meet such emergencies and they had not come up with legislation acceptable to the President and his Cabinet which legislation, they felt, would have any chance of passage with the Congress.

The argument has been made that had the President carried out the message he gave to the joint session, possibly we would not be in this position today. Maybe we would not be. I do not even know whether Congress would have followed his recommendation. Perhaps the Senator from New York knows.

We all know this: We have been battering ourselves around here for the past week, and what have we been doing? We have been voting down the President of the United States and his recommendations. Under the Constitution, the President is charged with the responsibility of carrying out the foreign policy of this Nation.

I am one Senator who has stood stanchly behind the last four Presidents on foreign aid. I never questioned Truman when he was President and I was a Member of this body. I never questioned Eisenhower when he was the President, though he was a Republican. I voted down the line when Eisenhower said, "I need this to carry on my responsibility as President." I stood behind the President whether he was Republican or Democrat. It did not make any difference to me. I did the same thing with John F. Kennedy. I am doing the same thing now with Lyndon Johnson.

What are some others doing? I have in mind those who are now castigating the President because he did not make drastic recommendation on the airlines.

The President made his recommendation on foreign aid and look what we have been doing to it. They say that if he had made a recommendation on the strike, we would have followed it. Maybe we would have and maybe we would not have. That remains to be seen.

And what has been the initiative of the Congress?

Has the President estopped us?

This is not the fault of the President of the United States. This is the fault of the Congress. Legislation is pending before two committees to rectify the situation. The situation should be rectified. It should not be permissible for any group of people to blindly and boldly tie up the entire economy of the United States, I do not care who they are. They cannot render this country prostrate. They cannot do that. No one can stop the economic machinery of this country and possibly put millions of people out of work because a few in industry or labor are dissatisfied and hold out irrationally to get what they think they are entitled to. Maybe they are entitled and maybe they are not. And there should be a process of fair hearing and binding judgment.

Somewhere along the line when two parties cannot agree, and when irreparable harm is being done to the whole body of American society, there should be some process by which we can have an umpire to say what is fair and what is not fair.

Mr. President, I shall now complete my remarks. I did not expect to get into this fracas this afternoon, but I suggest in closing that we do our job in Congress and maybe things will be a little better all around.

I yield the floor.

---

## AMENDMENT OF VARIOUS PROVISIONS OF LAWS ADMINISTERED BY THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the

House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2822) to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 10, strike out "amended—" and insert "amended"; on page 2, strike out lines 1 through 12, inclusive; on page 2, line 13, strike out "(b)"; on page 2, lines 21 and 22, strike out "Administration":" and insert "Administration."; and on page 2, strike out all after line 22 over through and including line 7 on page 3.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the House yesterday passed S. 2822 with three amendments. The amendments struck from the bill provisions which would have—

First, permitted loan applications to be approved by the manager or other employee of the Land Bank Association instead of by a loan committee;

Second, repealed a requirement that stockholders in a farming corporation assume personal liability to the extent required by Farm Credit Administration regulations on land bank loans to such corporate borrowers; and

Third, repealed the present statutory requirement that any land bank loan in excess of $100,000 must have prior approval by the Farm Credit Administration.

Governor Tootell, of the Farm Credit Administration, which originally proposed the provisions stricken by the House, has recommended that the Senate agree to the House amendment. He advises that he knows of no opposition to such course of action.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 254) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 139) to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland.

## MARCH FROM MEMPHIS, TENN., TO JACKSON, MISS., JUNE 5–26, 1966

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, James H. Meredith began a march from Memphis, Tenn., to Jackson, Miss., on June 5, 1966. After Meredith was sprayed with birdshot on June 6, 1966, other individuals converged on Mississippi and continued the march to Jackson.

The following were among the individuals who participated in the march to Jackson:

Edward Crawford, Earl Harris, Blyden Jackson, Bennett Johnson, Clarence Jones, Phillip Lapsansky, Oliver Leeds, Stanley Levison, Derrick Morrison, Ann O'Brien, and C. T. Vivian.

One Edward Crawford was chairman of the New York Council To Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a Communist-sponsored movement.

Earl Harris, in 1944, was registered as a member of the Communist Party.

Blyden Jackson was formerly the campaign manager for Herbert Aptheker, a member of the National Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A.

One Bennett Johnson, Jr., attended a meeting of the Negro Commission, Communist Party of Illinois in 1964.

Clarence Jones is an attorney who, during the 1950's, held a position of leadership in the Labor Youth League, which has been cited by the Attorney General as a subversive organization under Executive Order 10450.

Phillip Lapsansky is a current member of the Socialist Workers Party, which organization has been cited by the Attorney General as subversive in accordance with Executive Order 10450.

Oliver Leeds is a member of the Communist Party, USA.

Stanley Levison was a secret member of the Communist Party, USA, as late as 1963.

Derrick Morrison is a current member of the Detroit branch of the Socialist Workers Party.

One Ann Mary O'Brien has admitted membership in the Labor Youth League in Chicago from 1954 through 1958.

C. T. Vivian was a member of the Community Section, Communist Party, Peoria, Ill., prior to November 1947.

Mr. President, these were the people who manipulated the Communist invasion of the State of Mississippi.

These were the people who were behind the cries of "black power" in the State, which was nothing but a revolution against constituted legal authority.

These are the people who, in my judgment, are behind the race riots which are occurring in northern cities in this country today. What we have got is an attempt by the Communists to foment revolution in the United States.

Mr. President, in the future I am going to have some other names and much more to say about the Communist revolution which is taking place in this country today.

## FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment he wishes to have printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 694

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the foreign economic aid bill (S. 3584) which I intend to propose at the proper time. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the pending bill (S. 3584) is in the nature of amendments to the Foreign Aid Act of 1961 which set forth a statement of foreign aid policy. Subsequent acts have expanded that statement.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is proposing an additional policy statement in the bill now before the Senate. My amendment would add another expression by Congress.

It is conceded that the Red Chinese are supplying North Vietnam's Vietcong with materiel for fighting the Vietnam war in which thousands of Americans are being killed.

In March of this year it was publicly disclosed in this country that the West German Government approved—with financial backing—a deal under which a West European consortium would supply steel plants to Communist China.

My amendment would have Congress condemn that action as aiding Communist aggressors, and as a grave blow to the common defense of the free world.

## REVENUE, EXPENDITURES, DEFICITS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Treasury Department would object if any American taxpayer were to use two sets of books in his business. The Securities and Exchange Commission would take prompt action if any American corporation issued misleading reports to its stockholders. The Department of Justice would move in rapidly if any American corporation when selling its bonds provided prospective purchasers with false or misleading information as to its true income and its expenses.

Yet unfortunately these rules do not apply to the Federal Government.

Yesterday the administration reported that last year's deficit had been brought down to $2.3 billion. No doubt this will be hailed in financial circles as evidence that we are making great progress in Congress and the executive branch toward balancing the budget and that now there will be no need for a tax increase to finance the Great Society's programs.

But this is not the true picture.

The $2.3 billion deficit is compared to the $6.4 billion deficit which was projected by the President in his message to Congress last January.

Also this week—just a couple of days ago—in discussing this problem of expenditures and income with members of the Appropriations Committee, the President emphasized the fact that we were either going to have to cut spending or endorse wage and price controls in this country, or there would have to be a tax increase.

I think that for the RECORD we should straighten out exactly how much this administration is spending as compared to its income.

The fact is that the deficit for 1966, which ended June 30 last, while it may be reported at $2.3 billion does not tell the true picture.

For example, there were $7.9 billion taken in during fiscal year 1966 in nonrecurring income. This figure is admitted by the Treasury Department. This nonrecurring income is broken down in this manner: In 1964 Congress passed a provision to accelerate payment of corporate taxes, which in fiscal 1966 would have brought in an extra $1.8 billion. At the time the President spoke last January he referred to this item and included that in his computation. He also told Congress that he was planning to sell $2.6 billion in assets. This too was taken into his calculations. Based upon this estimate he still projected a $6.4 billion deficit for fiscal 1966.

Since January, the administration has taken several additional steps to inflate income on a one-shot basis, steps which were not included in the message of the President.

On March 15, 1966, Congress passed a bill which would further accelerate payments of corporate taxes. This resulted in an increase from corporations for fiscal 1966 of an additional $1 billion.

In addition, the Treasury Department decided that it would include as a part of the general revenues the profit it makes from reducing the amount of silver in the dimes, quarters, and half dollars. This results in an increase for fiscal 1966 of an additional $1 billion. This too is nonrecurring income.

In the latter part of May of this year the Treasury Department issued a special regulation which required all corporations over a certain size to start forwarding to the Treasury Department on a semimonthly basis that withheld payroll taxes. Prior to that time, they had been paid on a monthly basis. This executive order accelerating the payment of withheld payroll taxes brought in during fiscal 1966 an additional $1 billion.

Sales from the stockpile over and above normal sales and transactions represented by sales of the Government of aluminum, copper, and other major commodities, brought in another $500 million over and above what would be normal.

All together, as a result of steps that have been taken by the Congress plus Executive orders by the administration since last January, there has been brought into the Federal Treasury during fiscal 1966 in nonrecurring income $3.5 billion more than was taken into consideration in the President's message. This added to the $4.4 billion of nonrecurring income that were already in the budget brings the total to $7.9 billion.

I pointed out earlier that already $4.4 billion, represented by the $1.8 billion which came from the 1964 act accelerating corporate tax payments and $2.6 billion representing sales of assets were in the budget estimates.

When we add these figures we find that in fiscal 1966 the Treasury collected $7.9 billion in nonrecurring income. These are one-shot operations; therefore the real deficit for fiscal 1966 is $10.2 billion, not $2.3 billion as claimed.

There will be some nonrecurring income in 1967, which I shall discuss in a moment, but once nonrecurring income is utilized and included as a part of general revenues it cannot be duplicated, nor will there be an opportunity to get this amount again. Congress must take into consideration the amount of nonrecurring income that was included as a part of 1966 general revenues. Part of it was used to reduce reported expenditures, part of it to increase revenues, but it all had the effect of reducing the deficit as reported on June 30.

I repeat, if we take the $7.9 billion of nonrecurring income and add it to the $2.3 billion deficit which was reported yesterday we have an expenditure in fiscal year 1966 of $10.2 billion more than was taken in income. This is figuring it on the same basis as has always been used prior to this time.

I do not object to the administration accelerating these payments. I supported the legislation which required acceleration of corporate tax payments, but in doing so I said I did not want it to be interpreted by the American taxpayers in any such misleading manner. The fact remains that the Government has spent $10.2 billion more in fiscal 1966 than it has taken in, in normal revenues.

Let us tell the American people the truth.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. No one would dispute what the Senator from Delaware is saying. We all know and admit that the Congress of the United States made certain concessions by law, which, in a sense, did affect the deficit or balance. But will not the Senator grant, in the same spirit, that the President is very much concerned that requests by Congress amount to potentially $6 billion over and above the requests made by the administration? If that happens, it will not be the fault of the administration or the President; it will be the fault of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not disagree with that statement. I will go into that further later.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Delaware talks about keeping two sets of books as though there was fraud or deceit practiced on the part of the administration in reporting the last budget deficit. There is no fraud or deceit involved. Nobody is more concerned than the President about overspending. He has had several meetings with various Members of Congress. He had a group of us at the White House recently, emphasizing his request not to adopt legislation going beyond his requests. The spending mood of Congress has a potentiality of $6 billion more than the budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator that the President of the United States cannot spend a dime more than what Congress approves, so Congress does have a responsibility. But the President also signs these bills. I am not trying to place the blame for this alone on either the President or Congress. I am trying to present the facts as far as the American taxpayers are concerned, and it does not make any difference whether it is the fault of the President or of the Congress. Working together we are operators of the Government.

I am presenting the fact that for the fiscal year 1966, instead of a deficit of $2.3 billion as was reported, the Great Society programs, military expenditures, and so forth, actually amount to $10.2 billion more than was received in revenues. This is the true picture if we follow the same methods of bookkeeping we always have followed heretofore. That is the point I want to make. Let us report this deficit in its true form.

We must take these facts into our calculations, because while next year we will have a similar windfall—if one wants to call it that—on these one-shot operations, after fiscal 1967 they will be done.

There will be no more chance for using those one-shot operations. We will not be able to accelerate the payment of corporate taxes beyond the point to which they have already been accelerated in the legislation enacted in 1964 and 1966. Tax payments for corporations as well as for individuals will be on a prepaid basis. At the end of 1967, corporations will be paying in advance on a quarterly basis. Surely no one will advocate that taxes be paid 2 years in advance. Nobody advocates that. So this one-shot operation will come to an end after 1966 and 1967. In the meantime our expenditures are running at an annual rate of about $10 billion higher than our revenues; this at a time when our economy is at a top level.

I am not trying to place the responsibility for this on either the President or the Congress. Both are responsible. I am merely trying to bring out the facts. We should have accelerated corporate tax payments, and I supported the measure which the administration proposed, but in doing so I wanted it clearly understood that the increased payments evolving therefrom during fiscal 1966 and 1967 would not continue forever and should not be included as normal revenues when reporting the deficit.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Will not the Senator admit that this $10 billion over and above

what we spend in fiscal 1966, as against fiscal 1965, does include the buildup in Vietnam?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course it does; and that has been much more expensive.

Will the Senator further agree that because of these decisions as to nonrecurring items we made this last fiscal year, and because of the lack of them next year, it behooves the Congress to be very careful in appropriating money that is not essential?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. That is the basis of my argument here today.

Mr. PASTORE. I am happy that the Senator is making this dissertation, but I would hope he would not do it in the tone and spirit of criticizing the administration. I fear that was his purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am merely stating the facts. If the facts are a reflection on the administration, so be it.

I think Congress should understand these figures, because after fiscal 1967 there will be no further nonrecurring income from these sources.

On the seigniorage on coins the Treasury Department has always claimed a small profit, amounting to $150 million to $200 million a year. But once they complete this major changeover from the quarters, half dollars, and dimes with the silver content to the present content of mostly copper the large windfall stops. Meanwhile it will result in a $2.5 billion profit that will be spread over the 2 fiscal years, $1 billion of it in fiscal 1966, and $1.5 billion in fiscal 1967. After that it will level off and will not recur again unless we start printing paper quarters and paper dimes. So that is nonrecurring income.

In fiscal 1967, there will be the remainder of this nonrecurring income, but as I pointed out earlier, that ends it. In fiscal 1967 through the action of Congress in accelerating the corporate payments under the 1964 and 1966 acts, which brings the corporations fully on a prepaid basis, the administration estimates it will take in $5.3 billion extra. This amount is over the normal taxes that would be paid by the corporations in 1967.

They expect to sell assets in an estimated amount of $4.2 billion next year. The profit on the coins, the seigniorage, will be $1.5 billion next year, which means that next year we will have total nonrecurring income of around $11 billion. That means that we can spend $11 billion more in fiscal 1967 than we are taking in and still report a balanced budget at the end of fiscal 1967.

We have here a situation where we will have a nonrecurring income of around $18 billion to $19 billion spread over fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967, giving the administration a chance to spend that amount above its regular income and still report a balanced budget when in reality we are spending about $1 billion per month more than we are taking in. As we vote on these appropriation bills Congress should take that factor into consideration. The President was right in reemphasizing this deficit to the Appropriations Committee, but he should have gone further and backed up his remarks with some vetoes. The President could exercise his veto power on some of these bills if he disagrees with them and see whether Congress would sustain him. He has an equal responsibility with Congress, but in making that statement, I am not discharging or absolving Congress of its responsibility.

I wish to point out that the method of financing the Government through the sale of the assets is resulting in an unnecessary increase in the interest cost. There is no question on that point; in fact, the Treasury admits that selling these assets through FNMA is costing them in excess of the one-half percent extra interest charge. Selling these assets as Government-guaranteed obligations is costing us now $34 million a year more in interest charges than would be necessary. Project that over the next 10 to 20 years, and you can see what just that one item alone means.

This was the President's idea to cover up his real deficits. It is like a shell game—"now you see it, now you don't."

There is no question but that the administration's plan of selling these as guaranteed obligations rather than direct obligations not only has had the effect of costing one-half percent more interest but also has had a tendency to skyrocket further the prevailing interest rates on all loans throughout the country. It was only a matter of a few days after the administration sold its 5.75 percent Government-guaranteed FNMA mortgages that the prime interest rates of all of our banks advanced automatically to 5.75 percent. And why would they not? Why would they lend to the A–1 corporations of America at rates less than they can obtain on a Government-guaranteed obligation?

Meanwhile, the administration is selling 4.15 percent E bonds to small investors, while at the same time, paying 5¾ percent on Government-guaranteed obligations to the bankers. That rate is filtering down through the whole economy. An extra one-half of 1 percent rise in the interest rates paid by the Federal Government will ultimately mean that on the Federal debt of $320 billion the Government will pay an extra $1.6 billion in annual interest charges.

This is all unnecessary and on this particular point is done solely to disguise or to hide from the American people the true costs of these Great Society programs. The sale of these securities does not show up anywhere in the bookkeeping system as reported to Congress. It would have been far better, not only from the standpoint of saving interest but also from the standpoint of accurate bookkeeping and reporting, if the Government had continued its normal methods of financing, by selling direct Government obligations.

Really this plan may be referred to as the Great Society's poverty program for the bankers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. To whom is the Government selling these assets?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Almost 100 percent to the banks, because the average investor when he sees Fannie Mae bonds advertised is not sure whether or not such bonds have the status of Government bonds. Therefore, very few private investors interest themselves in such bonds. But the banks understand this thoroughly, so in effect this arrangement is a bankers' gravy train because the banks pick up the extra one-half of 1 percent by buying the Government-guaranteed obligations; and a Government-guaranteed obligation is just as good as far as a bank is concerned as is the Government bond itself.

Mr. AIKEN. How do the banks pay for these assets which they purchase? What do they use to pay for them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They use depositors' money or obtain the money through the normal discount procedures.

But the point is that the banks would buy direct Government obligations at the same time for an interest rate at least one-half percent less. The only reason the Government is selling 15-year Fannie Mae, Government-guaranteed bonds at 5½ or 5¾ percent rather than selling Government bonds at the lower rate is that there is a so-called legal ceiling of 4¼ percent on the rate of interest the Government can pay on bonds having a maturity of more than 5 years.

Instead of asking for a repeal of this unrealistic 4¼ percent ceiling the administration insists on selling short-term securities, thereby monetizing the debt and creating inflation.

This little thin cloak of trying to hold down interest rates is being used because the Government is ashamed to ask Congress to repeal the outmoded 4¼ percent legal ceiling. They are, therefore, paying $34 million a year in premiums to protect their ego.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Government selling Government mortgages to the banks?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I understand that the Government is selling participation certificates, which are backed by Government mortgages and other collateral with the proviso that if one of the mortgages that is used as collateral turns out to be unsatisfactory it will be replaced immediately by a new and sound mortgage. Also Fannie Mae has the authority to go to the Treasury and borrow money to pay off these bonds upon maturity. They are as good as Government bonds.

Mr. AIKEN. Are some of the securities mortgages on homes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. What puzzles me is that if the banks have money to buy Government assets in the form of mortgages, why do they not have money to lend for the construction or purchase of a home or for the transferring of a mortgage on a home today? Is the Government getting all that money from the banks so

that the banks cannot lend to a family that wants to build or buy a new home?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The banks could lend it to home buyers, but with the Government-guaranteed FHA notes carrying a rate of 5¾ percent the banks save a lot of the detail work of servicing and collecting on the small mortgages.

When the Government offers the banks a Government-guaranteed bond at 5¾ percent with no servicing required, they do not have to worry about the collections and other details, so they stop lending on homes and lend their money to the Government itself.

This 5¾-percent rate is equal to or above what they could get on small mortgages, so why bother?

Mr. AIKEN. So the Government, in direct competition, has practically put the homebuyer out of business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Government has gobbled up the money which the banks would otherwise be lending for home construction.

They outbid the homebuyers for the money when the Government started paying 5¾ percent on a Government-guaranteed bond. In effect, they are writing the end of the housing program as long as they follow this deliberate high interest policy.

Ironically, this same administration, which now subsidizes the highest interest rates our country has seen in the past 40 years, is the same administration which has said so much about cheap money.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am interested in the statement of the Senator because the largest number of complaints that we receive from our constituency these days relate to the inability to borrow money from banks, insurance companies, or from anybody else for the construction of homes, motels, recreation areas, or any construction at all. They say that they cannot borrow any money.

The Senator from Delaware now undertakes to tell us that the banks are using the money to buy Government assets, and therefore they do not have any money left to lend to homebuilders.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As an example of how interest rates have risen I cite a report the Secretary of the Treasury presented to the Finance Committee which shows the interest rates today are at the highest level they have been in the past 40 years.

This has been accomplished by an administration which has shed more crocodile tears over high interest rates than have all the other administrations for the past 100 years. The interest on our national debt in 1961 was $8.9 billion. In 1964 it had risen to $10.6 billion. To pay the interest on our national debt today it is costing $12.3 billion annually. That is over $1 billion a month merely to pay the interest charges on our national debt.

It is interesting to note that $1.5 billion of that annual interest charge goes to pay the interest on the $30 billion deficit that has been created by the Johnson-Kennedy administration in the past 5 years. It costs the American taxpayers $1.5 billion a year to pay the interest alone on the deficit of the Johnson-Kennedy administration.

When we speak about the cost of Government to the taxpayers they should know where the money is going.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the argument of the Senator is rather depressing, I find, because in view of the present lack of credit which exists among our constituency, it has occurred to me that if this situation continues to grow, the time will come when we will be in dire trouble and the Federal Government will have to step in and buy the assets from the banks in order to keep our economic head above the water. Is there anything to that conclusion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think that there is any question but that we are headed for trouble unless the administrations and the Congress recognize the danger signs and take action to correct it. Nonessential spending must be stopped.

I agree completely with what the President said the other day that we must cut back on our domestic spending and I only hope that he will start using his influence and help some of us who are trying to accomplish this objective. We cannot do it alone, and thus far we have received no help from the White House.

There is a responsibility of Congress; however, it is a dual responsibility, a responsibility of Congress and of the Executive.

While the President cannot spend any money that Congress does not appropriate it is also true that Congress cannot appropriate any money that the President does not endorse. There is a dual authority and responsibility. The President signs every bill, and he could veto some of them if he so desired.

Let us stop pointing a finger at each other by saying that the executive branch or the Congress is to blame. Let us stand up and admit that we the Congress and the executive branch who are in control of the Government, are all to blame if we do not correct this situation.

This planned deficit spending has got to stop, or we can have some real trouble with our dollar. Let us not overlook what is happening in England today. It can happen here unless we change our policies, and the hour may be later than some think.

Mr. AIKEN. The gist of the remarks of the Senator, or part of it at least, indicates that if the Federal Government did not sell its assets to the banks, the banks would have more money to lend on home mortgages even though the Federal balance would not look so well at the end of the year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is only so much money. The Federal Government interfered with the homebuyers when they unnecessarily boosted the interest rates on Government borrowing by one-half of 1 percent over and above what was necessary. They could have sold direct Government loans for one-half of 1 percent less.

When they adopted this method of back-door financing they siphoned off the money in the direction of the Federal Government rather than permitting it to go through the normal channels of trade as it would have done. Who wants a 5½ percent home mortgage when they can get a Government-guaranteed bond paying 5¾ percent?

To that exent the administration has done great damage to the homebuilding industry. The way that we can correct the situation is to cut down on Government spending and thereby reduce the need to borrow new money. In the last 6 years this Kennedy-Johnson administration has spent $30 billion more than it has taken in. This is the deficit after giving it credit for the one-shot operation.

We do not at all times appreciate how much $1 billion amounts to. Very few people in America understand what $1 billion represents, and certainly I am not one of them. In the past 6 years $30 billion is a total deficit for this administration. It means that they have spent $5 billion a year beyond their income. That is $400 million a month, or reducing it further it is $100 million a week. For a 40-hour week that is $2½ million an hour, or $40,000 a minute that they have been living beyond their means. A $40,000 deficit for every minute of a 40-hour week that the Kennedy-Johnson administration has been in office.

We just cannot afford this. When the President gets concerned about the cost of Government I think that what he should do is to turn on the lights in the White House so that he can see what is actually going on in his administration.

We need more light on what this Great Society is costing.

Last year and again this year the President in the face of a sure deficit proposed a tax reduction. I opposed those tax reductions. I said that I would not approve of a tax reduction when it could be financed only by borrowing the money. We had a $6 billion deficit, and there was no purpose in increasing that deficit by cutting taxes. The result was to overheat the economy, which results in inflation.

This administration must accept its responsibility for this inflation. Through planned inflation this Great Society has been pauperizing the aged of our country. We should recognize the fact that part of this inflation is planned inflation. They have been boasting about it for a number of years.

This planned inflation is the President's responsibility.

When the President says that he is being pressured by Congress and businessmen to increase taxes that is a lot of political bologna in my book. The pressure is being exerted by these deficits created by an administration determined not to cut down spending under this Great Society.

The present administration without any question is the greatest spendthrift of any we have had in the history of our country.

The slogan of this Great Society from the beginning has been that they would plan these deficits and plan the inflation.

The Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury before our Committee on Finance both boasted of the fact that they were planning these deficits. They said: "We are planning the deficit and can control inflation."

Mr. President, they are not witnessing an example of how well they can control inflation. Prices, the cost of living, is getting out of hand.

Even the administration will soon have to recognize that there is a problem of inflation; however, they still seem to take pride in the increased cost of living. I read in the Evening Star of July 1, 1966, quotes from the President's speech in Des Moines, Iowa, a couple of weeks ago. Here the President was boasting of the fact that inflation is prevalent in this country, and he claimed it as an asset of the Democratic administration. I was surprised and disappointed to hear that statement.

I shall put the entire article in the RECORD, but I should like first to read from the article just what President Johnson said on this subject.

I quote:

> The President got in his first jibe of the day at Republicans while talking with a tenant farmer beside a cornfield near Des Moines.
>
> Anybody "really worried about inflation ought to vote Republican," he said, adding: "Because if you get them in there you won't have to worry about inflation—you won't have to worry about high prices—you won't have to worry about high wages."

Continuing, this article said that the President liked this "idea so much that he ad libbed much the same remark into his speech last night." He told the dinner audience:

> When those folks start talking to you about inflation, you tell them that is something you only have to worry about in Democratic administrations.

Mr. President, I believe it is a sad day in America when the President of the United States, with the cost of living rising as it is today, goes out on the political stump and boasts of the fact that his administration endorses the inflation in this country and even claims credit for it. I wish to say this: At least I compliment him for being honest about who should assume the responsibility.

But what about the housewife who must buy groceries at the higher cost?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an item appearing on the UP Wire Service today which outlines the substantial increase in the cost of living for the month of June.

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

WASHINGTON.—The cost of living went up again in June when the Consumer Price Index rose three-tenths of 1 percent, the Labor Department reported today.

The increase was caused mostly by higher prices for food and medical care and higher mortgage interest rates.

The increase in living costs carried the Consumer Price Index to 112.9 percent of the 1957–59 average, up 2.5 percent over a year ago.

This means that consumers in June paid $11.29 for the same market basket of goods and services that cost $10 about 8 years ago.

The price increase in June was three times as big as the rise in May of one-tenth of 1 percent. Prices held steady in January, rose five-tenths of 1 percent in February, four-tenths of 1 percent in March and four-tenths of 1 percent in April.

Overall, the cost of living went up 1.7 percent during the first half of the year, the biggest 6-month increase since 1958.

Food prices, which had fallen four-tenths of 1 percent in May, rebounded and rose four-tenths of 1 percent in June. But the June increase is about normal for that month, the department said.

The main increases were for fresh fruit, pork, dairy products and bread. Egg prices and canned fruit and juice prices both declined last month.

Food prices in June were 3.5 percent higher than a year ago, with the biggest gainers meat and eggs.

But fresh vegetables were 16 percent cheaper than in June 1965.

Consumer services which account for about one-third of the average family budget, also cost four-tenths of 1 percent more in June than in May and were up 3.7 percent over a year ago.

Doctor, dentist and health insurance charges rose seven-tenths of 1 percent in June while hospital charges increased six-tenths of 1 percent. Home repairs, laundry and dry cleaning, and barber and beauty shop charges also moved higher last month.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President is correct—the credit for inflation does belong to his administration, and I hope that every housewife in America gives him full credit when she pays extra for the groceries. Remember that the President claims the full credit for those increased costs.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of July 1, 1966, written by Mr. Garrett D. Horner, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WARMUP FOR THE FALL: JOHNSON, THE BARNSTORMER, RETURNS

(By Garrett D. Horner, Star Staff Writer)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—President Johnson, in good spirits after warming up for the congressional election campaign, relaxed at his Texas ranch home today.

The President stoutly defended his Viet Nam policy and jibed at Republican cries of alarm about inflation in speeches at Omaha, Neb., yesterday afternoon and at Des Moines, Iowa last night.

The day harked back to Johnson's vigorous, personal style of campaigning in the 1964 presidential race.

The President apparently had decided to use the barnstorming style to take up the offensive politically—to go to the people and plead his case on Viet Nam, inflation and other issues.

Despite polls showing his popularity slipping in the area recently, Johnson got an enthusiastic reception, especially in Des Moines and in the Iowa countryside on a visit to a farm near Des Moines.

A GOOD EVENING

"This evening in Iowa has been good for your President," he told a cheering crowd of more than 5,000 at a Democratic fund-raising dinner in Des Moines. "It may be just a warmup of things to come between now and the fall."

He said he was told that the campaign talk this year was going to be about two things—the Viet Nam war and inflation, so he talked about those issues.

He stressed determination to fight on in Viet Nam until the Communists are convinced their aggression cannot succeed—and challenged critics to produce an honorable alternative.

Occasionally departing from his prepared texts, Johnson pressed his points with the personal, off-the-cuff rhetoric which proved effective in 1964.

At the same time, the President was more eloquent than ever in urging the Communist leaders in North Viet Nam to join in unconditional peace talks.

JIBE AT GOP

The President got in his first jibe of the day at Republicans while talking with a tenant farmer beside a cornfield near Des Moines.

Anybody "really worried about inflation ought to vote Republican," he said, adding: "Because if you get them in there you won't have to worry about inflation—you won't have to worry about high prices—you won't have to worry about high wages."

He liked the idea so much that he ad-libbed much the same remark into his speech last night. He also told the dinner audience: "When those folks start talking to you about inflation, you tell them that is something you only have to worry about in Democratic administrations."

Much of his Speech at the Democratic dinner, giving boost to the re-election campaigns of Iowa's Democratic congressmen, was on the theme that farmers—as well as most other Americans—never had it so good. He cited a lot of economic statistics to prove it.

Officials said some 2,500 persons paid $100 a plate to dine with the President at the Des Moines Memorial Armory, and more than that many sat, dinnerless but for free, in the balcony to hear him. It was the first time Iowa Democrats ever had got above $25 a plate dinner.

Johnson was at his handshaking, folksy campaigning best during his Iowa visit. At least seven times during the afternoon and evening he stopped his motorcade to shake hands with cheering throngs along the streets or roadside.

When they were spotted riding in a separate car, the President's daughter Luci and her fiance, Pat Nugent, were almost as big an attraction. Women got a kick out of seeing Luci's engagement ring.

"That was a good speech you made in Omaha," cattle farmer Tom M. Tenhagen told the President along the roadside on the way into Des Moines from the airport.

"We are not going to duck our tail and run out of South Viet Nam," Johnson had declared at Omaha in words that seemed aimed at domestic critics as well as the Communist leaders in North Viet Nam.

He said the Communist aggressors "are wrong" in believing that "political disagreements in Washington fan confusion and doubt in South Viet Nam—and then in Asia."

Departing from his prepared text, his voice impassioned, Johnson recalled that only 20 months ago he was elected President, and said:

"Now there are many, many, many who can recommend, advise—and sometimes a few of them consent. But there is only one that has been chosen by the American people to decide.

"I hear my friends say," he remarked, " 'I am troubled, I am confused, I am frustrated,' and all of us can understand these people.

"Sometimes I almost develop a stomach ulcer myself just listening to them."

A small crowd interrupted with applause several times during the President's speech beside the sun-baked Omaha municipal wharf on the Missouri River.

Much bigger crowds lined the main street of little Indianola, Iowa, a small town he passed through on his way from the Des Moines airport to visit the $270,000 model farm of Woodrow W. Diehl.

They cheered him and waved home-made welcome signs. Police estimated the Indianola crowds at 12,000, nearly twice the population of the town.

ENJOYS INSPECTING CATTLE

At the Diehl farm, Johnson seemed pleased by a big sign of welcome to "Our Farmer President." He poured lemonade for himself, Mrs. Johnson, Luci and Pat. He inspected cattle and hogs—jumping a feeding trough to mingle with the hogs in their pen and straddling a fence to admire some cattle.

On the way into Des Moines from the Diehl farm, Johnson stopped at a crossroads to talk to two men who described themselves as "old carpenters."

One of them was a Republican. The other, Francis Knouse, told the President: "I am an old Democrat."

With a big grin, Johnson told him "get in there and do a good job."

Several hours later, instead of showing weariness after hours under a broiling sun and in the sweltering armory, Johnson still was exhibiting campaign vigor when he stopped his motorcade to shake hundreds more hands as he approached the Des Moines airport late last night.

From Des Moines, he flew to Randolph Field near San Antonio and from there early today to his LBJ Ranch, some 75 miles northwest of San Antonio.

He plans to remain at the ranch over the July 4 weekend and may stay through all next week.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In his recent comments the President has been attempting to blame Congress and business for the deficits and the possibility he may have to increase taxes. He is trying to pretend it will be their fault. I say again that Congress does have a responsibility, but so does the President. The appeal by the President to Congress and to American business to cut back spending would have far more effect in this country if he would set the example and start using his veto power on some of the measures passed by Congress that he says are too expensive. I shall cite a few examples of these measures and ask why he did not veto them if he disapproved.

The President expressed concern about the pay raise bill because Congress made an effective date of July instead of January. During the discussion of that bill the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] offered an amendment, which I cosponsored, which would have made the effective date of that pay raise January 1967 instead of July 1966. That proposed amendment received exactly nine votes in the Senate, and one of the main reasons it did not receive more than nine votes was that word came from the administration to defeat the amendment. Not one call did the administration make to assist us in passing the amendment. The word was passed around to defeat the amendment. Any number of Senators said, "We would have supported you, but we know the President wants the July date and will sign it.

The President could have used a veto pen, and if he does not have one I will send him one. He could have used a veto pen and sent that bill back to Congress, and then if Congress passed it over his veto I would excuse him from his responsibility. But I do not give him any credit for the speeches about economy he is making if he does not back them up with actions.

In his message to Congress the President said he desired to liberalize retirement benefits, provided they were properly financed. I give him credit for recommending that point in his message. I took him at his word, and during the debate in the Senate I offered an amendment which would have raised the contributory rates of the employees and the Government by one-half percent. This merely carried out his recommendations in January of financing the cost of those increased benefits. That proposed amendment received 18 votes, and the President gave us no support but instead signed the bill, and bragged about all he is doing for these retirees.

So I say again that I am not impressed by what the President says if he does not back it up with appropriate action. I wish to see him veto some of these bills if he does not desire them. I assure him that I will support his veto, just as I supported him by offering the amendments to which he had given lip service, but a minority in Congress cannot do it alone.

The President questioned the veterans bill. The reason that Congress had to pass a veterans benefits bill was that this administration does not recognize that a war is going on in Vietnam. Therefore, without special legislation, the American boys who are being drafted and sent to Vietnam would not be entitled to any of the benefits under the GI act because presumably there is no war going on. By all means this bill had to pass.

The President seems worried about what Congress is doing. So am I. About 4 weeks ago Congress passed a cotton subsidy bill which would allow special payments to the cotton producers who instead of planting cotton decided to plant soybeans. This bill was amended and expanded so that it covered wheat and corn and other feed grains. The estimated cost of that bill was $400 million per year. It is a 4-year bill. That represents a cost of $1.5 billion over the 4 years. The President had made no recommendations in his budget for this item. The bill was introduced and passed by the House the same day it was reported by the committee. No hearings were held in the House, no hearings were held in the Senate, and it was pushed through the Senate over the strong opposition of some Senators. Its passage represents in the next 4 years $1.5 billion extra costs beyond what the President had even asked for. But did he help those of us who opposed it? Not at all.

Instead the President signs the bill, and he is going to Texas to say, "Look what we are doing for you." I say he should also tell the taxpayers, "Look what we are doing to you." He should use the word "to" as well as the word "for."

Again, the President delivered a speech in Texas last December, and I quote from the New York Times of December 2. It is headlined, "President Backs a Cut in U.S. Jobs; Approves a Plan To Retire 25,000 Employees."

Then according to the article he spent a quiet day. He has spent a quiet 7 months. The President has not done a thing to carry out the pledge of cutting 25,000 employees from the payroll as he said he would. At that time this pledge was hailed throughout the country as a great economy move.

He said he would cut 25,000 employees from the public payroll. But what did he do? Since December 1, last year, the same day that he promised to cut 25,000 employees from the payroll, he has added 117,327 more employees to the public payroll. Figuring a minimum of $6,000 per employee, that means he has added an extra $700 million to the public payroll. This cost is above what it was last December when he said he was going to cut it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. It might be pointed out that in addition to the civilian employees about which the Senator has been speaking, approximately 550,000 more men are in the Armed Forces. They are also on the payroll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. But the President was not speaking about the Armed Forces. In fact, they are increasing in number, and we understand why.

But the President made much of the promise that he would cut 25,000 civilian employees from the public payroll. Instead of that, during the succeeding months he has added 117,327. In fact, 185,758 employees have been added to the public payroll in the last 12 months.

The fact that this is an election year may have some significance.

It is time that the American people put a halt to any administration's dipping into the Federal Treasury every time an election approaches and its padding of the public payroll with a lot of political hacks. Last December the President said that he did not need these employees. He said then that he had 25,000 more employees than he needed. Why did he add 117,000 if he had 25,000 too many last December? Why?

This is another example which I cited a couple of weeks ago: During the last 10 days of the last fiscal year the Department of Agriculture bought 2,900 typewriters at a cost of about $500 apiece. It instructed each of its offices throughout the country to buy one typewriter. It is estimated that if they had combined this purchase and had solicited bids they could have saved four to five hundred thousand dollars on this item alone. Why this extravagance?

Such waste could be corrected if the administration means what it said when it speaks of economy.

Just a couple of weeks ago the President addressed the Elderly Citizens at their National Convention. He promised them an increase in Social Security benefits. Significantly he never mentioned the fact that an increase in the Social Security benefits would automatically increase the Social Security tax. Oh, no. He mentions nothing about the tax, but he does mention the benefits. Why not tell the whole truth?

Four weeks ago the administration, through an agency of Government, recommended that Congress authorize one pilot plant at a cost of $1 million to develop a process, for manufacturing fish flour. Congress increased that recommendation to five pilot plants at a cost of over $5 million. They multiplied this amount by 500 percent over and above what the administration had asked for and those of us who opposed this increase went down in defeat. Did we get any help in our opposition from the President? No, we are now told he plans to sign the bill.

The President signs these bills and than says, "Don't you boys down there in Congress vote me too much money."

Recently the President decided to allot $10 million for a housing project in Alaska which it was earlier claimed was not economically feasible. The only explanation that we received was that in turn, for approving that $10 million project he could pick up one vote on a major bill he was ramming through Congress. This indicates that the price tag that this administration puts on one vote is $10 million. That is a high price tag to get through the Great Society program. In fact, I would say that it may break his so-called guidelines.

Much of the confusion over whether or not we are going to increase taxes under this administration is unnecessary. The President's warning that we have to cut spending, have price and wage controls or a tax increase is justified. But the first step that the administration and Congress should take is to cut spending and stop just talking about it. Stop spending. If the President does not like a bill he should veto it and those of us in the Congress who have been trying to cut spending will try to sustain him.

I am getting a little impatient with the fact that the President is always talking about how he is going to cut spending and then makes grandstand plays when he signs the bills, boasting how much his administration is giving to the people.

Such talk is just political windowdressing and deceives no one.

The question is asked: Will there be a tax increase in 1967 or 1968? I do not think there is any doubt about the answer. There is going to be a tax increase in 1967, but the President is not going to ask for it until after the election. He knows now that we cannot continue the rate of spending under the Great Society unless there is an increase in taxes, but the administration does not have the courage to tell the American people the cost of these programs until after the election.

It is even rumored that they are going to drag out this session of Congress and then recess until after the elections so that we can come back after November and approve an increase in taxes. Even now soundings are being taken as to how fast Congress can act should the request be delayed until after January.

If it takes them a year to make up their minds and work up enough courage to ask for an increase in taxes as far as I am concerned they need not ask Congress to stampede it through without an explanation with regard to the spending plans.

As one member of the Committee on Finance I shall ask that they put first things first. The first duty of Congress and the administration, before they talk about increased taxes, is to cut spending. It is time that we go ahead and cut the spending rather than just talking about it when we get out on the political platform.

---

## FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The pending business is the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be temporarily laid aside so that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may offer his amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 685

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 675 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 23, before the quotation marks insert the following: "With respect to any dollars herein provided, the voting power of the United States shall be exercised for the purpose of disapproving any loan for any project, enterprise, or activity in any country during any period for which the President has suspended assistance to the government of such country because of any action taken on or after January 1, 1962, by the government of such country or any government agency or subdivision within such country as specified in paragraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (e)(1) of section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and the failure of such country within a reasonable time to take appropriate steps to discharge its obligations or provide relief in accordance with the provisions of such subsection."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, paragraphs (A), (B), and (C), of subsection (e)(1) of section 620(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, direct the President to suspend assistance to the governments of those countries which have acted directly, or through subsidiaries, to nationalize, expropriate, or seize ownership of U.S. citizens' property, or have acted in other discriminatory ways, which would have a similar effect of taking control of such property.

The application of my amendment would cause the voting power of the United States in international lending organizations to be directed against requests by those countries to which the President has suspended U.S. assistance pursuant to the above-directed conditions.

I, therefore, submit the amendment. This is nothing more than an application of the Hickenlooper amendment to the lending agencies. We do not have complete control, but we do have a substantial voice. I believe it is entirely proper if we deny aid to countries which expropriate property of our nationals, the same should apply to lending agencies.

On the amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Did the Senator ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, the Senator said he is going to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think, as the temporary manager of the bill, that we can accept the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 685) offered by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 684

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 684, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 24 insert the following:

"(c) Section 201(e), which relates to the making of loans from the Development Loan Fund, is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) In carrying out this title, the President shall not allocate, reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside, funds, including foreign currencies or credits owned by the United States, aggregating in excess of $100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country together with sufficient information and assurances to indicate reasonably that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner, or (2) the President determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.'"

On page 4, line 1, strike out "(c)" and substitute "(d)".

On page 4, line 11, strike out "(d)" and substitute "(e)".

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, section 201(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, has prohibited the commitment of development loan funds by the United States in any country unless an application is made with sufficient information and assurances to indicate reasonably that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner.

This requirement is one which any prudent lender would insist on to protect his investment and in practice has proven to be a sound requirement which makes those countries desirous of borrowing funds from the United States face up to their financial responsibilities

at the time they submit a loan application. However, a major loophole exists in that section 201(e) applies only to loans made in dollars and does not apply to loans made in foreign currencies owned by the United States.

The United States has acquired very large holdings of foreign currencies in recent years through the sale of agricultural commodities overseas pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, commonly known as Public Law 480. These currencies are given or loaned to the same countries in which the agricultural sales were made to be used for military assistance and economic development. In 1965 over $700 million in U.S.-owned foreign currencies were loaned to foreign countries for their economic development programs.

I believe it important that these foreign currency loans be made subject to the same requirements as dollar loans, insofar as the United States obtaining assurance that they will be used in an economically and technically sound manner. There is an all too prevalent attitude among the officials of the executive agencies that foreign currencies do not represent assets of real value to the United States, and I have noted instances in which these currencies are used in a manner which would never be contemplated for U.S. dollars.

The purpose of my amendment is to stop this practice and to require a change in attitude. U.S.-owned foreign currencies can be every bit as valuable as dollars if property managed and effectively utilized. Indeed they can go a long way in substituting for dollars and in favorably affecting our balance of payments.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I oppose this particular amendment. In carrying out this title, the President shall not allocate, reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside, funds aggregating in excess of $100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country together with sufficient information and assurances to indicate reasonably that the funds will be used in an economically and technically sound manner, or (2) the President determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.

This applies because they are funds. The law now carries almost the exact language which the Senator from Alaska seeks to change. His proposal has to do with foreign currencies on credits owned by the United States aggregating in excess of $100,000. The foreign currency loans to which this amendment would apply are made from foreign currencies and generate almost entirely under Public Law 480 and not under this particular development loan program. It may be that the Senator would like to offer this amendment when we consider Public Law 480, but I respectfully suggest that it does not have any really significant application to this bill.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know why not.

Mr. McCARTHY. It does not generate foreign currencies under the development loan program. It does under Public Law 480, which is another bill, to be considered at another time. I hope that the Senator would not press his amendment at this point in consideration of the bill.

Mr. GRUENING. I think it is important to have a record on this amendment. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, for the purpose of asking for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 684 of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 147 Leg.]

YEAS—29

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bartlett | Gore | Moss |
| Bayh | Griffin | Ribicoff |
| Bible | Gruening | Robertson |
| Brewster | Harris | Russell, S.C. |
| Byrd, Va. | Hart | Russell, Ga. |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Hartke | Symington |
| Cannon | Jordan, N.C. | Talmadge |
| Eastland | Long, La. | Thurmond |
| Ervin | Mondale | Tydings |
| Fong | Morse | |

NAYS—61

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hill | Mundt |
| Allott | Holland | Murphy |
| Anderson | Hruska | Muskie |
| Bennett | Inouye | Nelson |
| Boggs | Jackson | Neuberger |
| Burdick | Javits | Pastore |
| Carlson | Jordan, Idaho | Pell |
| Case | Kennedy, Mass. | Prouty |
| Church | Kennedy, N.Y. | Proxmire |
| Clark | Kuchel | Randolph |
| Cooper | Lausche | Saltonstall |
| Cotton | Long, Mo. | Simpson |
| Curtis | Mansfield | Smith |
| Dirksen | McCarthy | Stennis |
| Dominick | McGee | Tower |
| Douglas | McGovern | Williams, Del. |
| Ellender | McIntyre | Yarborough |
| Fannin | Metcalf | Young, N. Dak. |
| Fulbright | Miller | Young, Ohio |
| Hayden | Montoya | |
| Hickenlooper | Morton | |

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bass | Monroney | Sparkman |
| Dodd | Pearson | Williams, N.J. |
| Magnuson | Scott | |
| McClellan | Smathers | |

So Mr. GRUENING's amendment (No. 684) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 672

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 672, and ask that it be stated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of which I am the sponsor may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and when that amendment is disposed of, that my amendment may again become the pending business.

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

Mr. TOWER. I thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from New York.

Mr. GRUENING and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Texas has the floor.

The Senator's amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed by Mr. TOWER, at the end of the bill, to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 203. It is the sense of the Congress that, in view of recent changes in the Government of Indonesia, the Secretary of Agriculture should take such steps as may be necessary to encourage and facilitate the export to Indonesia of agricultural commodities produced in the United States, under the Commodity Credit Corporation export credit sales program authorized by title IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

The purpose of my amendment is to stimulate the sale of agricultural commodities to Indonesia. It is well known that in the past I have opposed any kind of help or aid to Indonesia under the Sukarno government; but in view of the internal political change in Indonesia, I think we should proceed as rapidly as possible to establish normal economic

and political relations with that country. Considering the fact that we are searching for export markets for our cotton, and considering the fact that the Indonesian textile mills very much want our cotton, I think this would be a very constructive piece of legislation to pass.

I am aware, however, that this is properly a matter to be handled by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and that this amendment is primarily addressed to Public Law 480. I therefore yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for any comment he may wish to make.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is now considering the food-for-freedom bill. We will take cognizance of this amendment since what the Senator is trying to do in his amendment is properly within the purview of our committee. The amendment clearly amends the so-called food-for-freedom program, or Public Law 480 as it is commonly known.

I assure the Senator that, before the food-for-freedom bill is reported, consideration will be given to the amendment of the Senator. If the Committee on Agriculture disagrees with the views of the Senator from Texas, he will then have an opportunity to offer his amendment to the food-for-freedom bill when it is presented to the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for that assurance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make a short comment on this matter. Yesterday the junior Senator from Illinois introduced an amendment which was agreed to, banning the granting of aid to Indonesia.

There is already in the law section 620(j) which generally prohibits aid to Indonesia unless the President determines it to be in the national interest.

I want to note that the Communists were suppressed in Indonesia only after U.S. aid was halted. I think that we should be very careful about reinstituting aid to that country, because none of us want to revive the Communist influence in Indonesia.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I point out that this provision would come within the purview of Public Law 480, and it therefore would not be subject to the proscription noted by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas.

When a government determines that it will be friendly to the United States and its allies, or when a government has successfully thwarted a Communist takeover, I think we should do everything we can to strengthen that government and to establish normal relations with the government.

I hope that my amendment will be agreed to in the food-for-freedom bill.

I again express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the Senate will revert to the Javits amendment at 3 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will consider the amendment immediately.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have an amendment that I would like to offer. I doubt that we could conclude action on my amendment before 3 o'clock unless my good friend, the Senator from Arkansas, will accept the amendment. It is very mild amendment, and I have discussed it with him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think it is the kind of amendment that we ought to vote on. I do not think that we ought to accept an amendment of that character without a vote.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be held at the desk and be considered after the disposition of the Javits amendment that is now pending.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the senior Senator from Oregon is going to move to amend my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be held at the desk until the disposition of the Javits amendment.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, so much time has elapsed since we began to consider my amendment, that I feel it necessary to restate very briefly the premises upon which the amendment is based. I shall do this rather quickly and then the senior Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have proposed is designed to prevent the granting of assistance to any member country of the Organization of American States—that means the Western Hemisphere, other than Canada, for all practical purposes—which is controlled by a government which came into power by the unconstitutional overthrow of a freely elected, constitutional, democratic government—or a so-called de facto takeover—generally by military means, as our experience has shown.

The amendment provides that we shall end assistance, military or economic, to such a de facto regime if, in consultation with the member countries of the Organization of American States, and in accordance with applicable resolutions and agreements of the OAS, the President finds that such government does not intend to take the necessary steps, within a reasonable time, to restore constitutional government, to hold free elections, and to apply human and civil liberties. The cutoff shall not take place if (1) the President is satisfied that it is essential to the national interest that we should proceed to aid such a de facto government and reports such determination and his reasons therefor to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and to the Speaker of the House or (2) the President is satisfied that such government intends to take appropriate steps to restore constitutional government, within a reasonable time.

Mr. President, the amendment as I have offered it, rather than the printed copy which is on the desk of Senators, is both prospective and retrospective in its application. Insofar as its retrospective application is concerned, it would for all practical purposes apply only to Argentina. The only two active military regimes at present are in Bolivia and Argentina, and Bolivia will shortly hold an election. Therefore, they would fall within the exception, or at least would be certified by the President and fall within the exception to the amendment.

The amendment would therefore apply restrospectively only to Argentina. I pointed out previously that the military regime in Argentina has given no promises or assurances as to what they will do. It has made only a most general statement of what it intends to do. It has eliminated the Congress, the political parties, and the Supreme Court of Argentina.

I made it clear that I was not attacking the Argentine regime. The President may feel that it is wise to give aid to that regime, and he may so certify to Congress with his reasons. However, he should at least be put to the proof.

I pointed out the tremendous instability created in Latin America by the constant concern over these military takeovers. Everybody is looking over his shoulder. The people do not know whether the army will let them have a duly constituted government or not.

The same situation existed in Argentina when I was there within the last 3½ months. It was common knowledge at that time that at any time the military wanted to pull the plug on the government they would do so. When I was there, an Argentine general issued a statement that he was not going to take over the government that particular Wednesday, so rife were the rumors and so unstable was the situation.

Congress ought to strike a blow for self-government and freedom and democratic institutions by giving notice that we are not going to leave it only to the executive to decide, without Congress having an opportunity to declare itself on the subject of when he will not only recognize the government but also continue to give it aid.

Recognition is in the hands of the President, but the aid is a matter over which we legislate.

For those reasons, I offered the amendment as I did. I believe that it will have a very salutary effect on two things. It will involve the prospects for self-government and democratic government in the Americas. Second, in my judgment—and equally important—it will be noted that my amendment ties in with the necessity for consultation among the Organization of American States in respect of any new de facto government.

This is a new thing and is occasioned by the fact that the Organization of American States adopted last November at Rio a resolution calling for just such a procedure on the recognition of de facto governments.

If we follow it, as we would be doing if the proposed amendment were adopted, I

believe it would be such an element of strength to the Organization of American States as to be worthy of adoption on that ground alone.

I point to the fact that Resolution No. 26 of the November 30, 1965, meeting at Rio carries out this design of the Organization of American States, which is followed in my proposed amendment.

For all these reasons, Mr. President, I urge that the Senate approve the proposed amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will agree with me that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] should be modified.

The Senator from New York and I have had a common objective in regard to this subject for the past several years. But in my judgment, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, relating to assistance in Latin America, is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

In 1963, I attempted to accomplish very much the same thing. In 1963, I offered an amendment that provided for suspending financial assistance to any government in Latin America that had come to power by overthrowing a prior-elected constitutional government.

Upon the same supposition as the one now made by the Senator from New York, I modified the amendment to give the President the same loophole that the Senator from New York proposes today to give to him, to act upon his own to resume assistance 30 days after notifying Congress of his intention.

The supposition was that that loophole would gain support for the amendment, and I was even given to believe that the amendment would be acceptable to the State Department. But that was a purely fraudulent supposition, as I find so often is the case with respect to so-called formal understandings reached with the State Department. The State Department opposed my amendment in other quarters, with the result that it threw its influence against my amendment, by its legislative lobbyists, who are sitting in the gallery as I now speak. That is one reason why not the best of cooperative relationships exists between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the State Department on a good many matters.

This watered-down version did not receive even the vote of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. It received 11 votes on a yea-and-nay vote. The State Department did a good job of lobbying that year.

My conclusion was that it was a waste of time to offer such ineffectual language in the hope or expectation that it would at least furnish an indication of congressional attitude on an area of concern.

If we are to exercise our constitutional checks—we owe it to the American people to exercise them—we cannot leave a loophole by which a President can ignore an expression of viewpoint on the part of Congress. That is all that would be done by the language in the proposed amendment. That is why I have sadly come to the conclusion that the so-called Presidential escape clause has the effect, in most instances, of defeating the very purpose and objective that Congress has in mind when it seeks to express its view in the field of foreign policy, as would be done by the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

I agree with the point of view. I disagree with the procedure set forth in the amendment of the Senator from New York.

My amendment of 1963 at least had the virtue of giving Congress 30 days in which to act to ban the renewal of assistance. There was that much of a congressional check. The amendment now proposed by the Senator from New York does not provide even for that.

What a pity that the Senate did not see fit to adopt this language in 1963. It could have served as a warning, both to Presidents of the United States and to potential military adventurers in Latin America, that the Senate took a dim view of coups against elected, constitutional governments, and a dimmer view of supporting them with American money.

What a pity that the Senate in 1963 saw fit to judge this issue on the basis of the man who occupied the White House at the moment, and not on the basis of the duty of Congress to establish standards for the administration of foreign aid.

I point out to Senators that the problem before us in connection with the amendment is not the recognition of a foreign power. That is the prerogative of the White House. But it is not the prerogative of the White House, without congressional approval, to pledge the money of American taxpayers to another government. We should give that approval on the basis of the facts existing at the time the President seeks to grant the aid.

What is being sought here is that we tell the President: "We have strong doubts about whether or not you should support a military junta that has come into power by overthrowing a constitutional government. We don't want you to do it. We don't think you should do it. But, of course, if you decide that it is in the national interest that it should be done, then go ahead."

So we simply transfer to the President what is obviously a legislative responsibility to analyze the facts, case by case, and decide whether we want to adopt a recommendation by the President to grant aid to a military dictatorship that has overthrown a constitutional government. That is the plea of the Senator from Oregon.

There is no reason in the world, after a military junta has overthrown a constitutional government, why the President should be given discretionary power to invest the taxpayers' money to the tune of a good many million dollars, in most instances, in that kind of dictatorship, without the approval of Congress. All I am asking is that Congress grant its approval.

I know all the old line arguments that there is a question of time; that getting approval takes time. But how long does it take for the President to get a message before Congress, setting forth his reasons why aid should be granted to a military junta that has overthrown a constitutional government? If his report is a good report and establishes a sound case, it will not take much time for Congress to adopt a concurrent resolution, as my amendment provides, authorizing such a grant.

I know that when one talks about constitutional theory in the Senate, particularly when the pressure is on to have a bill disposed of, there are those who wish that that amount of time would not be taken for such discussion. I shall continue to point out, perhaps on the basis of the educational principle that sometimes much repetition is needed to get a lesson across, so often as I have it presented to me in the Senate, any proposal that seeks to give to the President what amounts, in fact, to unchecked power.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I have worked shoulder to shoulder on so many issues that I now find myself in the unhappy position of not agreeing with him on a particular issue; but I say most respectfully that I do not believe our difference is really a difference of objective, but is more a difference concerning the procedure that ought to be followed by Congress in a determination of the exercise of a legislative check.

So I shall continue to plead that we stop developing in this country, more and more of a government by executive supremacy. I shall continue to try to warn the Senate and the people of my country that we must check the executive branch of the government, I do not care who sits in the White House. This has nothing to do with the personality in the White House. This is an abstract principle of American constitutionalism; yet all the freedoms and all the liberties of the American people depend upon the implementation of the check-and-balance system of our Government, a system which our constitutional fathers gave to us as a great governmental legacy for maintaining a system of three coordinate, coequal branches of government, each branch checking the other.

Therefore, as far as this abstract principle of constitutionalism is concerned, the senior Senator from New York takes the position again, as I have time and time again during my 21 years in the Senate, of saying: Stop, look, and listen before you give this unchecked power to a President.

If the Senate this afternoon thinks that the situation is serious enough so that we should warn the President to go slow whenever he is dealing with a junta that has overthrown a constitutional government, then all the more reason for saying to the President: "If you think that there are reasons for providing the aid, you tell us those reasons and we will decide whether or not we agree with you."

But under the Javits amendment we do not have that right. Under the Javits amendment we forgo it. Under the Javits amendment we delegate it.

Under the Javits amendment, as I have said so many times, we again advocate what I consider to be the clear, constitutional responsibility of the Congress to check a President in the exercise of arbitrary discretion.

But you say that a President will not exercise arbitrary discretion, and you cannot be more wrong. The pages of American history are filled with example after example when Presidents have engaged in arbitrary and capricious discretion.

The Senate knows and the country knows that I feel that that is one of the great problems confronting us in connection with the war in Vietnam. We have permitted the President to exercise arbitrary discretion, and, in my judgment, shocking, capricious discretion at that. You simply cannot continue this trend. If more and more discretionary power is granted to him by the Congress, this fine principle of checks and balances disappears.

I am pleading this afternoon that we add my amendment to the Senator's proposal to require that the President be required to send to the Congress a report setting forth his reasons why aid should be given to a military junta or a coup group that has overthrown a constitutional government, and then Congress considers his reasons and passes a concurrent resolution approving of the aid, if it decides that the President is right.

I think it will be discovered in many cases that he was wrong. In fact, if we had the procedure that the senior Senator from Oregon is arguing for, some aid we have given in Latin American countries in recent years never would have been given.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, it was most unfortunate that it was given, for it has greatly increased our problems in Latin America in some of the instances I shall mention before I finish my speech.

No, Mr. President, I think that now is the time for the Senate to go on record in an amendment that carries out what the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has in mind, as far as his major purpose and objective are concerned, but requires that the Congress place its stamp of approval upon the recommendation.

Since 1963, the flurry of coups, which had begun that year, has continued apace. The resumption of assistance to such juntas as the Reid-Cabral junta in the Dominican Republic, the Peralta junta in Guatemala, and that in Honduras encouraged the fashion to spread to the continent of South America.

I have talked to a great many Latin American leaders. I talk to many of the outstanding democratic Latin American leaders each year. I am in frequent communication with them. Our democratic friends in Latin America are greatly concerned about the foreign policy of the United States, vis-a-vis Latin America, when a coup takes place. They just take it for granted that after a polite waiting period the United States will recognize them and then proceed to pour millions of dollars by way of aid into that country.

When we do, we are letting down our democratic friends in Latin America, and we are playing into the hands of the Communists in Latin America.

In fact, this policy of the United States in Latin America in my opinion, must be charged with the responsibility of aiding and abetting the Communists in a good many Latin American countries. When we help build up juntas and help supply aid to juntas, we play into the hands of the Communist propaganda which, points out to the people, whose rights are going to be trampled under foot by these military dictators: "See what the policy of the United States is. It talks a good game about freedom but when the chips of freedom are down in Latin America time and time again it does not support freedom."

I shall summarize quickly in connection with this case because it is so applicable. The President on December 10, 1963, had under consideration the recognition of a military junta in the Dominican Republic, because there was threatening a new coup and this coup was to overthrow the civilian commission that had been set up to administer the government as a facade for the military junta. My good friend the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was at the White House when the incident I now describe took place. There had been called in by the President a group of Senators for advice, after we had been briefed by the Under Secretary of State, who was the Acting Secretary of State that day because the Secretary of State was out of the country.

We were told that the policy level of the State Department was unanimous in favor of recognizing this military junta. I happened to be the lone dissenter at the meeting in the cabinet room. That is not a new role for the senior Senator from Oregon. But, Mr. President, I am always willing to be judged by the decisions which I make on the basis of subsequent events.

I take the position that had my position prevailed that day a good deal of the trouble that the President had to go through in the Dominican Republic subsequently never would have developed, because when he agreed to follow the advice which he got to recognize that junta in the Dominican Republic, in my judgment, he paved the way for what history will record as a series of costly mistakes which the United States made in the Dominican Republic.

It was on that occasion that I said to the President:

"You should call in your democratic friends in Latin America and get their advice. You should call in the President of Chile. You should call in the old President of Colombia and the new President. You should call in the former President of Venezuela, Betancourt, and the new President. You should call in the old President of Costa Rica and the new President. You should call in the President of Peru, Terry, former Governor Marin of Puerto Rico, and the President of Mexico."

If he had done that, Mr. President, the advice would have been unanimous against the proposal the State Department is making for recognition of the military junta. The President, in a conversation which he had with me in his office subsequent to the meeting, expressed some serious doubt as to whether or not he was wrong.

But, under the circumstances, he probably would have to go along, and would go along with the advice of the State Department. That was on a Tuesday. On the following Saturday, he recognized the military junta in the Dominican Republic.

It was at the meeting in the Cabinet room that for the first time I said that when the chips of freedom are down in Latin America, too frequently the United States walks out on freedom.

That has been our record. We have supported dictatorships in Latin America such as Batista of Cuba and Castro of Cuba. Do not forget that we recognized Castro of Cuba and proceeded to support him. For some time, the one person in the Senate who opposed Castro was the senior Senator from Oregon. I stood on the floor of the Senate at that time and tried to warn the Senate and the Government that it was making a great mistake in the support it was giving to Castro. I said at that time that what we were doing was merely changing our support from a Fascist dictator to a Communist dictator—at least a dictator who was following the Communist line because, then, there was doubt as to whether he was a Communist—but his procedures were Communist.

The Senate went along then, too. The Senate should have exercised its checks against the administration then, as it should exercise its checks against the administration today.

Mr. President, it was then that I stressed that we have got to stop walking out on freedom in Latin America when the chips are down. We have got to stop supporting military dictatorships in Latin America. We have got to stop adopting the rationalization that just because some other countries recognize a dictatorship, we should join the crowd. I do not care how many countries recognize a dictatorship. I do not propose to let them determine what is sound American foreign policy.

No President should object to it. Give me any reason why a President should object to have a recommendation for economic aid that does not fall within his constitutional prerogative. Recognition does. But not the granting of taxpayers' money to be spent by the millions of dollars in a country ruled by a dictatorship which has overthrown a democratic constitutional form of government.

Give me a reason why the President of the United States has any justification for not wanting to put his case before Congress.

Is he afraid of it?

Does he not trust his own case?

Does he not think that he can prove his case?

If he cannot prove his case, then he should not be given this extraordinary constitutional prerogative. He should be held to the facts of the case.

Oh, yes, it can be said, but the Senator from Oregon has gone along in past years with some resolutions and some legislation which have included Presidential escape clauses in them.

I have.

In fact—and I am quickly recalling now—I know that in 1956 the Senate adopted the Morse-Lehman resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the executive branch should not give countries economic aid which discriminate against American citizens because of their religious faith, which applied at that time to American soldiers who were Jewish who were being denied the right to serve on American bases in Saudi Arabia. It also dealt with practices of Arab countries in their discrimination against American-Jewish citizens.

At that time, in Norway, although they quickly changed it, there was an example of discrimination against American Catholic priests. But even the raising of the problem in the Senate, I was advised later by some of my friends familiar with the situation in Norway, brought an end to discrimination there.

It can be said that I went along at that time with the Morse-Lehman resolution which included a Presidential escape clause.

I did.

It can also be said, going back through my record, that in 1949, in the Javits-Morse amendment to a policy section of the foreign aid bill dealing with the same general problem, we had a President's escape clause written into it.

That is true.

But, I have learned my lesson since. I have learned the lesson that it is simply a waste of effort, because those escape clauses have not, so far as I can see, ever had any effect on the White House. It has gone right along, in spite of so-called sense-of-the-Senate resolutions. In 1959, on the Javits-Morse amendment, they sent up a report telling why the President was proceeding with the aid, but they went ahead with the aid, anyway, and there was nothing we could do about it until the next aid bill.

Now the Senate has a new aid bill before it, and there is something it can do about it.

The Senate can adopt an amendment this afternoon which will place the responsibility squarely in the lap of Congress.

The military coup in Brazil was positively beamed on by Washington, not only by the Pentagon but by the State Department. The Ambassador, who is now Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, was a leading exponent of American financial support to the Castelo Branco military junta in Brazil.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate found it a little difficult to understand why I did not support his nomination, and voted against it—the only Senator on the Committee on Foreign Relations to do so. In my speech against his nomination on the floor of the Senate, I gave one of the controlling reasons, that, in my judgment, I did not feel that the American Ambassador to Brazil should be appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs in view of the well-known strong support he gave to those who had overthrown constitutionalism in Brazil.

The increasing financial assistance by the United States has been accompanied by increasingly dictatorial practices, by increasing disaffection for the junta in Brazil, and increasing evidence that the junta plans to remain in power no matter how heavy an iron fist it takes to maintain itself.

Congress must assume its responsibility for picking out of the pockets of the American taxpayers millions of dollars to feed into Brazil to support its junta and strengthen the threat of communism there.

Mr. President, many do not wish to face it now, but I am certain that it is only a matter of time when unless constitutional governments are established in the countries of Latin America, junta governments will be faced with bloody revolutions. The pages of history are replete with examples, that the people can be suppressed only so long and then, as inevitably as the sun rises in the morning, they will revolt.

With all the media of information now available to the masses of people in the trouble spots of the world, here we are following a shortsighted course of action as we support dictatorships and juntas anywhere in the world.

Those of my generation may not live so long as to see the fruition of the prediction I have just made, although we will see its fruition in the not too distant future in some spots of the world. But I am talking about worldwide revolt of the masses of people against tyranny, of the oppressed against the denial of human dignity and civil rights all around the globe.

I do not want to leave a legacy to American boys and girls who will follow me of making a record here which will lead to the finger of scorn being pointed at the United States as having to assume responsibility for giving support to military dictatorships and juntas that suppressed freedom in the countries where agitation is already on for freedom. The leaders of the freedom movements are not Communists. The leaders of the freedom movements do not want anything to do with communism.

We all know that whenever there is strife anywhere, whether it is abroad or at home, the Communists will always try to move in to capitalize on the strife, to seek to agitate so they can falsely claim credit for any constructive development that might flow from the strife.

It may be said that the particular problem to which I am addressing myself this afternoon in connection with my amendment is not of such serious import as I say it is. It clearly is. My purpose is to prevent the development of executive, arbitrary, capricious suppression, and to put in the type of checks to prevent it. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The April 25 issue of the New Leader carries an article written in Rio de Janeiro entitled "Letter from Brazil." It is by William Lineberry, and after reviewing the activities of the Branco junta and the decision of the United States to promote the junta government to the No. 1 recipient in Latin America of U.S. aid, he states:

> The result of all this is that inflation remains an unsolved problem, the economy continues to lag, reforms have been sabotaged in some cases and slow to start in others, and the political course has been away from rather than toward the restoration of popular democracy. Perhaps the one solid accomplishment of the regime has been thoroughly to debunk the notion that generals make good, progressive reformers.
>
> True, two years is a short time in which to coax an economy as vast as Brazil's back from the brink of ruin. But it has been ample time for the regime to show its colors.
>
> Meanwhile, conditions in the poverty-stricken, rural Northeast of Brazil continue to fester. One U.S. official recently returned to Rio from two years in that area reports privately that, if anything, conditions are worse than in the past. SUDENE, the much touted Northeast Development Superintendency, is said to be almost wholly ineffective in its work—a bagunca, as the Brazilians say, meaning an impossible bureaucratic mess. This is the same Northeast which a few years back was the subject of much sensational attention in the U.S. press for its grinding poverty and its Communist-influenced peasant leagues. The grinding poverty is still there, but the troublemakers are in prison or exiled—hardly cause for rejoicing in the "new stability."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in its entirety at the close of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Guatemala is another example of the futility of the American "aid the dictators" policy in Latin America. It is interesting that during the Eisenhower administration we befriended the dictators in Latin America, and when that policy proved disastrous we thought it desirable to abandon it. But now, we not only befriend them, we hasten to bestow millions of dollars of American financial and military support upon them.

An article written from Guatemala City before the recent election appeared in the Los Angeles Times on March 13. After describing the details of the election campaign, the correspondent, George Nathanson, concluded:

> Many observers here believe the anti-Communist campaign has helped rather than harmed the Communists, first by crediting them with powers they do not have, and secondly by giving communism publicity it could never have otherwise received.
>
> Politics in Guatemala appears to be bent more on instilling fear in the people than on encouraging hope. All parties, including the government, are contributing to electoral confusion.
>
> The way is seemingly being paved for a small band of ragged, ignorant Communist guerrillas whose only strength lies in the growing hopelessness here to reap rewards of sympathy and hope from an apathetic and disillusioned people.

That is the pattern that is followed in Latin America when we aid juntas and military dictatorships and walk out on the rights of the people who are seeking

to improve their lot. It is no way to help people who want freedom by, in effect, reinforcing communism when we support an aid program which makes it possible for the dictators to levy an even heavier hand on the people in denying them their precious rights of human dignity.

This was 3 years after we resumed bountiful American aid to a military junta on the ground that it would be more efficient in reforming the Guatemalan economy and society than the elected government had been.

"Growing hopelessness," and "an apathetic and disillusioned people"—those are the results of the roughly $15 million a year in aid we had been extending to the Peralta junta in Guatemala.

I ask unanimous consent to have two articles concerning Guatemala printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is scarcely to be wondered at that, after this performance by the United States of supporting dictator after dictator in Latin America on the flimsy excuse that some alleged Communist influence would prevail if the military did not kill off democracy before the Communists could do it, the generals in Argentina concluded that military governments were welcomed in the United States for their own sake.

There was no particular known threat of communism in Argentina. But the concept of military rule has become a good one in itself to those who once advocated it as an anti-Communist measure. Now the militarists do not even wait for the Communists to appear on the scene before they begin to see advantages in government by generals and admirals.

The New York Times has quoted one official of the new Argentine junta as stating that the generals believed the official opposition to a coup from our Embassy to be "just window dressing." How right they were. The day before we extended recognition to the coup government, the Times reported:

> "We thought the Pentagon favored a grand anti-Communist alliance between the military governments of Brazil and Argentina," a Government House aide said.

I ask unanimous consent that this entire clipping from the Times of July 14, 1966, be printed at the close of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. Surely Brazil, Argentina, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Guatemala, Ecuador, and El Salvador, all of which have succumbed to military juntas in recent years, are evidence enough that whatever our military aid missions are advising the local military, they are encouraging and not discouraging the seizure of power by military cliques.

It was what the Pentagon was considered to favor in South America that prevailed in Argentina, and it will continue to prevail so long as the State Department goes along with Pentagon thinking.

As I have been heard to say so many times, the evidence continues to increase that American foreign policy is determined, in a large measure, by the military policies of the Pentagon. And let me say, when a foreign policy becomes militarily oriented, I advise the American people, "Watch out for your freedom. For you can have military control under democratic slogans and democratic labels. You can have a military leading you into war, outside of the Constitution, without a declaration of war."

That is why, already, over 4,000 American boys have died in South Vietnam, because the Pentagon has been running American foreign policy in Asia.

Mr. President, we are talking, again, I say this afternoon, about some basic abstract concepts in principles of constitutionalism. We have before us an obligation to check the executive branch of the Government by imposing upon it the duty of coming before Congress and justifying any recommendtion for the support of a junta that has overthrown a constitutional government.

I agree with the Senator from New York that the Senate should give support to the views of the Latin American governments assembled recently in Rio. But we should give it support and not just lipservice. It is only lipservice to say we will suspend aid to a government that overthrows a constitutional government, but on the other hand if the President decides to give aid anyway, that is all right, too.

If Congress is going to support this basic principle of the Alliance for Progress, then let us support it, and not further weaken it with meaningless verbiage that will not be taken seriously either by the administration or by the generals and admirals of Latin America.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, in my conversations with great democratic leaders in Latin America, do you know what they told me? Why, it is just then taken for granted that after there has been a coup, a certain number of U.S. Senators and Representatives will stand on the floors of Congress and deplore it, and issue some constituent-attention statements.

We make nice talks about it, and then, when we have an opportunity to vote and check, we vote just the opposite. That is why I have been heard to say so many times, "Never pay any attention to anything a politician says, I do not care who he is, including the senior Senator from Oregon, unless what he says can be squared with his voting record."

The sad thing is that too frequently, in the development of American foreign policy, the votes of U.S. Senators cannot be squared with their speeches in or outside of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think that the crisis in American foreign policy has become so serious that the American people need to wake up to the failure on the part of their Congress to carry out its checking responsibilities. And the American people ought to make clear to Congress that they expect it to exercise its checking responsibilities when appropriate legislation comes before it

In my judgment, this is such a case this afternoon. It is not one of the great major issues in the aid bill, but it is a very important issue in the aid bill.

The amendment I am offering is an amendment to the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The principal weakness of the Javits amendment is that its loophole is too big. The Javits amendment would prohibit economic assistance to unconstitutional Latin American governments—

> Unless (1) the President finds that the prohibition against furnishing such assistance is contrary to the national security interest of the United States, or (2) the President is satisfied that [such] government . . . has agreed to take appropriate steps, within a reasonable time, for the restoration of constitutional government, the holding of free elections, and the application of human and civil rights and liberties . . .

This exception is so broad as to make the amendment virtually meaningless.

All I say is that if the President thinks they are going to take appropriate steps within a reasonable time for the restoration of constitutional government, for the holding of elections, and for the application of human and civil rights and liberties, let him send our committees a report that proves it, and then let that report go to Congress. The report will go first to the Foreign Relations Committees of the two houses, and they will make their recommendations to Congress, as to whether or not they believe the facts warrant the contentions of the President.

My amendment to the Javits amendment provides a loophole but one which is very much smaller and which, furthermore, is guarded by the Congress.

I would require the President to send to Congress his recommendations. I know the tendency of so many in Congress to rubberstamp a President and go along with him if he asks for something. But I always have hope, Mr. President, and I think we have a right to assume, that Members of Congress will vote upon the merits of an issue. And so I do not think that I weaken my amendment in any way in providing for this report from the President, but in fact I strengthen my amendment, though some may call it a loophole.

Then, after that report is made, upon a finding by the President that the action proposed is in the national interest, my amendment would require that the matter come to the floors of Congress, and Congress be given an opportunity to vote on a concurrent resolution in support of the aid.

Thus, under my proposed amendment, if a coup d'etat took place in Latin America, and if subsequently it appeared to be in the national interest of the United States to aid the country involved, the President would submit such a report, together with his reasons, to the two committees of Congress, which in turn

would report to their parent bodies. If he made a good case, the committees in Congress could approve the proposal quickly, and send a proposed resolution to the floors of the Senate and of the House. If he did not make a good case, then Congress would have the additional check of a report from the committees of the Senate and the House, setting forth what was wrong with the President's alleged findings of fact.

That is the check and balance system. That is what we mean by it. And it is for that reason that it was written in the Constitution in the first place, as a great political heritage for the American people, to protect this system of three coordinate and coequal branches of government.

There are several other points, some of them technical, about my proposal which I wish to mention.

The Javits amendment, in referring to assistance "under this act," limits itself to economic aid. I suppose the Senator from New York can say, and with merit, that he does that because we have only the economic aid bill before us. It is too bad that we have only the economic aid bill before us. It is too bad that we have two bills on aid this year, instead of the combined bill for economic and military aid. But in my judgment, the same check should also be imposed in connection with military aid—exactly the same check.

There is no reason in the world why the President should be allowed to grant military aid to a military junta without its being checked by Congress through the approval of a concurrent resolution.

In this connection, attention should be called to sections 638 and 639 of the Foreign Assistance Act which provide that no provision of the act shall be construed to prohibit assistance pursuant to the Peace Corps Act, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or the Export-Import Bank Act, or assistance for famine or disaster relief.

My amendment contains a sentence that—

> No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

It is important to have that safeguard in view of the very broad waiver authority the President is given in section 614 of the act.

In present circumstances, the amendment would prohibit assistance only to Argentina, where assistance has already been suspended by executive action—but where, absent this amendment, it might also be reinstituted by executive action.

I want to make it very clear that the amendment would apply to Argentina. The situation at present is that he would have to send his report to the committee, the committee would make its report to Congress, and Congress would, by way of concurrent resolution, decide whether it wanted to give the President this power. That would apply to Argentina as well as to any other country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is no difference between us on that point. I have provided against the granting of aid to Argentina in my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I have attempted to list all the points on which we agree. This is simply a persuasive argument to put us in complete agreement on the adoption of the Morse amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as of today, Bolivia would also come under the terms of the amendment, but an elected President is to take office in Bolivia August 6 and the amendment would then no longer apply.

Ecuador has an unconstitutional government, but it did not come to power through the overthrow of "a prior government which had been chosen in free and democratic elections." Thus the amendment would not apply to the present government of Ecuador, nor to governments which might come to power in Cuba and Haiti through the overthrow of the existing governments of those countries.

The case of Brazil is admittedly ambiguous. It is arguable whether Goulart jumped or was pushed from power in 1964. In any event, once the presidential office was vacant, the constitution was meticulously followed in providing for the succession. Further, Brazilian elections are scheduled for this fall, though it is difficult to see how they can be very democratic in view of the fact that a new President will be elected by a lame-duck Congress.

In any event, U.S. policy toward Brazil seems badly in need of review in the light of Brazilian political trends, and this amendment would require such a review in both the executive and legislative branches.

EXHIBIT 1

LETTER FROM BRAZIL

(By William Lineberry)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Two years have now passed since the Brazilian military jumped into the political arena by replacing Leftist President João Goulart with Marshal Humberto Castello Branco. According to the original "revolutionary" times table, Brazil was to return to democratic civilian rule at about this time—its economy healed and its political system purged of corrupt and subversive elements. But the generals have found that getting into the Brazilian political arena is a lot easier than getting out, and in effect have extended their "revolutionary mandate" until March 1971, when the term of the new President, to be named by Congress this October, expires. Presumably, it will take that long to revive Brazil's tattered economy and to establish a political framework immune to the menace of Leftist demagoguery.

These have been a rough two years for the Army, which prides itself on its professionalism, its adherence to legality and its apolitical tradition. Not only has its economic recovery program met with considerable resistance, but its political policies have opened serious fissures within the ranks of the military establishment itself. And since the Army must give final approval of the President chosen in the indirect election next October, the ugly spectacle of generals running against one another has become the likely eventuality.

The so-called "hard line" faction of field commanders is pushing the already announced candidacy of War Minister Artur Costa e Silva, to the obvious consternation of President Castello Branco, who represents the so-called "Sorbonne School" of military intellectuals and made the mistake of declaring himself ineligible to serve again in the top office. Two other generals have also entered the race, Amauri Kruel and Oswaldo Cordeiro Farias. Meanwhile, a sizable faction of lower ranking officers is said to be grumbling in favor of a "return to the barracks" where they belong.

In marked contrast to the usual loathing accorded politicians in Brazil, the Army has long enjoyed the respect and admiration of civilian opinion. It builds the bridges, maintains the roads and offers a modicum of law and order in the vast frontier regions, as wild and wooly as the U.S. West in its own era of cavalry versus Indians. Unlike many self-serving Latin American "gorillas," moreover, Brazilian military men have a tradition of serving constitutional governments rather than themselves. A colonel earns about $200 a month, and even generals are financially embarrassed by tours of duty in high-priced cities like Rio.

In the past, the military has intervened in politics only to insure the preservation of legality and constitutionalism. It toppled the Vargas dictatorship in 1945, demanded Vargas' resignation in 1954 (after he had been popularly elected), assured the installation of President Juscelino Kubitschek in 1955, and demanded in 1961 that Goulart's powers remain within the limits set by the Constitution. But on each of these occasions the Army was careful to withdraw in favor of civilian rule as quickly as it had intervened.

In April 1964, saddled with the chaos unloosed by Goulart, it decided to stay on and straighten things out once and for all. This is perhaps the biggest mistake it could have made, for after being ground up in the Rube Goldberg machinery of Brazilian politics, it will be lucky to emerge with even a tattered shred of its old respectability intact—and it may well find itself shorn of the unity it sought to preserve by intervening against Goulart in the first place.

When Castello Branco assumed the Presidency two years ago he was promptly hailed by Washington as a new, progressive, reform-minded and professional variety of military strongman, wholly removed from the self-serving *caudillo* type of old. Here, according to the State Department, was a prime example of the patriots and responsible new military class emerging in Latin America—a class dedicated to national economic development and the protection of democratic institutions from extremists of the Right and Left. Trained in the U.S. or under U.S. advisors in their own countries, possessed of middle-class values, untainted by corruption—these men have been singled out by U.S. officials like Ambassador-at-Large W. Averell Harriman as cornerstone of future Latin American stability.

And, indeed, the Marshal remains the very antithesis of that peculiar blend of charisma and brute force which constitutes the successful *caudillo's* image. He is a humble, pensive man given to self-depreciating jokes about his squat, undistinguished appearance. (Even now the Marshal's image on the screen evokes titters of laughter among Rio moviegoers.) He reads widely in several languages and is undoubtedly one of the most distinguished graduates of Brazil's Superior War College (the so-called Sorbonne School), where the nation's complex economic, social and political problems are subject to as thorough an analysis as problems of military command.

During the twilight hours of Goulart's rule it was Castello Branco who, torn between fealty to the Constitution and disgust with the mounting chaos and leftward drift in evidence around him, finally came down on

the side of those pressing for a military revolution, carrying a number of fence-sitting generals along with him. When he took office as President in April 1964, it was with the pledge that Brazil would soon return to popular democratic rule and stable economic growth. These goals were to be realized by a series of drastic reforms which would halt spiralling inflation, curb runaway spending by corrupt bureaucrats, tax the rich into a sense of responsibility for the country's future development, and assuage the multitudinous poor with programs of better education, housing and land reform. In fact, the Marshal was proposing to do in moderation much of what the wild-eyed Goulart had been threatening to do in excess.

Professionals themselves, the new soldier-statesmen called upon other professionals, such as economist Roberto Campos, to man the ramparts of reform. In came U.S. and International Monetary Fund experts to advise on monetary and fiscal policies. Out went the old and discredited politicians in an extensive purge. At the same time, the revolutionary government ended official anti-Americanism and opened the door to close and cordial relations with Washington. The welcome mat went out to foreign investors and the regime let it be known that the Alliance for Progress, ignored by Goulart, was now considered a bulwark of hemispheric solidarity.

For its part, Washington could not have been more pleased. It had become a cliché of U.S. opinion that if reforms were not soon carried out in Brazil by responsible elements, they would most certainly be carried out—and in the most painful manner—by irresponsible ones. As a token of U.S. esteem for the new government, the State Department promptly promoted Brazil to the rank of number one aid recipient in Latin America, and U.S. technicians began to help draft the great changes that were to be made.

Certainly, Brazil had been crying out for change. During Goulart's last months in office, inflation had been running at the rate of 144 per cent a year and economic growth had ground to a virtual halt. Even now some 60 per cent of the country's rapidly expanding population of 85 million people is illiterate, the bulk living a hand-to-mouth existence outside the money economy altogether. Although three-fifths of all Brazilians make their living in agriculture, 75 per cent of the land is concentrated in the hands of 8 per cent of the population, while the nation's rural conditions are as squalid as any in the Hemisphere. And the luxury-loving upper classes, alarmed themselves by the structural inequities and social ferment around them, have been shipping their capital to New York and Switzerland, where it can do capital-hungry Brazil no good whatsoever.

The revolutionary government's reform program, however, was shot through with contradictions from the start. It sought to halt inflation through rigidly enforced austerity while pledging costly improvements in education, housing and land tenure. It promised to uphold democracy while threatening, and sometimes imprisoning, entrenched and powerful elements in Brazilian society and proposing drastic changes harmful to their interests. It tossed out Goulart, who had preached radical reform, while keeping in office the Congress which had so successfully blocked Goulart's program. (It still sits.) It talked of a new deal for Brazil's poor, but put political police in charge of their labor unions, banned strikes, and put the squeeze on wages in the name of fighting inflation. It also has allied itself with some of the most conservative elements in Brazilian politics.

Last October, when Castello Branco decreed the abolition of Brazil's 13 old political parties, those politicians who had not been purged by military tribunals were ordered to group themselves into the two new parties created by government fiat—the government-backed ARENA (National Renovation Alliance) and the MDB (Brazilian Democratic Movement), representing the loyal opposition. Curiously, Castello Branco chose to build the new ARENA around a hard core of politicians belonging to the old UDN (National Democratic Union), which had been one of the three strongest parties under the old system.

This was curious because the UDN had been the party of conservative and traditional interests in Brazil—the party of Right-winging Carlos Lacerda, for example, the dynamic ex-governor of Guanabara state—and it seemed strange that a "revolutionary" government committed to "drastic reforms" would purposefully ally itself with such unenthusiastic instruments. But the generals were also in revolt against the twin evils of Communism and corruption, each of which they saw embodied in the two other dominant parties of the old system—the Brazilian Labor party of Goulart (PTB) and the Social Democratic party of ex-President Juscelino Kubitschek (PSD). Hence ARENA, which was after all to be the majority party, had little place else to turn except to the UDN.

The UDN, of course, was delighted. It had never won the fruits of Brazil's patronage-rich Presidency in a popular contest, and now it foresaw not only obtaining these delectables by riding khaki coattails but stifling all this wild talk about reforms.

The result of all this is that inflation remains an unsolved problem, the economy continues to lag, reforms have been sabotaged in some cases and slow to start in others, and the political course has been away from rather than toward the restoration of popular democracy. Perhaps the one solid accomplishment of the regime has been thoroughly to debunk the notion that generals make good, progressive reformers.

True, two years is a short time in which to coax an economy as vast as Brazil's back from the brink of ruin. But it has been ample time for the regime to show its colors. The battle against inflation, which continues to occupy so much of the government's energies, is indicative. Wage rises have lagged behind price rises by government design, and the working classes have borne the brunt of official austerity measures. General wage levels are set by official action, but in the name of "free enterprise" the government has sought to hold down prices through "voluntary" schemes.

Time and again Planning Minister Roberto Campos has issued optimistic statements to the effect that the inflation problem has very nearly been resolved, and time and again the upward swirl of prices has belied his optimism. Retail prices rose 45 per cent in 1965 by one authority's count, 65 per cent by another's. According to government plans, prices for the entire year 1966 were to rise no more than 10 per cent, but in January alone they jumped 5.1 per cent, against a 4.8 per cent rise during January 1965. Quite naturally, Brazilians are asking what all their sacrifices have been for.

In mid-February an opposition deputy rose in the Brazilian Congress to recite some figures compiled by the Getulio Vargas Foundation (Brazil's most reliable data gathering organization). Until 1963, the Foundation reported, the consumption of meat in Brazil was 250 grams (a little over half a pound) per capita a week, while between 1964–65 this average fell to 180 grams. Milk consumption in the same periods fell from one soupspoon to one teaspoon per person a day. Bread descended from 100 grams a day to 80 grams and eggs from two to one a day per person.

The people have literally been paying with emptier bellies for the regime's stabilization efforts. But since most of the old labor leaders, who were allied with Goulart, have been jailed, exiled or removed from office, and since union activities are now under the control of political police, effective channels of worker protest have been silenced. A recent strike of dock workers over wages, for example, was broken up by government troops.

The situation might be understandable if the social reforms pledged by the Castello Branco government were being carried through as promised. But except in the fields of banking and taxation, where far-reaching reforms have been initiated if not wholly implemented (the rich are actually being threatened with imprisonment for income-tax evasion, though no one is yet known to have spent a night in jail for it) there is distressing evidence of the old political run-around—the gap between promise and performance—which has made talk of reform in this country the special province of demagogues in years past.

In the case of land reform, for example, the government has effectively overseen the emasculation of its own program. Under the direction of Campos, the professional, the land reform bill was designed to tax potentially productive but unused lands on large estates at progressively higher rates, the aim being confiscation and redistribution to the landless poor. The key to the bill's enforcement was a section transferring taxing powers from the hands of state and municipal authorities, where they had traditionally rested, to the hands of Federal authorities, where they would be effective. The transfer was deemed essential because in states where land reform really counts, local taxing authorities tend to be in the pockets of the big landowners.

In the name of "states' rights," however, Castello Branco's conservative allies in the UDN objected strenuously, and while Campos was out of the country the tax-transfer provision was quietly removed from the bill. Not quietly enough, though, because members of the old PSD and PTB in Congress caught wind of what was going on and gleefully voted the original taxing scheme back in before passing the bill. A slightly embarrassed Castello Branco then issued a decree "temporarily" returning the taxing powers to state and municipal authorities "for administrative reasons." And there they rest.

Meanwhile, conditions in the poverty-stricken, rural Northeast of Brazil continue to fester. One U.S. official recently returned to Rio from two years in that area reports privately that, if anything, conditions are worse than in the past. SUDENE, the much touted Northeast Development Superintendency, is said to be almost wholly ineffective in its work—a *bagunça*, as the Brazilians say, meaning an impossible bureaucratic mess. This is the same Northeast which a few years back was the subject of much sensational attention in the U.S. press for its grinding poverty and its Communist-influenced peasant leagues. The grinding poverty is still there, but the troublemakers are in prison or exiled—hardly cause for rejoicing in the "new stability."

Since the policies of the revolutionary government have made eating difficult and voting in popular elections next to impossible, and since Brazilians are fond of doing both, it is safe to say that the Castello Branco regime has failed to arouse any notable enthusiasm among the people. Accordingly, the Marshall himself has taken to posing as a sort of modern-dress Coriolanus, refusing to pander to the popular will while studiously rigging the nation's political system to insure that the popular will cannot be expressed.

In a series of three so-called "Institutional Acts," the government has armed itself with dictatorial powers, crushing several of the old

political parties, providing for the indirect election of the President and state governors, and in other ways overriding the Constitution to assure the continuation of revolutionary rule, at least through the next Presidential term ending in March 1971.

According to the new schedule, state governors will be elected by their respective legislatures on September 3 of this year (somewhat of an irony, since state legislatures have been recently criticized by the regime for being infested with corruption); the President of the Republic will be elected by Congress on October 3; and direct popular elections will be held for Federal senators and deputies and state deputies on November 15.

The prospect, of course, is for a divided government, since the old Congress is bound to appoint a President loyal to the revolution (*i.e.*, agreeable to the military), while the people are expected to vote in a new Congress overwhelmingly in the opposition. But the regime has many cards to play and does not appear overly concerned about the prospect. Under the Institutional Acts its powers to purge "subversives" and "corrupt elements" are vast. Very early in the revolution Congress was picked clean of such undesirables, and the process is now going forward at the state legislature level. Military "boards of inquiry" are still in operation throughout the country, and thus far about 500 Brazilians (including all three living ex-Presidents) have had their political rights suspended for 10 years while some 3,600 others have been purged from Federal or state office.

It is likely, then, that the range of candidates open to popular approval will fall within bounds considered "decent" by the authorities. And the power to purge will continue even after the new Congress is installed—a sword of Damocles over obstructionists. Finally, there is nothing to prevent the current government from issuing a Fourth Institutional Act tossing out congressional elections or even abolishing Congress itself altogether.

About the only thing that can seriously disrupt the government's program is a falling out within the military itself, a matter widely talked about in Rio, along with rumors of another *golpe*, but discretely played down, thus far, by military top brass. Should hard-living, hard-lining General Artur Costa e Silva patch his differences with Castello Branco and gain the ARENA nomination for president, he is expected to assure the Armed Forces better pay, the people a relaxation of current austerity measures, and the "corrupt and subversive elements," whom the hard-liners have been out to get much rougher treatment than they have received from Castello Branco in the past.

The War Minister has been much quoted for his famed response to a senator who congratulated him on his political strength: "I am not strong, Senator, but my party is" (meaning the Army). But there seems to have been more bravado than substance to this remark. Castello Branco and the Sorbonne School are said to distrust him on the grounds of economic ignorance, impulsiveness and general immoderation (the general likes to bet on the ponies and is the type of funloving Latin who wears dark glasses into the shadiest night spots).

In fact, the President is said to have told his War Minister that he will not have Arena's nomination unless he pledges to keep Campos and agrees to a scheme for unifying the Army, Navy and Air Force under a single ministry of defense. General Costa e Silva has so far been unwilling to promise these things. But never mind. The next President may well be none other than Humberto Castello Branco himself, who, when the time is ripe, is expected by some to renounce his previous renunciation of another term and patriotically heed the call to continued national service.

Whichever general finally wins, it seems clear that somewhere along the line the progressive, reform-minded new military class got lost in the political shuffle. For this reason it seemed strange for retiring U.S. Ambassador to Brazil Lincoln Gordon (now Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs) to heap praise upon the Castello Branco government before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year and declare, "I think they have made tremendous headway." In so saying, he perpetuated a myth that was badly tarnished from the start. For professionally trained, life-long soldiers make poor saviors of democracy, particularly from an internal threat, in any society. And as social revolutionaries in Brazil they obviously have a long way to go.

---

EXHIBIT 2

TWENTY-EIGHT IN GUATEMALA REPORTED SLAIN BY POLICE IN PERALTA'S REGIME

GUATEMALA, July 17.—Twenty-eight Guatemalan students and leftists, missing since their arrest in February and March, were shot by firing squads of the head of the former military government, Col. Enrique Peralta Azurdia, two former police agents told the University Students Association last night.

Among the victims, the association was told, were the former Communist party leader, Victor Manuel Gutierrez; the former farm labor leader, Leonardo Castillo Flores, and Fernando Arce Behrens, a law student on vacation from the University of Mexico.

The former police agents, whose identity was withheld, said the three men were tortured in the police headquarters in the capital, then driven to a military base near Pacific coast and shot. Their bodies were sewn into burlap sacks and dropped into the ocean from an army transport plane, according to the informants.

The former policemen also told the association, which has been conducting an investigation of missing-persons cases since March, that "many others" besides the 28 people known to be missing were also killed by the police.

WOMAN REPORTED SLAIN

Those killed were said to include Kris Yon Cerna, the niece of the guerrilla leader, Marco Antonio Yon Sosa, and Eunice Campiran de Aguilar Mora, wife of a Mexican student David Aguilar Mora, who disappeared after his capture in Guatemala last December. She had come to Guatemala to search for her husband. Both young women were said to have been beaten to death with clubs and buried in shallow graves near the Zacapa military base.

The former police agents told the student asociation's investigators that most of the police killings had been ordered by Alberto Barrios, who was chief of the judicial police under the former military regime. He is believed to be outside Guatemala.

In another development, the guerrilla organization Rebel Armed Forces declared war anew against the Guatemalan army despite the advent of a civilian Government under President Julio César Méndez Montenegro, who was inaugurated July 1. In a statement issued last night and signed by the rebels' 24-year-old commander, Luis Turcios, and their political adviser, Bernardo Alvarado Monzon, the leftist guerrillas set their policy toward the new Government.

The statement said that "despite the popular extraction of the new regime, the army retains most of the effective power." "The Guatemalan Army is still the same reactionary tool of native plutocracy and foreign companies and therefore must be fought to the bitter end," it added.

The statement, while avoiding any direct challenge to President Méndez, said in effect that the guerrillas were not going to fold their tents and go home. But, there has been no significant guerrilla action since the new Government was inaugurated.

To many, the rebels' statement reflected their apparent dilemma with respect to the new Government. Their criticism of the Peralta regime as unconstitutional and rightist cannot be used against President Méndez, who won election against the Peralta forces.

But the guerrillas apparently feel that their movement remains necessary and will die if it becomes inactive. Hence their attack specifically on the army, not the civilian Government.

---

GUATEMALA ELECTIONS SOLVED NO PROBLEMS

(By George Natanson)

GUATEMALA CITY.—The Guatemalan presidential elections held here last Sunday have settled none of the political, social and economic problems endemic to this country.

If anything, the situation here has worsened.

Under the military regime which has governed Guatemala for the last three years there has been some semblance of political stability—even if it was maintained through repression and the iron fist. But accusations of electoral fraud from all three participating parties and irresponsible threats of violence emanating from the country's political leaders, military and civil alike, have obviously brought Guatemala to the brink of chaos.

NO OFFICIAL RESULTS

Still, no official results have been announced. Instead, the three contesting parties, including the official party, have lashed out at each other, threatened to take their partisans to the streets, and have claimed victory for themselves while declaring they will recognize no results other than their own.

Added to the muddle is the jumble of the radically conflicting returns which each party has released. This has led to a student declaration made Friday morning that if the issue is not settled by Tuesday night, university students here will declare a strike and take to the streets. These developments clearly raise the possibility of a disastrous civil war.

At best the Guatemalan people can expect little from the party that eventually wins control of the country. This includes the military party which might manage to remain in power.

A study of the platforms of all three contesting parties in last Sunday's race leads to the conclusion that none has an ideological base. All make vague promises of urgently needed social and economic reforms, but pledge that the old order of Guatemala's government structure will undergo no change.

No matter which faction eventually takes power, Guatemala's leadership will remain essentially unchanged.

Even leaders of the so-called mildly leftist Revolutionary Party (PR) blanche at the mention of agrarian reforms, probably the most pressing issue which confronts this country's new government.

"In this respect we are ultra-conservative," said Gregorio Prem, member of the Revolutionary Party and one of the few candidates for Congress whose victory is believed assured.

In an interview with The Times, Prem declared: "With the PR in power, we will not touch any privately held lands (it is estimated that more than 75% of Guatemala's arable and accessible land is owned by 27 families. Instead, we will open vast land tracts owned by the government and encourage migration."

While the plan has practical merit it calls for large outlays of money, believed to be beyond Guatemala's financial capabilities. Prem made no suggestion that the PR had any detailed plan for financing its agrarian program. Like many other members of his party, Prem is among Guatemala's largest landowners.

ISSUE DODGED

When control of the Guatemalan armed forces was broached, Prem said with an uneasy laugh, "I don't think the party wants to get involved in that issue. It's too hot."

Their program appears to have been written to allay the fears of the country's businessmen rather than to strike at the heart of the social and economic problems which beset the nation. But however mild the platform might be, the two remaining parties go further to the right with conservative principles of tight credit, strict inflationary controls, wage ceilings, a free price market and tightly controlled labor.

Above all, both the official Institutional Democratic Party (PID) and the National Liberation Movement (MLN) have a campaign of anti-communism; both PID and MLN accuse the PR of Communist leanings. It is generally agreed among diplomatic observers here that Communist elements in Guatemala are few in number and totally lacking in popular support. It is believed that even if a popular uprising were to occur here as post-election confusion becomes more chaotic, the Communists could do little more than contribute to the general chaos.

Many observers here believe the anti-Communist campaign has helped rather than harmed the Communists, first by crediting them with powers they do not have, and secondly by giving communism publicity it could never have otherwise received.

Politics in Guatemala appears to be bent more on instilling fear in the people than on encouraging hope. All parties, including the government, are contributing to electoral confusion.

The way is seemingly being paved for a small band of ragged, ignorant Communist guerrillas whose only strength lies in the growing hopelessness here to reap rewards of sympathy and hope from an apathetic and disillusioned people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the reasons I have enumerated, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment of the senior Senator from New York and urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Beginning with "(1)" strike out all through the period, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(1) the President has determined that such government intends to take such appropriate steps or that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States, and reports such determination and his reasons therefore to the Congress, and (2) the Congress shall have adopted a concurrent resolution approving the furnishing of assistance to such government. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope that we may get a vote on both the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon and the amendment offered by the senior Senator from New York.

We have a little history on this matter. In 1963 we agreed to a very similar amendment to the amendment of the senior Senator from New York. We took that amendment to conference and the House would not agree to it. I think it is a good amendment.

In my view, the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon really closes up any loophole as if there were a flat prohibition, because at any time the President wished to get an exemption, he could come up and ask for new authority. That is what, in effect, the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon requires.

We have had these recent coups, and it seems logical to me that, if we are going to do anything at all, we ought to agree to the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon.

I agree that an expression of opinion deploring this situation may be of some value. We have done that sort of thing before. We have had many speeches on the floor of the Senate on the subject. I am willing to vote now and I shall vote for the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the consent of the majority leader, I shall do whatever I can to get a rollcall vote on my amendment. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like very briefly to address myself to the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon. He sneaks up on my weak side as it were, because he makes a really magnificent argument, a much better argument than mine for the amendment which I have proposed. However, I must say that I am disquieted by the certainly very understandable buttoning up of the fact that the President shall not do this without the consent of Congress. However, for practical purposes it seems to me that this is tightening down these rivets too much.

With the greatest regret, because I like the senior Senator from Oregon, and I would much prefer to be with him than not, I feel that the amendment as I have offered it offers us the best opportunity.

There is a minor loophole in the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] which I am sure can be buttoned up in conference, but it presents a little question.

In the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, no account is taken of the time Congress might be out of session. It might be a number of months. There would be no way for a 30-day notice period to receive congressional reaction. As I say, that is a technical thing. We have met it in other legislation.

In addition, if the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should carry, he perhaps would have to write in language which would deal with the question of extended debate, as was done, for example, in the reorganization act, which also contains a 30-day limitation on the adoption of a nonconcurring resolution, so that the nonconcurrence could not be blocked by extended debate.

As I say, those are procedural matters. I call them to the attention of the Senator from Oregon because they are not included within the concept of the amendment as he has submitted it.

Mr. MORSE. First, may I say that I believe there is very little danger that Congress would ever be out of session long enough to create any problem—at least in our time.

In the second instance, I wish to say that I believe the matter is of sufficient importance to justify a reconvening of Congress, because we are dealing with something fundamental, and I believe the people should have their elected representatives come back here and exercise their check.

In regard to the second matter, I have no doubt that the Senate, if it were dealing with a matter of foreign policy, would have no difficulty in seeing that the matter got to a vote on its merits. I do not believe anything about that is needed in the legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am not quarreling too violently with the Senator from Oregon on those scores, but I should like to get to the merits.

On the merits, this is what disquiets me. All these foreign matters are very delicate; and where a military junta takes over, the representations it may or may not make to the nation could pose an extremely delicate question. We are dealing with delicate questions all the time. We are dealing with one right now, when we are talking about Argentina. But it seems to me that not having adopted an amendment of this kind before, and coupling it with the fact that this would be the first time it would be done, I believe that the temper of Congress is such that we are likely to make it stick this time, and that it would not fall away in conference as it has done before.

Coupled with the fact that there is a resolution of the Organization of American States which calls for a considerable amount of consultation by the President with the other American States in order to come to a decision of this character, and that my amendment would permit the President to make those consultations, I had felt that a fair compromise was being made between our feelings about these military juntas, if we vote for the amendment; and the fact that in a particularly exacerbated situation, when a military junta has taken over, and the President has certified and we are ready to vote, we should not mount, as we undoubtedly would, a full scale debate here upon what would very likely be the internal affairs of another country. At least, we should try it out that way. This legislation has not been on the books before, this has not been the case before.

In the first instance, therefore, I deeply believe that we should approach it with a little modesty, rather than going all the way, which is what the Senator from Oregon would have us do, and do the three things which my amendment would do: give notice that we are against aid to military juntas unless they are going to come back at an early time to constitutional government; require the President to carry through on the resolution of the Organization of American States for consultation, which the amendment does very effectively as it stands; and put the President to his proof.

My amendment not only calls for a report to Congress, but also for the President's reasons. I believe that when we are dealing with a President of the United States, this is not a weak position but a rather strong position. I believe we should not go all the way, which is what the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would require, to require a new approval by Congress under those circumstances.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I hope that my amendment will be approved. I am ready to vote now. The debate seems to be over.

A new resolution of the Organization of American States is on the books, and there is a new consultative relation between the United States and the American States on this very delicate subject of dealing with de facto regimes, such as exist in Latin America. I hope that under the circumstances, as the situation is new in these two respects, both as to the OAS and as to our policy in the law, we would not go the whole way as yet.

I shall show a proper respect for the prerogatives of the Presidency and a proper respect for the prerogatives of Congress. If the Senator from Oregon wins, I shall be very anxious to have the amendment approved as he has caused it to be amended. I am giving the Senate my best and honest judgment.

I believe it is a fair compromise, as it stands, between attempting to preserve as far as we can the position of the President in these matters and giving Congress a point of entry into a situation which has given us great dissatisfaction.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be left unamended, and that the Senate in due course may be able to carry it as it is.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I would be very happy to support the amendment of the Senator from New York, provided that it is amended and thereby strengthened, as Senator MORSE proposes.

Our experience in the Senate has been extensive in the field of having this type escape clause not merely in this proposed legislation of Senator JAVITS, but also repeatedly other legislation in previous sessions of the Congress. Again and again, Congress has passed bills which state that such and such shall not be done unless it is found by the President to be in the public interest. Without any additional report or explanation to Congress we find that some unseen man in some bureau downtown acting in the name of the President has declared that it is in the national interest, and so the escape clause nullifies the expressed purpose of the Congress.

I believe that the time has come if indeed it is not overdue when Congress should reassert its duty to advise and consent in a field within which the Constitution gives it the right and the duty to act. We are not dealing here with the recognition of a regime. That clearly is a province of the executive. It is not wholly within the province of the Executive but of the Congress when it has to do with the appropriation of funds, which it is the duty of Congress to provide and to protect.

So I am hopeful that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, which is an attempt to get realism into this picture, to assert for the first time in this debate the duty of Congress to pass on appropriations. With the Morse amendment the amendment of Senator JAVITS would have real meaning. I think that without it, the Javit's amendment would be of little value and would merely be a pious expression of hope. I hope that the amendment of Senator MORSE will be adopted, and we can then vote for a strenghened amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to reply to the Senator from New York.

First, I wish to say that I do not see how his amendment can be described as a compromise amendment. The only thing it compromises, it seems to me, is Congress, and it seeks to delegate once more to the President a checking power that Congress itself should exercise. That is the only compromise I see.

What my amendment does is to simply say that we shall exercise our right to determine whether or not aid should be given to a military junta. The granting of aid is not the prerogative of the President of the United States. The prerogative of the President is to recognize the country. That is his executive prerogative. But the prerogative of granting aid is a congressional prerogative, and I do not propose to compromise that congressional right.

Considering the position of the President for a moment, I wish to say in reply to the Senator from New York that my amendment strengthens the hand of the President. If one really wishes to put the President in the strongest possible position in dealing with a country in Latin America, or anywhere else, that falls within the factual framework encompassed by the amendment, he should put the President in a position where the President would present to Congress a case that would deserve the support of Congress and would get the affirmative vote of Congress in support of the President, and the President would be greatly strengthened in his relationships with the country concerned.

What happens now, when Congress is not exercising its voting voice in this matter, is that a great deal of doubt is created in other countries—for example, in Latin America—that are opposed, may we say, to the new government of the junta country, who wonder what the situation would have been if Congress had had a chance to pass upon it.

It makes a lot of difference. If Congress backs up the President, these countries know that the President has the backing of his Congress. It makes a lot of difference also in all of the diplomatic relations of the President with that country, for that country knows that it cannot flout a proposal of the President of the United States in the diplomatic field because it knows he has his Congress behind him. He has the vote of his Congress, which is quite contrary to the argument of my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

If the Senate wishes to strengthen the hand of the President, I believe that my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I will support the Javits amendment regarding the cutting off of assistance to unconstitutional governments. I do so because it is an important expression of the feelings of the U.S. Senate that these coups are not favored by us.

I did not, however, support the Morse amendment which would have taken away all discretion in these matters from the President. As I have said, I did not agree with our Government's quick recognition of the Argentine junta. But I believe the President must retain flexibility in these matters.

Now, for example, we give aid to Argentina only for universities. Will it help democracy in Argentina to cut off aid to the university?

The building of democracy, and the discouragement of military dictatorships, are not such a simple matter; they will not be accomplished by a simple aid cutoff—which may, for example, only enhance the regime's patriotic standing, as I pointed out in my speech on Latin America.

I, therefore, favor the Javits version, which allows some discretion to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

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 Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 71, as follows:

[No. 148 Leg.]

YEAS—16

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Burdick | Hartke | Nelson |
| Church | Jordan, Idaho | Simpson |
| Clark | McCarthy | Tydings |
| Fulbright | McGovern | Young, Ohio |
| Gore | Morse | |
| Gruening | Murphy | |

NAYS—71

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hayden | Moss |
| Anderson | Hickenlooper | Mundt |
| Bartlett | Hill | Muskie |
| Bayh | Holland | Neuberger |
| Bennett | Hruska | Pastore |
| Bible | Inouye | Pell |
| Boggs | Jackson | Prouty |
| Brewster | Javits | Proxmire |
| Byrd, Va. | Jordan, N.C. | Randolph |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Kennedy, Mass. | Ribicoff |
| Carlson | Kennedy, N.Y. | Robertson |
| Cooper | Kuchel | Russell, S.C. |
| Cotton | Lausche | Russell, Ga. |
| Curtis | Long, Mo. | Saltonstall |
| Dirksen | Long, La. | Smith |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Stennis |
| Eastland | McGee | Symington |
| Ellender | McIntyre | Talmadge |
| Ervin | Metcalf | Thurmond |
| Fannin | Miller | Tower |
| Fong | Mondale | Williams, Del. |
| Griffin | Monroney | Yarborough |
| Harris | Montoya | Young, N. Dak. |
| Hart | Morton | |

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allott | Dominick | Smathers |
| Bass | Magnuson | Sparkman |
| Cannon | McClellan | Williams, N.J. |
| Case | Pearson | |
| Dodd | Scott | |

So the amendment of Mr. MORSE to the amendment of Mr. JAVITS was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will take the time of the Senate for only 1 minute because it has just manifested its views after comprehensive debate. I have sought to lay the affirmative side of the amendment before the Senate. We heard no opposition during debate as to what is left of the amendment and therefore my disposition, unless other Senators feel differently about it, would be that this part of it be just left, if the Senate has decided as to the Morse amendment. My amendment could be decided by a voice vote. Therefore, I would deeply appreciate it if any Senators have disquiet about what is left of the amendment to speak on it, and then I shall ask for a voice vote and not take the time of the Senate to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment (No. 680) was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered previously, the pending question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 14, line 23, strike out "$700,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$658,000,000".

FOREIGN AID AND THE NUMBER OF COUNTRIES AMENDMENTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to express my deep concern over two provisions in the foreign aid bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. These provisions limit the number of countries to which development loans and technical cooperation grants may be extended. The committee bill requires that development loans to more than 10 countries and technical cooperation grants to more than 40 countries can be made only if the President determines it is in the national interest and his action is approved by resolutions of both the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

I believe there is considerable doubt as to the constitutionality of statutory provisions in the foreign affairs field which require formal consent by committees of Congress rather than the Congress as a whole.

More important, I believe that this requirement is unwise. It involves the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations committees in executive decisions which can best be made on the basis of a thorough country-by-country program analysis. The Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations committees have neither the time nor all of the facts necessary to make such an analysis.

The committee amendments are also arbitrary and mechanistic. The substitute numbers for sound analysis and judgment. This is legislation by arithmetic.

The Senate has always prided itself on a mature reasoned approach to matters of foreign policy. We have given way to no one in our adherence to sensible, practical standards for the administration of our country's foreign affairs.

We should adhere to these standards and traditions today.

The committee action would lead to inefficient and wasteful use of funds. It will undoubtedly lead to delays in the processing of loans. The Senate has been critical of these delays. The committee amendment would only serve to aggravate these problems.

The committee action would result in split administration of the program. We would be saying that the President should decide on the first 10 countries to receive development loans while decisions as to any additional countries would be made by 2 committees of the Congress. The same is true of the decision on technical cooperation grants—the President has a free hand regarding the first 40, but after that the committees decide.

This is illogical and inconsistent. If we trust the President to decide on whether U.S. interest is served by aiding the first 10 and first 40, involving the large bulk of funds, it makes no sense to say "we don't trust your judgment as to whether aid to additional countries is in the U.S. interest."

Congress should exercise review and oversight, but should not be in the business of making day-by-day decisions. That is not our role, as I have heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee emphasize many times in the past.

No one disagrees with the aim of the Foreign Relations Committee that development lending should be concentrated in as few countries as possible. But the program is already highly concentrated; 95 percent of development loans are concentrated in 10 countries. Thus the committee amendment would limit the President's ability to act for the sake of 5 percentage points.

Development loans should be made to no country without carefully examining U.S. objectives in that country, the degree and nature of the country's needs, whether its needs can be met from other sources, and whether the country will make effective use of loan funds if they are made available to it. But to take the further step of declaring that development loans should not be extended to more than a stated number of countries in a given year would introduce a wholly arbitrary and mechanistic element into what should be an orderly process of examination and analysis. If the Congress wishes to cut out paid programs, it should examine each one on a country-by-country basis, and then decide. But it should not say to the President, "this number sounds good. You choose the countries we can drop."

To the extent that development loan funds are made available by the Congress, the President should be free to determine, in the light of U.S. interests, the countries in which those funds are to be used under the standards laid down by the Congress in the Foreign Assistance Act. In fiscal year 1965 the United States made development loans to 18 countries. We made such loans to 19 countries in fiscal year 1966. An immediate cutback to 10 countries in fiscal year 1967 would unduly limit the President's freedom of action in advancing U.S. interests under the Foreign Assistance Act.

Any such numerical restriction would, among other things, limit AID's capacity to carry out a policy which has the support of both the Congress and the executive branch. The United States has consistently refused to make development loans to a number of countries on the ground that their self-help performance did not justify such assistance. Implicit in this position has been the assumption that if their performance improved, they would become eligible for, and would receive, development loans. If a limitation were put on the number of countries to which we could make development loans, the United States would not be able to live up to our part of the bargain. The Senate amendment would therefore eliminate the leverage we now have to urge better performance of such countries.

The committee amendment is thus self-defeating, and would undercut a basic congressional policy.

The amendment would also seriously limit AID in another respect. As a matter of policy the World Bank will today not make loans for certain purposes, for example, to carry out health programs such as the eradication of malaria. In certain situations loans for such purposes are desirable. If AID were prohibited from making loans to more than a set number of countries—and if the World Bank or some other appropriate multilateral institution was not prepared to make loans for purposes such as these—the proposed amendment might well prevent the United States from doing so in a number of countries where such loans would serve an extremely useful purpose.

The proposed restriction on the number of countries to which technical cooperation grants may be extended would severely and unnecessarily limit the President's ability to use, under the standards laid down in the Foreign Assistance Act, an important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. The committee version places the President in a straitjacket. Perhaps even more important, it would force a cut-back in small programs—mostly in Africa—which bring direct benefit to thousands of people and provide direct evidence of U.S. interest. We might save a few thousand dollars to be sure, but we would pay too high a price. Here again, let us remember we are dealing with people and their future. If we want to eliminate programs, we should get down to cases, and study each one.

The United States, through technical assistance activities, helps less developed countries acquire the skilled manpower and institutions essential to economic, social, and political progress. Technical assistance, largely carried out through private American institutions, provides skills in such fields as agricultural extension, malaria eradication, tax reform, education, and family planning. This is point IV—type aid. It gives the newly emerging and other less developed countries the kind of help that they need most. It is a relatively inexpensive way of advancing U.S. foreign policy objectives and at the same time giving concrete expression to American humanitarian concern.

An arbitrary limitation of 40 for the number of countries which can receive technical cooperation does not serve the interests of the United States. In fiscal year 1965 the United States gave such assistance to 52 countries in Africa and Asia. In fiscal year 1966 the figure dropped to 48 countries. In the presentation for fiscal year 1967 the executive branch has proposed to the Congress technical assistance programs for 47 countries. These programs are limited to those cases where the sound criteria of the Foreign Assistance Act will be met. But under the arbitrary and mechanistic numerical limit imposed by the committee, some 7 or more countries would be lopped off.

The President reports fully to the Congress each year on the proposed program for the coming year. He also reports on past programs and accomplishments in great detail. I know of no program which receives so much scrutiny—from four committees of the Congress, the GAO, a variety of ad hoc groups, the press, and the executive branch.

There is no lack of information on what we are doing in each country. The presentation materials and reports are complete and informative. There is no lack of opportunity for us to exercise continuing oversight and reasonable legislative control.

And I have no doubt of the ability of members of the authorizing committees or the Congress to make their views know in case they object to an action of the executive branch.

Mr. President, before concluding, I should like to return to the committee provisions to mention a very serious aspect, the constitutional questions they raise.

The provisions require the President to obtain resolutions from the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees authorizing loans or technical assistance to additional countries. In other words, if the Congress enacts these provisions, the Congress is saying to the President that he has the authority to grant assistance, but before he can exercise this authority he must obtain the approval of two committees of the Congress.

In my judgment, the Constitution of the United States does not permit this kind of arrangement.

The authority to extend foreign assistance must be viewed as an exercise of either, one, executive powers; or two, legislative powers. If viewed as executive, the provisions in the committee bill violate the principle of separation of powers embodied in the Constitution by attempting to give the Members of the legislative branch—in this case committees of Congress—the right to participate in the execution of the laws. If the authority is viewed as legislative, the provisions are an attempt to shortcut the constitutional process of legislation. The Constitution does not permit committees of Congress to enact legislation on behalf of or in lieu of the whole Congress.

Both Congress and the executive must be continually alert in their defense of the constitutional principle of separation of powers and the constitutional procedure for legislating.

Throughout our history Presidents have rejected legislation which they felt were unconstitutional. President Eisenhower did so.

More recently, in the case of Pacific Northwest Disaster Relief Act in 1965, President Johnson did so. That act required that no appropriation for certain reconstruction projects be made which was not approved by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works. In his veto message the President explained that the provision "seriously violates the spirit of the division of powers between the legislative and executive branches." "It is not only,"

He continued:

> An undesirable and improper encroachment by the Congress and its committees into the area of executive responsibilities—it also leads to inefficient administration. The executive branch is given, by the Constitution, the responsibility to implement all laws—a specific and exclusive responsibility which cannot properly be shared with a committee of Congress. (S. Doc. 34, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., 1965.)

In spite of the fact that most Presidents have taken a strong stand when attempts were made to shortcut the legislative process and when the separation of powers principle was at stake, there are statutes on the books with provisions similar to those in the committee bill now under consideration. These existing provisions are now cited by proponents of the provisions contained in the Foreign Relations Committee bill.

But the statutes cited raise the same constitutional problems as do the provisions before us. The fact that they are on the statute books does not resolve the constitutional issues. In my opinion, they were constitutionally objectionable at the time they were enacted and the passage of time has not served to give them a gloss of constitutionality.

Mr. President, an examination of the facts shows that we have ventured into dangerous territory. The committee provisions raise major constitutional questions.

But they do more. They establish arbitrary, mechanistic standards which force administration of the foreign aid program into a straitjacket. The result will be waste, delay and inefficient use of funds.

Even more, the provisions would limit the President's freedom to move quickly and effectively in support of vital U.S. interests.

If the Congress wishes to hobble U.S. foreign policy or cripple the U.S. aid program, it should say so directly and act directly.

I strongly urge that we do not.

I believe that the Congress should support efficient administration of the foreign aid program, maintain Presidential effectiveness, and avoid a venture into unconstitutional legislation by rejecting the restrictions in the committee bill relating to development loan and technical assistance funds.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Deputy Administrator of AID clarifying certain aspects of the debate on this pending bill yesterday. It was stated at that time that AID had reported certain grants as loans. I think the letter will clear the record on this point.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
*Washington, D.C., July 21, 1966.*

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday during the foreign aid debate a statement was made on the floor of the Senate indicating that A.I.D. had misled the Congress by reporting as loans over $10 billion of assistance which was in fact given as grants. This statement by Senator DIRKSEN (p. 16470 of the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD) was repeated later in the debate by Senator DOMINICK (p. 16512 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). I think it important that the record be clear on this matter.

A.I.D. has correctly reported loan and grant assistance to the Congress.

Apparently, there has been some confusion over certain figures in a report entitled "U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants" prepared by A.I.D. for the House Foreign Affairs Committee. A sample page from this report is enclosed. Included in this report is the amount of assistance under "Other U.S. Economic Programs" (indicated by a double asterisk on the enclosed sample sheet). Because of space limitations this item was not broken down by loan and grant component in the report. However, the loan and grant components of "Other U.S. Economic Programs" are included directly in the totals for economic loans and grants (these totals are indicated by triple asterisks on the enclosed sample sheet). The figures reported by A.I.D., therefore, have accurately reflected the amounts of loan and grant assistance.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. GAUD,
*Deputy Administrator.*

*Greece*

[U.S. fiscal years. In millions of dollars]

| Program | U.S. overseas loans and grants, net obligations and loan authorizations | | | | | | | | | | | | Repayments and interest, 1946–65 | Total (less repayments and interest) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Postwar relief period, 1946–48 | Marshall plan period, 1949–52 | Mutual Security Act period | | | | | Foreign Assistance Act period | | | | Total, 1946–65 | | |
| | | | 1953–57 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | | | |
| AID and predecessor agencies, total | | 706.7 | 188.0 | 27.7 | 20.7 | 56.6 | 20.4 | 30.3 | 31.5 | 7.8 | −9.9 | 1,079.7 | 17.4 | 1,062.3 |
| Loans | | | 35.0 | 12.0 | | 31.0 | | 10.0 | 31.6 | 7.7 | −9.9 | 117.4 | 17.4 | 100.0 |
| Grants | | 706.7 | 153.0 | 15.7 | 20.7 | 25.6 | 20.4 | 20.3 | −.1 | .1 | (1) | 962.3 | | 962.3 |
| Social Progress Trust Fund | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Food for peace, total | | 0.5 | 85.6 | 33.4 | 11.6 | 10.8 | 20.8 | 15.1 | 14.6 | 18.0 | 25.1 | 235.3 | 12.2 | 223.1 |
| Title I—(Total sales agreements) | () | () | (46.0) | (18.8) | () | (5.8) | (15.1) | (9.6) | (11.2) | (16.0) | (6.7) | (129.1) | () | (129.1) |
| Less (planned for U.S. uses) | () | () | (12.1) | (6.0) | () | (2.2) | (5.5) | (3.3) | (4.7) | (6.7) | (2.8) | (43.5) | () | (43.5) |
| Title I—Planned for loans and grants | | | 33.9 | 12.8 | | 3.6 | 9.7 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 9.3 | 3.9 | 85.7 | 12.2 | 73.5 |
| 104c—Grants for common defense | | | | | | | | | 5.0 | 5.0 | | 10.0 | | 10.0 |
| 104e—Grants for economic development | | | 7.3 | | | | | | | | | 7.3 | | 7.3 |
| 104e—Loans to private industry | | | | 2.9 | | .9 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.1 | .9 | 12.0 | 3.5 | 8.5 |
| 104g—Loans to governments | | | 26.6 | 9.9 | | 2.6 | 7.3 | 4.8 | | 2.2 | 3.0 | 56.3 | 8.7 | 47.6 |
| Title I—Assistance from other country sales agreements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Title II—Emergency relief and economic development | | | | | | | 3.5 | | | | .2 | 3.7 | | 3.7 |
| Title III—Voluntary relief agencies | | .5 | 51.7 | 20.6 | 11.6 | 7.2 | 7.6 | 8.9 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 3.1 | 128.0 | | 128.0 |
| Title IV—Dollar credit sales | | | | | | | | | | | 17.9 | 17.9 | | 17.9 |
| Export-Import Bank long-term loans | 14.6 | | | | | | 1.2 | 2.0 | 3.0 | | 17.5 | 38.3 | 14.4 | 23.9 |
| Other U.S. economic programs [2] | 510.5 | 26.2 | | | | | | | | | | 536.7 | 112.9 | 423.8 |
| Total economic | 525.2 | 733.4 | 273.6 | 61.1 | 32.3 | 67.4 | 42.4 | 47.4 | 49.1 | 25.8 | 32.7 | 1,890.0 | 156.9 | 1,733.1 |
| Loans | 111.3 | | 61.6 | 24.8 | | 34.6 | 10.9 | 18.2 | 36.1 | 12.0 | 29.4 | 338.5 | 156.9 | 181.6 |
| Grants | 413.9 | 733.4 | 212.0 | 36.3 | 32.3 | 32.8 | 31.5 | 29.2 | 13.0 | 13.8 | 3.3 | 1,551.4 | | 1,551.4 |
| Military assistance program (charge to appropriation) [3] | | 150.8 | 433.7 | 135.1 | 81.2 | 91.4 | 42.8 | 34.9 | 68.2 | 83.2 | 104.0 | 1,349.6 | | 1,349.6 |
| Credit assistance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grants | | 150.8 | 433.7 | 135.1 | 81.2 | 91.4 | 42.8 | 34.9 | 68.2 | 83.2 | 104.0 | 1,349.6 | | 1,349.6 |
| (Additional grants from excess stocks) | () | (32.7) | (11.7) | (6.8) | (6.8) | (13.4) | (14.2) | (19.7) | (6.2) | (3.9) | (17.0) | (137.5) | | (137.5) |
| Other military assistance [4] | 198.4 | 172.7 | | 8.3 | 8.0 | 25.3 | | | 17.6 | | | 430.3 | | 430.3 |
| Total military | 198.4 | 323.5 | 433.7 | 143.4 | 89.2 | 116.7 | 42.8 | 34.9 | 85.8 | 83.2 | 104.0 | 1,779.9 | | 1,779.0 |
| Total economic and military | 723.6 | 1,056.9 | 707.3 | 204.5 | 121.5 | 184.1 | 85.2 | 82.3 | 134.9 | 109.0 | 136.7 | 3,669.9 | 156.9 | 3,513.9 |
| Loans | 111.3 | | 61.6 | 24.8 | | 34.6 | 10.9 | 18.2 | 36.1 | 12.0 | 29.4 | 338.5 | 156.9 | 181.6 |
| Grants | 612.3 | 1,056.9 | 645.7 | 179.7 | 121.5 | 149.5 | 74.3 | 64.1 | 98.8 | 97.0 | 107.3 | 3,331.3 | | 3,331.3 |

[1] Less than $50,000.
[2] Includes UNRRA and post-UNRRA, $317,100,000; Greek-Turkish aid, $122,500,000; surplus property credits, $96,600,000; and other, $5,000,000.
[3] Annual data represent deliveries; total through 1965 is the cumulative program.
[4] Includes Greek-Turkish aid of $371,100,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, 5 years ago, President Kennedy pledged—

> To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor.

He warned, "it cannot save the few who are rich."

Three years later, President Johnson restated that pledge:

> We have proved that by the wise application of modern technology, the determined labor of skilled men and women can ultimately produce enough food and clothing and shelter for all mankind. The possession of new abilities gives us new responsibilities and we want to live up to those responsibilities. That is our Christian duty.

And last year, the Senate reaffirmed, in an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself, and approved by a vote of 78 to 1, the responsibility of the United States to "close the widening gap between the economically privileged nations and those nations striving to achieve a developed economy."

Never were these pledges more important to fulfill than today.

I am particularly distressed to note that the gap between promise and performance, between hope and fulfillment, seems to be growing wider rather than narrower.

The events and amendments of the past few days have been distressing indeed. The amendments we have adopted—and failed to adopt—are signs of retreat from responsibility and from honoring those pledges of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Today, our newspapers report the virtually unanimous passage in the House of the largest money bill in our peacetime history—$58.6 billion for defense spending. Surely we can afford one-twentieth of that sum in foreign assistance—and without terms and conditions which virtually destroy its usefulness to the recipient.

We in Congress have failed to meet these obligations. But it is also a fact that foreign aid has no constituency, and no lobby, in Washington; and without a major effort at all levels of the executive branch of government, foreign aid will continue to decline.

That unfortunately, is what has happened this year.

We are increasingly an island of affluence and privilege in a world of desperate poverty—a world in revolution.

This is a revolution for individual dignity, in societies where the individual has been submerged in a desperate mass. It is a revolution for self-sufficiency, in societies which have been forced to rely on

more fortunate nations for their manufactured goods and their education, cotton textiles and calculus texts. And above all, it is a revolution to bring hope to the children.

The population of this globe, grows every day, nowhere faster than in the underdeveloped nations. In the next 15 years, the population of Latin America alone will be 50 percent greater than it now is. Already, more than half the world's people are under the age of 25; within a few years, the majority will be under 18.

We have it within our power to give to millions of these young people a greater chance at a decent life—to now have a major effect on the course of their next 30 or 40 years. Millions are without schools—and we can help to build schoolrooms; millions more are without textbooks, or teachers—and we can help to provide textbooks and train teachers; others cannot eat—and we have food.

Clean water, better housing, education and training, a job to look forward to; these things we can help to provide. And we must.

Opportunities lost to these young people now, as we have found to our sorrow here at home, will be far harder to make up later. But a relatively modest investment now can make a difference, in 5 or 10 years, to as much as half the world's people—including our own.

For our legacy—to our children, to the next generation of political leaders in the United States—will be far more than what we leave within our boundaries. Its most important element will be the role and standing of the United States in the world—whether, in short, people will look to this country with hope or with hate, emulation or envy.

The test for this bill, as for any foreign aid bill, is whether it does enough for the future of the young majority of the world.

In my judgment, it does not meet that test.

In the year just passed, the gross national product of the United States has grown by more than $40 billion; it will grow by a similar amount this year. The total wealth of this Nation—in plant and equipment, in educated and trained manpower, in housing and health, and every other physical measure—has grown almost beyond our capacity to count.

Since President Kennedy's inaugural pledge, our gross national product has grown by more than $200 billion—an increase greater than the total annual product of 84 countries on 4 continents—every non-Communist underdeveloped nation in the world.

But this increased wealth has not been used for the benefit of others. Our foreign aid budget—the authorization now before the Senate—is no larger than the authorization passed by a less fortunate nation in 1961.

In the last year, I have traveled in 10 countries on 2 continents:

To Ethiopia, where the average life expectancy is less than 35 years;

To Brazil, where there are villages in which 7 out of 10 children die before their first birthday;

To Tanzania, where 97 percent of the people cannot read or write; and to other countries, to Peru and Kenya and Chile and Venezuela, where there is no joy, but only day that follows day, with death the only goal. Everywhere I went, in this year, and everywhere I have gone before, men looked to the United States—looked to us to give of our knowledge and treasure, to bring help to their present and hope to their future.

The United States owns more than half the total wealth of the non-Communist world. The dozen developed countries of Europe and Japan share a total wealth about half as large as ours. The rest of the non-Communist world—the more than 100 nations potentially affected by this bill—share a total annual production of something over $300 billion—less than half of what we, 6 percent of the world's population, consume each year. The developed nations as a group—20 percent of the world's people—consume 80 percent of the world's goods.

It is not given to us to right every wrong, to make perfect all the imperfections of the world. But neither is it given to us to sit content in our storehouses—dieting while others starve, buying 8 million new cars a year while most of the world goes without shoes. We are simply not doing enough.

Fifteen years ago, rising to the challenge of a war-devastated Europe, we devoted 10 percent of our Federal budget—fully 2 percent of our gross national product—to foreign aid. In 1960, under the administration of President Eisenhower, we joined in the pledge of the United Nations' development decade—to devote a minimum of half that much, 1 percent of our gross national product, to the equally desperate needs of the newly developing nations.

I believe the time has come to reaffirm that pledge, and to make it a reality.

Such a pledge, in my judgment, is necessary to the demands of the 1960's.

To make such a pledge, it should be clear, the Senate—and the American people—must be fully satisfied as to certain vital points:

First. Can such sums be usefully absorbed by the developing nations?

George Woods, President of the World Bank, has told us that the underdeveloped world has an annual foreign exchange shortage of $3 to $4 billion each year—which shortage prevents the investment in schools and factories and farms and health, that alone can bring self-sufficiency, stability and self-respect. The Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress—a body in which the Committee reposes such confidence as to give it a veto over U.S. development aid to this hemisphere—has said that Latin America alone has a foreign exchange shortage of over $1 billion each year.

Moreover, the accomplishments of U.S. foreign assistance are already substantial—and are being felt in dozens of countries, all over the world. This year, 15 million students will learn in schools assisted by U.S. aid. Three-quarters of a billion people will be safe from malaria, 77 million from smallpox, 7 million from cholera, because of vaccinations given in 1966 alone. Over a million acres of farmland will be irrigated for the first time, and 3 million farmers will receive loans to improve their land, as a result of AID efforts. Nineteen million textbooks, 50,000 miles of better roads, 4,000 loans to private businesses—this is only some of what our aid will do this year.

I have seen—I know other Senators have seen—the hunger for education, for land, for progress and improvement of every kind, that pervades every nation in the developing world. If we provide more help, they will use it.

Second. Will the aid have an effect—will it be more than a perpetual dole.

At the outset, we must realize, as James A. Perkins, the distinguished president of Cornell University and chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Foreign Aid has written, that—

> We are not discussing a problem to be solved in a year or even a decade. We must consciously adopt a program that will last for the rest of the century—and perhaps into the next.

Still recognizing the enormity of the task, we can also take comfort in the fact that nations have achieved self-sustaining growth, and ended the need for U.S. assistance. As Mr. David Bell pointed out aptly last week, it was thought by some as late as 1949 that our economic aid to Japan was a "$2 billion failure," and that "the American taxpayer must prepare himself for an indefinite period of vast appropriations." But within 5 years our aid to Japan had ceased; Japan will now repay much of our assistance; and, in 1965, it in turn aided other developing nations with over $240 million.

Taiwan is another country which has moved into self-sustaining growth, progressing without further American aid. It should be noted in this connection that heavy investment in Taiwan over a relatively short period produced better results than lower levels of aid to other countries carried on over a longer period—this proving what every businessman knows, that too little investment may be worse than none at all. As the National Citizen's Commission on International Cooperation has said:

> The approach requiring the least amount of assistance in the long run is one which requires a relatively large volume of assistance during the early period when self-help measures are initiated and first become effective.

Third. Does our assistance advance the essential interests of the United States?

I believe the American people are ready to recognize that foreign aid is not a "giveaway," but rather a moral obligation and a sound and necessary investment in the future. I believe we are ready to recognize that millions saved now can mean billions lost 5 or 10 or 20 years from now—and that the human cost of delay is incalculable.

We have shown in the Senate that we are willing to spend nearly $2 billion a

month for tanks, for planes, for napalm, for the other weapons of war—all to save people from communism. But we seem reluctant to spend, to save people from the tyranny of starvation and ignorance, as much in a single month—even though we know, in our own purest self-interests, that the tyranny of poverty is easily exchanged for the tyranny of communism.

The foreign aid program has not been completely successful. There has been corruption. There have been abuses of other kinds in some of the recipient countries. But if we consider the program as a whole—what is at stake, what has been accomplished—I believe we will conclude that it has been a significant success, and made a major difference in the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

Economic assistance is no magic cure; it will not abolish dictatorship, nor automatically remove oppression, and injustice; and given unwisely, it can even bolster the forces of reaction and hamper progress. But an adequate program of assistance can help to prevent oppression, can at least right the basic injustices of starvation and ignorance and degradation and want, in dozens of countries on four continents.

Ideals, however, are not self-executing. They require thoughtful planning and forceful administration. Last year, the Senate attempted to meet this problem by creating a special Foreign Aid Planning Committee charged with reexamining and reevaluating our entire foreign aid program.

Although that committee was eliminated—along with the 2-year authorization—in conference, the need for a basic reappraisal is as great today as it was last year. I therefore urge that the study, contained last year in sections 702–704 of the Senate bill, be inserted in this bill with appropriate changes. Foreign aid is too important to receive less than the best planning and administration of which we are capable.

There is one final question: the proper relation of this aid bill to the war in Vietnam. The committee has stated that American citizens should not be called upon to accept reductions in programs which affect their daily lives, see their taxes increased and war costs spiral, while the foreign aid program escapes unaffected and undiminished. But foreign aid, as I have stressed, is not a giveaway. And if anything, the war in Vietnam should serve as a reminder of the greater costs we may have to pay in the future, if we now fail to meet the challenge of development in Latin America or Asia or Africa.

The war in Vietnam should not and cannot be allowed to keep us from doing anything which is vital to our future, at home or abroad. A nation which increases its gross national product by $40 billion a year can spend $20 billion in Vietnam and still meet its domestic and foreign needs out of new growth, without diminishing the well-being of its citizens. This war is difficult and dangerous enough without causing us to now lay the seeds of greater difficulty and danger in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a speech made by Mr. George Woods, president of the World Bank Group, on July 20, 1966, on the question of foreign aid and assistance; and also an article entitled "Aid-to-Africa Policy Being Reappraised by Presidential Panel," written by Richard Eder, and published in the New York Times, of July 5, 1966.

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

REMARKS OF MR. GEORGE D. WOODS, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK GROUP, TO THE MINISTERIAL MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE OF OECD, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 20, 1966

When I last had the honor of addressing the Ministerial Meeting of this Committee a year ago, I suggested that the time had come to take bold decisions about the volume and character of development assistance. I think we must all be deeply disappointed, 12 months later, that these decisions still wait to be taken. Let me state again my conviction that the amount of financial assistance to the developing countries is inadequate by any reasonable standard—whether it is considered in relation to the growth rate the industrial countries say they are willing to help the developing countries to achieve, or by the amount of capital which the developing countries themselves are able to use to good purpose.

If there were to appear on this planet earth tomorrow a new country with a population, say, as big as that of the United States or the Soviet Union—some 200 million or more—this would be an event of far-reaching significance. Foreign offices and defense establishments would have to adjust themselves to this new presence; so would ministries concerned with international trade, finance and the distribution of physical resources in the world. In many countries, the necessary adjustments would be matters of the highest policy, to be determined by cabinets and chiefs of government.

You may say that this is fanciful. Yet in the past five years the population of the developing countries has grown by over 200 million souls—a number larger than the population of the United States, and comparable to the population of the Soviet Union, of Africa south of the Sahara, or of all Latin America.

While this is certainly not the same as the emergence of a single country, it is emphatically a circumstance of great weight in world affairs. It presents new tasks to the political and administrative organizations of the developing countries, and bears heavily on their physical and financial resources. It speaks urgently for striking a new balance in the relations between high and low-income countries.

* * *

Yet the pages of recent history show little recognition by the industrial countries that the equivalent of a new continent has been added to the less developed world, or that, despite population controls which are starting to take effect, a second such equivalent will be added in the next five years. The low-income countries must finance their development effort mostly out of exports to industrial countries—and they are increasingly able to produce for export. But the trade policy of the industrial countries in 1966 still offers them too few opportunities. The flow of financing for development has not noticeably increased. In fact, by some important measures it has declined.

Since 1961, the level of official net capital flows from OECD countries to the developing countries has remained static at about $6 billion a year. As a proportion of the rising incomes of the OECD countries, these net official flows declined from an estimated eight-tenths of one per cent to six-tenths of one per cent. The export of private capital increased, but most of it was directed to only a few countries, and discouragingly little of it went to the poorer ones.

We know and agree that the terms of development finance must be made easier for the developing countries. But the reverse is happening. As the Chairman's Report points out, the recent trend toward improvement in loan terms has been more than offset by a decline in the amount of grants. Today the average terms of assistance are harder than they were last year or the year before, and the prospects are disturbing.

At the same time, more and more of the flow of finance is being counterbalanced by the debt service paid by the developing countries. Service on public and publicly guaranteed debt more than doubled between 1961 and 1965. More than half the inflow of development finance is now being offset by the return flow in the form of amortization, interest and dividends.

Paradoxically, at the same time that the relative volume of aid has been dwindling, the capabilities of the developing countries have been growing. Last year, I reported the judgment of the World Bank staff that for the balance of the 1960's, the developing countries—outside the Sino-Soviet areas—each year could effectively use, on the average, some $3 to $4 billion more of development finance than they are now receiving. This judgment was based on estimates of the capacity of the developing countries to save and to export, to follow acceptable economic policies, and to plan and carry out high-priority development. We have kept these estimates under review, and this review confirms and underlines our judgment of a year ago. And in this connection I wish to reassure the Chairman, who on page 51 of his draft report wonders if we are basing these estimates on what he calls "our fairly high standards of economic justification for external assistance." We are. We have only one standard.

The capacity of the industrialized countries to support an effective assistance effort also has been rising. Assuming that effective financial assistance would cost an added $3 to $4 billion a year, the industrialized countries can certainly afford it. Their national income has been increasing, in the aggregate, at the rate of $40 to $50 billion a year; and if over the last five years, only one per cent of that increase had been devoted to additional development support, we should by today be not very far from a satisfactory level of assistance.

In the meantime, the contrast between the rich and the poor continues to be both striking and, it must be said, ominous. The 20 or so industrial countries of Western Europe, North America and the western Pacific now account for over a thousand billion dollars of the world's product. These 20 countries, with less than a fifth of the world's population, produce and enjoy more than half the world's wealth. By contrast—taking only the developing countries within the World Bank's membership—another segment which is half of the world's population accounts for only one-sixth of world product.

It is unrealistic to think that this state of affairs can persist. Surely any government, if half or more of its people lived in poverty, either would make strenuous efforts to help them or would itself fail to survive. Through changes in communications and transportation, the world each year becomes a smaller neighborhood, and what is intolerable in a

single nation inevitably—and quickly—will become intolerable in the community of nations.

Many of the industrialized countries represented here today are now, and for some time have been, engaged in examining at high levels of their governments matters which they consider to be of pressing and mutual concern. Foreign ministers and commerce ministers and others are negotiating fundamental changes in trade and tariff policies; finance ministers are conferring on the troublesome problem of international monetary policy; and the foreign ministers and defense ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty nations are facing up to problems of defense organization.

Yet, looking ahead over the next ten years, where *are* the threats to international tranquility and order? Are they confined to balance and maintenance of military strength among the most powerful nations? Of to financial questions among the richest? Or is there also a threat arising from the possibility that, without concerted and adequate help from abroad, a large part of humanity will remain on the ragged edge of subsistence? I believe this is a possibility which presents a real and present danger.

What is now necessary, I suggest, is that the governments represented in this room should give to consideration of their policies relating to development finance a priority at least comparable to consideration of their other basic concerns. After twenty years of experience—and to some extent of frustration—the time has come, I believe, for a thorough examination of the objectives we are trying to achieve in our relationships with the developing world, of the importance of those objectives to the national interests of the DAC countries, and of the adequacy of the resources, the mechanisms and the techniques which are being employed to attain those objectives.

The kind of examination I have in mind would engage foreign ministers and finance ministers as well as development ministers. It would put the world-wide aid effort—which has emerged somewhat haphazardly from the post-war reconstruction program—in a well thought out and agreed upon place in the whole scheme of international affairs. It might implement some of the thought-provoking suggestions made last May by the American Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, in a speech to a meeting of bankers in Spain.

The industrial countries here represented have been assisting world development for a span of two decades. In that time, science, technology and the means of creating material prosperity have advanced at a rate unprecedented in history. We can say confidently that the knowledge and the means exist to enlarge greatly the resources of the world, and to help many millions to achieve, or at least approach, decent living standards for the first time. A solution to the problem of hunger, one of the major problems which will be discussed here, is certainly not beyond our reach if we arrive at a plan and coordinate our efforts to implement it.

Agriculture is entitled to the highest priority, not only in the context of the food shortage, but also, and importantly, because up to 80 per cent of the people in the underdeveloped world depend on it for a livelihood, and because in many countries, the output of agriculture is the biggest single item of production. However, as is true of most development matters, we must stay with the problem of agriculture for the necessary period of years. Unhappily, there are no shortcuts to sound development.

All along the development front, the policies which must now be evolved and the actions which must be taken transcend the interests of any particular group of nations; they involve all. Today, the disparity between the living standards of a prosperous fraction of mankind and the rest of humanity is a gulf that separates the two; but tomorrow it may swallow up both rich and poor in political strife and economic chaos. We must begin to act decisively, and now, to avoid that outcome.

---

[From the New York Times, July 5, 1966]

AID-TO-AFRICA POLICY BEING REAPPRAISED BY PRESIDENTIAL PANEL

(By Richard Eder)

WASHINGTON, July 4.—A searching effort to rethink and, eventually, to reshape the strategy of United States assistance to Africa has concluded its first phase here.

The project was commissioned by President Johnson a month ago. It is being carried out by Edward M. Korry, Ambassador to Ethiopia, assisted by five African experts whom he chose from the State Department and the Agency for International Development.

Mr. Korry has spent the last month meeting with persons from a wide range of backgrounds—business, the universities, professionals and scientists—all of whom have experience in Africa.

In a series of brain-storming sessions, which participants described as freewheeling and irreverent, he and his staff talked with disparate gatherings including Peace Corps members who have returned from Africa, members of the National Academy of Science, a group of lawyers who served in African governments under the auspices of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and others.

PROPOSALS ARE GATHERED

From these, from a broad range of books and reports, and from his three years of contact with Africans from all parts of the continent, Mr. Korry has gathered suggestions for what the United States could be doing to spur the continent's development.

The group is now sifting these suggestions into a report that will attempt to define what the United States role should be in Africa, what objectives it should pursue, and how it should attain them.

In a departure from State Department practice, the report will go to the President and Secretary of State Dean Rusk as written by Mr. Korry, without revision by the layer of committees that usually get at State Department papers before they are finished. It will, according to an official familiar with the work so far, approach the problem "as if we had no previous policy."

What use will be made of the report is difficult to say. With the heavy involvement of the United States in Vietnam, and its difficulties with gold outflow, it is unlikely that Mr. Johnson will be able to order a substantial new effort in Africa.

LIMITATIONS TO BE SHOWN

The report, however, will not attempt to prescribe how much money should be spent in Africa, although it may point out the limits of the present aid level. What it will try to do is to define a purpose, a role and a method for United States assistance in the continent—something that Mr. Korry and other African specialists believe is lacking at present.

A.I.D. assistance to Africa has run to $200-million a year in recent years. This, as African specialists are fond of pointing out, is approximately what one United States company, the International Business Machine Corporation, spends each year on development and research. It is considerably less than the $250-million to $300-million that the Soviet Union sends in arms alone. As for United States military aid, it is limited to $25-million annually.

If the aid is small—some officials call it, not in jest, "conscience money"—the fundamental problem, in the view of many specialists, is the fact that although it is frequently spent on worthy projects, the total effect is one of aimless scattering.

The $200-million goes to 33 nations, making an average expenditure of a little more than $6-million. In one country, Mauretania, assistance in 1965 was something under $50,000. In many countries, the programs run from $1-million to $2-million.

Officials, who believe that the United States can and must play an important part in helping Africa to develop, are frequently bitter about the restrictions in the United States aid program. They argue that unless development comes quickly, perhaps in the next generation, the forces of disintegration may begin to move irreversibly.

One official, noted for his enthusiastic faith in Africa's future, speaks, with an evident effort not to exaggerate, of "a Haiti of continental proportions" resulting unless the next 10 or 15 years are made use of.

Mr. Korry is expected to argue that in the long run the limitations of the United States effort—even if commitments elsewhere diminish—are a result of a lack of a thought-out strategy for Africa. If Congress cuts the African appropriation a bit more each year, it is because it gets a series of isolated projects to approve, with little sense of over-all direction.

QUESTIONS ARE RAISED

To identify such a direction, the Korry group will seek to answer a number of basic questions.

For example, it will explore means by which regional groupings—commonly conceded to be a desirable goal—can be encouraged. The difficulty has been that countries that would be logical partners in one sector may be badly matched in another.

Nations that could cooperate to form a power grid may not be suitable for agricultural or industrial integration. The old colonial divisions may suggest one combination of states, but economic or political interests may point a different way. Finally, the linguistic barriers between French and English Africa may impede groupings that otherwise would be dictated by geography and resources.

Another question is how the United States can harmonize its aid with Britain and France, whose roles are often more significant, so as to work toward a common economic strategy.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, I should like to compliment and congratulate the Senator from New York for a very articulate, inspiring, and tremendously moving speech on this question of foreign aid. My only regret is that he did not make it at the beginning of the debate; because, contrary to what he has recommended and so well reasoned, we have already made very serious cuts in this bill, cuts which I consider to be most regrettable.

I should like to join with the Senator in everything he has said. I agree with him and I support him in the statements he has made. It is American statesmanship at its best.

A matter that has puzzled me during the past four Presidential administrations is the frustration of foreign aid. Whether it was President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Ken-

nedy, or now President Johnson, all men of very wide experience, each dedicated to the welfare of this great society of ours, each devoted to the security of our Nation and the peace of the world, each, in his turn has come before Congress, year after year, in his dedication and in his attempt to carry out his responsibility under the Constitution to administer the foreign policy of this country. Each has consistently, constantly, and persistently advocated a foreign aid program.

Each has seen the role that an affluent America must play in a world plagued by the desperate needs of yesterday and of today—needs that will grow tomorrow beyond desperation unless we see the picture as displayed by the Senator from New York—and make it our purpose to make tomorrow better.

Each President has made a logical presentation to Congress.

With what result?

Each President has had a miserable experience with Congress—so much so that it has become an enigma why the Chief Executive, the one man, elected by all the people, who is charged with the development of this society and the peace of the world, must be subjected to this sabotage. The President has recommended a very modest amount, as the Senator from New York has brought out, to keep this world together. After all, we are the most affluent society in the world. If we allow the world to fall apart, we who have the most have the most to lose. All we are trying to do, is to keep the world together by extending a helping hand to those who cannot help themselves.

Every time a foreign aid bill has come before us, there have been attempts to whittle it down, to chop it down, and to destroy it. In this year of 1966 the situation is no different. Already we have done a terrific scissors and hatchet job on the bill. By the time we get through it, it will not be recognizable as an aid bill.

I hope that the eloquent remarks of the Senator from New York have not fallen on deaf ears. Here is a man who has traveled the world over and has seen human need at first hand. Here is a man who has been privy under two Presidents to the most intimate information that could come to any government. He stands before us today and tells us that we have the resources and the responsibility to keep this world together, if it is to be kept together at all. His facts and figures are unanswerable. The responsibility falls the greatest upon our senatorial shoulders. I hope that Congress, and particularly the Senate, having heard him—will heed him.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at this point I simply wished to respond with a few words to what the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has said.

Mr. President, as is well known, I voted for the original Marshall plan, and I have no excuses to make; I would probably vote for it again.

But when the Senator from Rhode Island and the President of the United States state that these are barebones requests, I should like to refer to the appropriations made last year.

We had a barebones suggestion by the President of the United States of $3,400 million. But when you add the $3,400 million to the $1,750 million for surplus commodities, and when you add to that the amounts that we provide each year in order to finance the international banks, to which we contribute heavily, you will find that the barebones appropriations of last year did not amount to $3.4 billion, but to $6.8 billion.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the amount that we appropriated for fiscal year 1966, the fiscal year which ended on June 30, was as large an amount as was provided when the Senate first considered and provided funds for the foreign aid program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I would like to enunciate the great adage:

Cast your bread upon the water.

In the process and profit of doing that, our gross national product has risen from $650 billion a year to $750 billion a year. With all our generosity we have become richer. What I am saying here this afternoon is that we have given the money to a degree that is modest compared to our means. Whatever we have given we have given it in love of neighbor to alleviate the suffering and poverty in the rest of the world. I do not think it is disgraceful. I think it is a mark of distinction for America.

It would be a world tragedy if America did not care.

It would be a national shame if America did not share.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the views expressed by the Senator from New York today. I am glad that he made reference to the action of the House of Representatives on yesterday in authorizing $58.6 billion for military expenditures. The Senator might have added that that was $1 billion more than the administration wanted.

While we are going through the exercise here of curtailing the administration request for a very modest expenditure for economic and technical assistance, we are also being treated to an exercise in which Congress is forcing an additional $1 billion on the administration for armaments that the administration says it does not want and has no plans to spend.

Beyond that, the news article to which the Senator referred informs us that the Pentagon has another $42 billion left over from their previous authorizations. That money has not been spent. Therefore, with the additional $58.6 billion, they now have approximately $100 billion to spend in the fiscal year 1967.

Earlier today I offered an amendment to provide that the United States ought not to reduce the economic and technical assistance that we are giving worldwide to less than 10 percent of what we are spending on our highly questionable effort in Vietnam.

As the Senator suggested, approximately $20 billion a year is being expended in Vietnam. Some estimates are higher than that. I think that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia, has estimated our Vietnam expenses at approximately $2 billion a month. Certainly, if we can afford, in the name of freedom, to spend approximately $24 billion a year in Vietnam, we ought to be able to find some way to spend 10 percent of that amount for all the remainder of the world—Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. For every $10 that we spend in Vietnam, we should surely be able to allocate $1 to the remaining countries of the world to help meet their serious problems.

I earlier asked that my amendment be laid temporarily aside because of a prior understanding with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that his amendment would be considered first.

Since then, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Although I think it is a worthy amendment, the Senator from Arkansas feels that a majority of the Senate would probably oppose it. So, I think, under the circumstances, I shall not ask that it be further considered. Again let me say that I wholeheartedly endorse what the Senator from New York has said. There are, indeed, rich moral, political, and economic dividends that can come to us, to our children, and to the world when we join in a cooperative effort to raise standards of life in the developing countries of the globe.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New York on what he has said here today. I think perhaps it should have been said earlier in the course of the debate. It awakens in our minds many of the things that have been going on in the Senate for these past few days as we have our annual free for all in an effort to see whether we can pick apart the foreign aid bill with the greatest ferocity.

This is one of the reasons that I strongly supported the proposal for an authorization for a longer period of time than for 1 year.

It seems to me that we come back and go through this exercise again and again. I do not believe that anyone who heard the speech of the Senator or anyone who will read the speech can help but be impressed with the facts he mentioned concerning our great affluence in this country, the vast productive power, and the

great consumption of goods that exists in this country.

Nevertheless, we are here cutting funds in every possible place on a bill that would lend some assistance to the less fortunate of the world. It certainly is in our own interest to stabilize and help the governments and peoples of the world to reach a higher pinnacle of economic self-sufficiency.

I think the Senator from New York has rendered a great service to us here today.

I associate myself with his comments and commend him highly.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wish to make an additional remark regarding the miscalculation that I perhaps made, and that perhaps others made, about not speaking at the beginning of the debate.

I think all of us felt that we generally supported foreign aid. We realized the importance of the various programs around the world, and the position of the United States around the world. The foreign aid program had been very modest; it had been proposed by the administration, and supported by the country. It was obvious that there would be some changes, but generally, from the information given to me, it was felt that the measure would receive the support of the Senate. It was only after the debate commenced, these last few days, that we realized that the measure did not have that kind of support. In fact, in my judgment, the measure is badly damaged, was destroyed in many areas.

I think that if we were to examine our position in the Senate now and realize how different our position is from the position of this body in the 1940's and 1950's on the aid that was given to Europe and other countries, we would realize that we in the United States are as powerful as we are and are able to sit in this Senate Chamber because of the efforts made by others 20 or 30 years ago.

We have the same responsibility to the next generation of Americans. But instead we are making only one-third of the effort our predecessors were willing to make. And the next generation of Americans, the next generation of political leaders, will have to face hatred and distrust of the United States all over the globe because we have saved a few dollars today.

We certainly should not be proud of that legacy. I think it will present a major problem for us.

The profit, for instance, of the General Motors Corp.—one of our finer corporations—is $2.2 billion a year, which is more than the gross national product of half of the countries of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator does not quite reflect what some of us, at least, think about the AID program. It is not the amount that we question. It is the manner in which the program has been administered, and the use to which aid has been put by the administration. For example, they have used our aid as one justification for intervention in the civil war in Vietnam.

The engagement in the war itself colors the judgment of many of us, in my opinion, at least, as to the validity and wisdom of this form of intervention all around the world.

The Senator from Rhode Island made a very impassioned and eloquent plea concerning charitable contributions. I have never regarded this program as justifiable on the basis of charity. It is much too large for a charity program. It is not a relief program. We have had relief programs under UNRRA in its different stages.

A day or two ago, the majority leader offered to send $25,000 as relief to Outer Mongolia. Relief aid is a tradition with this country. However, I never think of this foreign aid program as being a charitable program, any more than I think of old-age assistance or social security as being charitable programs.

It is a program which this country has deliberately adopted for justifiable reasons as being in our own interests. I think the program should be administered on a nonnational basis.

I would go along with the Senator from New York as to amounts if the program were administered through the proper international agencies. For example, the Senator cited Mr. Woods, who made, I thought, a very important statement the other day with regard to IDA. I favor his proposal.

I would favor not only the amount he proposed, but also the diversion of much of our aid through such agencies. But our bilateral aid program has, in my view, over these recent years, accumulated some very serious political barnacles, if I may call them that. It has created some serious problems for us, among them the involvement in Vietnam.

I am not willing to continue to use this tool, which could be used very beneficially to promote both our interests and the interests of the developing countries, in the way that it is now being used.

I am not for undertaking a policy of hegemony in Asia, certainly not without very serious consideration and approval by the Senate. I, therefore, am inclined to reexamine this program very thoroughly.

The Senator from New York mentioned his proposal for reexamination of the program which was adopted last year. I am in favor of that. I have no objection to it.

I may say that I am unable to read parts of the copy that I have. I wonder whether the Senator could present a printed copy for the benefit of the Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 696

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I intend to offer it tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it is identical to the committee's proposal of last year, providing for the restudy of aid, I point out that we have already agreed to the need for such a review. The committee considered and recommended it last year. I do not wish the record to appear to indicate that some of us who have voted for these cuts have suddenly decided that we should close our pocketbooks and do nothing to help the poor nations. My complaint is about the manner in which we are providing aid. I think the way the program is now constituted is self-defeating and is doing great harm.

Numerous studies have been made. A whole book was written recently about our program in Nepal, and the conclusion was that it has done more harm than good. I believe this can be said about a number of places around the earth.

It is a misunderstanding and a misrepresentation to say that those of us who voted for certain restrictions and cuts are turning our backs on the world, have no interest at all, and do not realize that this is a rich country. We are rich, but we have much to learn. We are not nearly as wise as we are rich.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have some serious reservations about the struggle that is now taking place in Vietnam, and about some of the steps that are being taken. I do not believe that if we look back over the history of the war in Vietnam, we can say mistakes have not been made. Mistakes have been made by every administration, including that in which I served the longest period of time—the administration of President Kennedy. But I do not believe we can say the determining mistake that was made was in giving foreign aid and foreign assistance to Vietnam. There have been mistakes, and perhaps that might have been one; but I believe it is pretty far down on the list of errors made in Vietnam or southeast Asia over the last 10 years.

If we are going to look at Vietnam and say we should cut back on foreign aid, we should consider the situation in the forties and fifties. We are now giving approximately a third of our budget and of our gross national product as compared to what we gave 15 years ago.

All Members of the Senate have traveled. Although mistakes have been made, some of these programs have been very effective. Some of these programs have saved the lives of many tens of thousands of people. Some of these programs have permitted hundreds of thousands of young men and women to obtain an education and removed the burden of ignorance from their backs.

I do not know about the situation in Nepal; I accept the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas about that. But I believe we also should look at what has been done all over the world that has been good, and why people look to the United States. Why do they think there is something special about the United States? It is not just because of what we have done internally, that our companies and corporations have grown. It is the Peace Corps, and also the fact that we have in a generous way given our aid and assistance to those countries, in helping them to develop themselves. We have a

responsibility as the most developed nation in the world. We have taken an interest in them. If we have decided not to be an isolationist country, and that we have a role to play in the world, then it should be something more than going in when a war takes place, as in Vietnam, and being able to buy bigger tanks and better planes and larger bombs and killing more people and more Communists or Vietcongs, or whatever they might be called, than any other country.

I believe that we have a responsibility on the other side, to attempt to prevent those situations from arising, not just for ourselves, but also for the next generation.

In Tanzania there is 97 percent illiteracy, and the life expectancy is under 35 years of age. We are giving $10 million to Tanzania, and we spend 80 percent of that in the United States. This percentage is in the form of food.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The money amount is really very small.

The Senator from New York has drawn attention to the fact that a bill has been passed providing $58 billion for defense. The other day the Secretary said that we have spent $850 billion for defense since World War II. According to the figures of the minority leader, about which there is some question on items, we have spent roughly $114 billion, less than one-eighth that amount, for our aid program. I do not object to the amount; I am only saying that I believe there is a more effective way of administering our aid effort.

The one outstanding example of success was the Marshall plan. That was not administered as a unilateral program. We utilized the OEEC to plan and administer the program and we furnished the money.

I am only saying that I believe it would be a great thing if we could take one-tenth of the amount now spent for military purposes and give it to the International Bank or the U.N. Development Fund and have it used to help build up the societies and economies of the underdeveloped world.

One of the distinctive things we have tried to develop since World War II, in my opinion, has been a cooperative, multilateral, approach—not a unilateral approach—to world problems.

What I believe I detect in recent statements of this administration—and I am not sure the Senator does not confirm them—is that this whole program is just for the United States, that we should do it; that the United States, because it is rich, ought to undertake a program of rehabilitation and assistance around the world. I believe we can make a great contribution monetarily, and I believe we can do it through these organizations. I do not believe we have the wisdom to do it, but even more, I do not believe any nation can, as a national entity, undertake this kind of job and do it effectively. Inevitably, it is bound to become tainted with the suspicion—if not the fact—of materialism or paternalism. These words have acquired certain rather bad connotations by their use.

I believe a trend in this direction is already in progress. If a country undertakes to administer this kind of program worldwide, in accordance with its own individual views, without utilizing an international organization, the effort will ultimately defeat its purpose. It will not bring about political peace and social and economic reform, in the countries it tries to help. It will only end up in political competition with other countries.

Even now, I believe that our aid program has inspired Russia to start one; also the Chinese, who probably never would have done so on a competitive basis.

What would make sense to me is that our undertaking to bring about improvements in the underdeveloped countries should be a cooperative program through the international agencies; and, hopefully, we should enlist aid not only from the Western World but also from Russia. The Russians are having second thoughts and disillusionment about some of their aid programs, for many of the same reasons that trouble our program. They had experience in Ghana, in Iraq, and in Indonesia that was not unlike our experience in certain countries. This happened for the same reasons, I may say—resentment of the smaller countries at the incursion of big, rich countries.

I believe there is an inherent defect in this approach. I am perfectly willing to match the desires of the Senator from New York as to amounts, if the program is administered by the international agencies.

All we need to do is to make up our minds to approach this problem as a member of the community of nations, and not just as the great United States, which is going to tell everybody what to do and pay them to do it, as we are now doing in a number of instances. That, I believe, is the real difference between us.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate that.

The Senator referred to other countries. It is true that the United States, on the basis of its gross national product and its budget, even at the present time gives less percentagewise than France or Germany, for instance.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would have to say that they provide assistance in a very different way to their colonies. Let us say that their aid is in the nature of an investment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the French do not go around giving grants. About 99 percent of their aid goes to their colonies where they know what the results of the aid will be, and it is really in the nature of an economic investment, in my opinion.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have no disagreement with what the Senator from Arkansas suggests.

If we can develop in the Senate and in the Government a program of administering aid in a fashion which would be more acceptable, I would be completely in favor of that. That is why I suggested that there be formed a committee to make a study of our foreign aid to see if we are proceeding in the best possible way.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am sorry.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is one of the reasons I suggest that this committee should make a study of it to determine what we should do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator that what was effective for the forties, fifties, or the early sixties we might not want for the 1970's. In the meantime, it is my strong feeling that we should not burn down the house while trying to reach understandings either in the Senate, the House of Representatives, or in the executive branch.

If we get beyond what the Senator from Rhode Island referred to, I think we have a moral responsibility in connection with our self-interest.

I think all of us have traveled around the world and everyone would feel that what we did in the forties, the fifties, or the early sixties in the aid program has been in our self-interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Some of it has, but not all of it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not think all of it. But while trying to find an answer, to have the whole program fall apart at the seams and bring all kinds of repercussions, not only for the present but for the future of the United States, does not seem to me to make a great deal of sense.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know why the Senator thinks it has fallen apart. The bill has not been completed. What does the Senator mean by "falling apart"?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am referring to the amendments that have been accepted over the last 2 days. I refer to the fact that there was a modest proposal in the beginning which is getting more restricted each year.

I find in this critical period and in the last 2 days less of an effort that is necessary on the part of the executive branch of the Government to marshal the forces of business, labor, churches, and others interested in this matter to develop public interest in the importance of the aid program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator that the administration is so preoccupied with making war that they have very little time for anything else—time or money. They are spending about $2 billion a month in the prosecution of this futile war in southeast Asia. There is $68 billion in this budget and they do not have the time or the money for this program.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thought that maybe the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would make up for that deficit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing new about my views about this multilaterialism, if the Senator had something else on his mind.

But 3 or 4 years ago I began to plead with the Senate. We put in a provision authorizing the diversion of loan funds for the International Bank where they have a good reputation for administering this kind of program for the development of underdeveloped countries. It was approved by the Senate and by the

House of Representatives, but the Appropriations Committee of the other body refused to abide by it and put in a limitation which would prohibit it.

We tried it year after year. There is no other way to do it. This is not a rational view. I am hopeful of bringing about a change.

I am perfectly willing to have a committee. As a matter of fact, I advocated it last year, and the Senator from Oregon did. The House of Representatives would not approve it last year. They were adamant about it. We passed it here with little opposition. This entire matter should be restudied and some new approach taken.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator. I would like to make the comment at this time that the emphasis in the speech of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and in the colloquy of my good friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and others who have joined them in exalting foreign aid, is that those who have introduced amendments are aiming to slash, ruin, downgrade, and diminish the foreign aid program.

As a matter of fact to this bill providing economic aid I have six amendments, one of which has already been accepted by the Senate. It happens that not one of my six amendments cuts a single nickel from the pending bill. They are designed to improve the program. Some of the amendments will be adopted as some of mine have been in the past and are part of the existing foreign aid procedure.

The amendments which I have submitted and will offer would materially improve the program.

I call to the attention of the Senate the report issued by me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations which gives a case study of one country which was selected because it was in its area, Latin America, most advantageous from the standpoint of prospective success. Yet the report is an objective and factual exhibit of the tremendous errors which have been committed in the past in our foreign aid programs and have not been rectified by experience, and which if rectified would greatly strengthen and improve the foreign aid program.

There are few of us who do not believe that some foreign aid program is necessary. But the fact is that as it has been administered and misapplied, the program has been greatly weakened. That is why many of us seem to be and are critical of it. If we are to improve the program, it is not going to be by the mere addition of money. Experience has shown that larger doses of the wrong medicine do not effect a cure.

There is also another aspect to be considered. There has been a certain amount of—perhaps not conscious—misrepresentation. The President sends down a budget, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana pointed out which is declared to be a "barebones" request. Yet it is less than half of the program. There are all kinds of other spigots which more than double the alleged barebones request.

The loans being made under it at negligible rates of interest are one large spigot running into billions of dollars. We have tried to raise the interest rate. Many are loans which will never be repaid. They are, in reality, grants, but the American people are asked to consider them as loans.

I remember 3 years ago when I was in Egypt on a foreign aid study I was present when our Ambassador signed an agreement with Nasser to build a powerplant in West Cairo. The terms of that loan provided for no repayment of capital for the first 10 years. The interest was to be at three-quarters of 1 percent during the entire period, and it was to run for a period of 40 years. That was not a loan. It was a gift. A powerplant is a profit-making, self-liquidating enterprise. The loan should have been made at the rate the American people are obliged to pay for their money.

We have been making that type of loan all over the world. It makes people wonder what kind of suckers we are. There are some types of loans, whether for schools, roads, or some other project which do not generate revenue where the token interest rates may be justified. We have not been as vigilant as we should be in the interest rates, and this has been brought up year after year without much improvement.

In many instances we have unquestioningly accepted the foreign aid program of the administration. The amount of money we ladle out is not the answer. It is the way in which it is administered.

Instead of giving money promiscuously all over the world, often rushing in before a nation is even independent, we should give it to those countries which are willing to cooperate and are willing to make self-help efforts and have an appreciation of their responsibility to help expend these vast sums honestly and prudently.

I remember that 5 years ago John K. Galbraith, one of our leading economists and recently our Ambassador to India, wrote an article in the quarterly Foreign Affairs in which he pointed out four conditions to make foreign aid effective, and without which it could not be so.

First, in the country receiving aid there should be a knowledgeable elite which knew how to receive foreign aid and use it; second, that the people in its government would have to be honest so that the money would not be stolen; third that there would be a sense of social justice in the government so that the money would not stay at the top and benefit a few, but would percolate through its social structure to all levels; and fourth, such country would have to have a sense of direction, purpose, and destiny.

Those are desirable guidelines, but except in one instance they have not been followed. If these desirable guidelines had been adopted, our program would be infinitely more successful and would have far more support by the American people and in the Congress than it appears to have.

Let me say in conclusion that it is difficult for some of us to be wholly enthusiastic about scattering our funds generously in all parts of the world when we are cutting down our own essential programs at home, when for example the administration has sought to eliminate even the milk program for our children, and cuts out other authorized projects which our own people need. It is difficult, therefore, to work up any fervor for far more lavish projects abroad, for which there is often doubtful validity. That is probably the most compelling reason why so many of us have doubts about the foreign aid program today. I consider that our first obligation is to the folks at home. Nevertheless I have sought to improve the foreign aid program to weigh its importance in relation to our domestic needs but not to weaken it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Alaska. I also appreciate his efforts, with which I frequently agree. I appreciate his dedication to strengthening the foreign aid program.

I am sure that mistakes have been made in the foreign aid program. Mistakes have also been made in the military program. The Senator knows that hundreds of millions of dollars—perhaps billions of dollars—have been wasted by the military at various times, in the wrong kind of shells, the wrong kind of planes, the wrong kind of tanks, or the wrong kind of ships. Fuel has been wasted. Planes have been wasted. However, but just because it has not been completely successful or completely effective, or because we can point out corruption, inefficiency, or bad judgment, we do not suddenly cut out the whole military program.

As the Senator knows, the defense budget this year will be $58.6 billion.

I agree with the Senator that the program has not always been administered in the best possible way. It is administered by human beings. General Electric has made mistakes. General Motors has made mistakes. All of us as Senators have made mistakes because we are human beings. The foreign aid program will make mistakes, too. But if we look at the overall picture of foreign aid over the past 20 years, we know that it has benefited not only people all around the world, but also ourselves. That is what I think is to our best interests.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks prompted in part by the statement of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

As one who has supported every foreign aid program beginning with the Marshall plan, I do not feel that the votes I cast yesterday are calculated to tear the program apart. The two important votes yesterday dealt with the

Development Loan Fund, one with respect to the amount available and the other with respect to the interest rate.

I do not know to what extent all Members of the Senate have studied the programs. Certain members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have studied them in detail, of course. I hold in my hand only one of the several compilations which were available, some in confidential form.

Does the Senate realize that many of these loans, at these unreasonably low interest rates, are made to our largest U.S. corporations for investment abroad?

They are made to concerns—I shall not name them because I do not criticize them, and to name them in this context might be interpreted by some as criticism—whose securities are on the board in the New York Stock Exchange, corporations which could sell their stock in the United States and raise their own money, corporations which, in fact, could borrow within the countries where they expect to make investments.

Please understand that not all loans, not even a majority of the loans, are made to U.S. corporations. But, I say that when a large U.S. corporation with unprecedented profits flowing into its coffers wishes to make an investment abroad, there should be a limit to the subsidy which the American taxpayers should be called upon to supply.

Shall we continue to loan money at 1 percent when there are people in our own country—like the expectant mother who came to me this week complaining that she and her husband could not obtain a GI loan to build a home in which to rear the child. We should think of what effect current policies are having here at home.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, just out of curiosity concerning his presentation?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I am somewhat amazed at what the Senator is saying. Is it not because the American company is really the builder of the project, but the recipient nation must pay back the bill—the benefits, or whatever it is being built, because of our interest to see that the money is spent in America through an American firm. Naturally, the project will have to be built depending entirely upon the economic situation in the recipient country and how we feel about that country. But they have to pay back the debt. In other words, this is not a loan made to the American company. The loan is made to the country. The company is the beneficiary because it is contracting and it is the company that will do the building. That is the way I understand it. I have gone into this thoroughly myself. I am on the committee, too, that listens to this.

Mr. GORE. Well, Mr. President, the situation which the able senior Senator from Rhode Island describes certainly prevails in many cases, but by no means all. Loans are made for which the United States corporations or the foreign subsidiaries of a large United States corporations are the direct beneficiaries.

Here is the modus vivendi of repayment. The corporation which invests, let us say, in Brazil, repays the loan, not to the United States but to the Government of Brazil. The corporation repays the loan but with a grace period, not over a 40-year period, but in 15 years to the Government of Brazil. It is the Government of Brazil, then, which enjoys the long and very generous period of repayment, not the U.S. corporation that really obtains the credit at comparatively low rates for capital investment abroad.

This is presented to us and justified to us on the ground that that country has a great problem of balance of payments. Well, the United States has a slight problem of balance of payments, too.

It has not been submitted to the satisfaction of some members of the committee that a U.S. corporation with vast investments already in existence in a given country could not borrow within that country.

But, this is only one of the questions. The question of amount, I think, is only one of the questions involved. That was in one of the amendments. When the United States has an enormous financial drain burdening it, and when the President calls the leaders of Congress together and admonishes them to reduce governmental programs here at home that go to the very essence of our social welfare, then it may be prudent for Congress to seek some ways to reduce this particular program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think, if United States corporations desire to invest, they should be willing to borrow their own funds on their own debentures, rather than seek subsidy from the U.S. Treasury. This reduction would not seriously harm the program.

What about the interest rates? I do not subscribe to policies which have brought about artificially high interest rates, which have restricted credit and tightened the supply of money. Interest rates are artificially high, pushed to present unreasonable rates by government programs and actions or the lack thereof.

Shall the foreign aid program, shall foreign loans, be the only exceptions to the extra toll the use of money is taking now?

It seems to me the program started with some relationship to the cost of borrowing in the United States. That cost of borrowing on the part of the United States Government has drastically increased.

The amendment adopted yesterday raises the interest rate from 1 to 2 percent for the first 10 years of such loans. This may hinder some projects, but in every State of the Union there are counties and cities galore that are postponing projects to build schools, hospitals, and water systems because of high interest rates.

In every community in this country there are men and women who want to build homes. The desire to build homes is not less than it was 5 years ago. It is more. But there now is the lowest rate of home construction in 5 years. Why? Because lumber is in short supply? No. Because bricks are in short supply? No. Because of the high interest rates and the unavailability of money for home mortgages.

So I say, while we consider raising the interest rates under the bill from 1 to 2 percent, think of the small businessmen, in America, many of whom are now paying 8 percent. Think of young fathers and mothers who desire to build homes but are unable to do so because of the policies which our Government has pursued.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Would it not be safe to say that when the businessmen pay 8-percent interest, this is only the start; that the ultimate consumer will be the one who will be paying the 8 percent, because of the increase in the cost of the product he will buy from that company?

Mr. GORE. Of course.

Mr. MILLER. So we have this situation——

Mr. GORE. If I may interrupt, the high interest rate is a very important cause of the rise in the cost of living.

Mr. MILLER. So we have this unfortunate situation. We have high interest rates which ultimately are going to be borne by the general consumer, and we have the reason for that increase in interest rates in the form of inflation, because inflation always brings increases in interest rates, and the general consumer will absorb them.

I wish to make the point with my colleague that if he will trace where inflation comes from, he will end up finding its cause in the Congress, because in every case the majority of the Members of Congress have voted to run our Government deeper and deeper into debt year after year. It is such a foundation for inflation which brings about high interest rates.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall close by saying that I expect to vote for passage of the bill, as I have voted for all foreign aid bills. I am beginning to have some doubts, I may say. We seem to have as good relations if not better, with countries we have not aided as with those we have aided. But as one who has supported the bill, and still expects to do so, I do not wish to sit still when the charge is made that I am tearing down the program when I wish to bring about a reduction which I hope will result in American corporations borrowing their own money upon their own vast resources, and raising interest rates just a little. The increase in interest rates is not equal to the rise in the effective interest rates in the United States, but the increase in the interest rates now in the bill are a small increase, in an effort

to bring about some ratio between the rates at which the money is borrowed by the U.S. Treasury and the rates at which the loans are repaid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Pursuant to the discussion of the Senator from Tennessee on interest rates, there appear, on page 322 of the transcript of the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, two interesting tables showing the interest rates charged by other countries on loans to different nations of the world.

If my colleagues will look at page 322 of the hearings, they will find that the interest rates charged by Germany, France, Italy, and England by far exceed the 1 percent, and also the 2 percent to which we raised the original 1 percent figure.

I ask unanimous consent that the two tables appearing on page 322 of the transcript of the hearings be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE 7.—*Interest rate structure of official bilateral loan commitments in 1962*

[Millions of dollars]

| Country | Total loans | Interest rates of official lending for more than 1 year | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Less than 1 percent and interest free | 1 to less than 3 percent | 3 to less than 4 percent | 4 to less than 5 percent | 5 to less than 6 percent | 6 to less than 7 percent | 7 percent and more | Not available |
| Austria | 5.8 | | | | | | 5.8 | | |
| Canada | 14.0 | | | | | | 14.0 | | |
| France [1] | 140.7 | 8.6 | 54.2 | 13.4 | 4.0 | 40.9 | 19.6 | | |
| Germany | 315.0 | | 1.0 | 137.3 | 30.5 | 127.2 | 19.0 | | |
| Italy | 112.4 | | | 9.0 | 12.3 | 4.8 | 32.0 | 54.3 | |
| Japan | 183.0 | | | | | 65.3 | 54.4 | 41.4 | 21.9 |
| Netherlands | 17.3 | | | 8.7 | | 7.2 | | | 1.4 |
| Portugal [1] | 39.4 | 1.4 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 22.3 | 3.7 | 1.4 | .5 | |
| United Kingdom | 356.5 | 26.3 | | | | 52.3 | 270.7 | | 7.2 |
| United States | 1,700.0 | 988.0 | 30.0 | 117.0 | 106.0 | 452.0 | 8.0 | | |
| Total of above industrial OECD countries | 2,884.1 | 1,024.3 | 92.2 | 288.5 | 175.1 | 753.4 | 424.9 | 96.2 | 30.5 |

[1] Gross disbursement data.

Source: "The Flow of Financial Resources to Less-Developed Countries, 1956–63," Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, p. 152.

TABLE 8.—*Interest rate structure of official bilateral loan commitments in 1963*

[Millions of dollars]

| Country | Total loans | Interest rates of official lending for more than 1 year | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Less than 1 percent and interest free | 1 to less than 3 percent | 3 to less than 4 percent | 4 to less than 5 percent | 5 to less than 6 percent | 6 to less than 7 percent | 7 percent and more | Not available |
| Austria | 0.9 | | | 0.9 | | | | | |
| Belgium [1] | 3.1 | 1.8 | | 1.3 | | | | | |
| Canada | 81.6 | | | | | | 81.6 | | |
| France [1] | 174.1 | 1.4 | 45.6 | 55.7 | 2.8 | 53.7 | 14.3 | | 0.6 |
| Germany | 523.5 | | 14.0 | 279.0 | 16.0 | 145.0 | 64.5 | 5.0 | |
| Italy | 140.3 | | | | 2.3 | 87.8 | 26.3 | 23.9 | |
| Japan | 218.1 | | | | 4.5 | 132.0 | 81.4 | .2 | |
| Netherlands | 20.6 | | | 2.9 | 2.6 | 13.7 | | | 1.4 |
| Norway | .5 | | | | | | | | .5 |
| Portugal | 44.7 | | | 42.0 | 2.7 | | | | |
| Sweden | 2.2 | | 2.2 | | | | | | |
| Switzerland | 5.8 | | | | 5.8 | | | | |
| United Kingdom | 240.7 | 6.6 | 50.8 | 9.8 | 1.6 | 166.5 | | | 5.4 |
| United States | 1,515.0 | 1,040.0 | 75.0 | 112.0 | 3.0 | 283.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | |
| Total of above industrial OECD countries | 2,971.1 | 1,049.8 | 187.6 | 503.6 | 41.3 | 881.7 | 269.1 | 30.1 | 7.9 |

[1] For Belgium and France, gross disbursement data have been used.

Source: The Flow of Financial Resources to Less-Developed Countries, 1956–63, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, p. 153.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I might suggest, if he does not mind, that it was upon a motion offered by him, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], that the amortization interest rate after the grace period was raised from 2½ to 3 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I completely associate myself with the remarks the Senator from Tennessee has made. They are a partial and very effective answer to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

I wish to make a few comments on the Senator's time, because the Senator from New York must return to his office, and I have notified him that I wish to make certain replies to his speech. So far as his criticisms of those of us who have been voting to improve the foreign aid program by amendments are concerned, I completely disagree with his point of view.

In my judgment, those who are doing great injury to the foreign aid program of this country are those who have spoken this afternoon in support of the point of view of the Senator from New York, for they are among those Senators who have taken the position here in the Senate that there should be foreign aid, at any cost, and have been in favor of granting great authority to the administration to run foreign aid in any way it wants to. They are the very Senators, these ardent advocates of blank-check foreign aid who for the most part have not supported those amendments. Some of them have not spoken. They have supported the position of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Let me say to the Senator from New York that, in my opinion, it is those who are criticizing and opposing our efforts to improve the foreign aid program through necessary amendments who are doing great harm to the foreign aid program. We do not have to yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], or the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], or the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], or the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], or any of the rest of them who, for the most part, have been voting for blank-check foreign aid as it comes from the administration, and who have failed to support our amendments in order to adopt reforms that foreign aid should have.

I say to my good friend from New York—and he knows we are good friends—that he has an obligation to come forward with a bill of particulars as to what we need to do to improve foreign aid, instead of making the general statement he makes in this speech of his, which I think is a statement of confession and avoidance—and he is a lawyer, and knows what I mean.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. As soon as I complete my charge.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thought the Senator said he wanted some information.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Oregon, after which I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Indiana. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator says in his speech, "The foreign aid program has not been completely successful," I am glad he recognizes that. When he says, "There has been corruption," I am glad he recognizes that. When he says, "There have been abuses of other kinds in some of the recipient countries," I am glad he recognizes that.

He continues:

> But if we consider the program as a whole—what is at stake, what has been accomplished—I believe we will conclude that it has been a significant success, and made a major difference in the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

Mr. President, I believe he needs a bill of particulars on that.

Let me say to my friend from New York that I believe it has been a success in some areas, and it has been a shocking failure in some areas; and the Senator from New York ought to be in here, working shoulder to shoulder with us, in trying to get some reforms adopted in the aid program to eliminate those abuses, so that he and I and the rest of us can go forward with a foreign aid program double the amount that we are now spending.

The Senator from Oregon, for the last few years, has said he is willing to vote for three times the amount of money now spent for foreign aid, if we will clean it up.

I wish to say that the first obligation of the Senator from New York is to help us clean it up first, before he comes to the floor of the Senate in what is obviously a blitzkreig on the part of the administration to stop us from cleaning up foreign aid this year.

Now is the time, may I say to my friend from New York, that we ought to clean it up. Now is the time he should be supporting reforms in foreign aid, instead of giving us this very generalized speech, making a great emotional appeal for the morality of foreign aid.

I agree on its morality in principle. But I wish to say to the Senator, I cannot see how I can, support this foreign aid bill as it has come up here, when we cannot get any support from the administration to reform foreign aid.

I did not hear the Senator mention a thing about the evidence of the Comptroller General that has been submitted year after year in regard to the inefficiency, the waste, and the corruption in foreign aid.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to reclaim the floor.

Mr. MORSE. The Comptroller General referred more directly to the military program, but I wish to say that economic aid, too, is wasteful.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not yield further, lest I get caught in this crossfire.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have not even looked at the Senator from Tennessee yet. I have only been looking at the Senator from New York.

Mr. GORE. I promised to yield, some bit ago, to the distinguished Senator from Indiana. Then I shall yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has already yielded to the Senator from New York. I have lots more I wish to say to him, but I am willing to do it on my own time. However, I think it is only fair that he have an opportunity to comment on what I have already said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oregon. I do not wish to be unfair to the Senator from New York, and I shall not so be, but I think those gems of the Senator from New York will be sufficiently imperishable that I may live up to my commitment to yield first to the Senator from Indiana; and I am sure that the Senator from New York will use the time the better to prepare his response.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to continue to speak?

Mr. GORE. I wish to yield now to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I asked the Senator to yield to me sometime before this last exchange started.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I would like for the Senator from Tennessee to yield to me for a comment on the original remarks which the Senator from Tennessee made.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I gather that the remarks of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York will probably be quite extended, and will not involve what I wish to talk about.

First, I commend the Senator from Tennessee for his outstanding analysis of the problem with regard to interest rates. I point out, for the information of the Senate, that before the matter is concluded, I intend to offer an amendment affording another opportunity for some of those who have, it is claimed, gutted this bill, to make equal—more equal, at least—the interest rates our American people are required to pay at home with those the people from some of the foreign countries concerned are required to pay. But that will come at a later time.

I wish to say that those of us who have asked certain questions, those of us who are really for the first time saying no to some of the things being asked in this bill, are following more or less what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has stated. He has done this numerous times; I should like to try to pull it all together once more.

I think I can do this without taking too much time away from the fine deliberations of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New York.

There was a letter addressesd to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] by the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, which said exactly the opposite of what he had said before in regard to how we got involved in Vietnam.

As we go through the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, we find a statement there by Hon. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, in which he makes this voluntary statement—and this is not in answer to any specific question, but it is a voluntary statement, made by the Secretary of State, during the hearings on the supplemental foreign aid bill.

He asks this question, in bold type: "Why are we in Vietnam?"

Then he says, on page 567:

> It is this fundamental SEATO obligation that has, from the outset, guided our actions in South Vietnam.

Here is the remarkable portion of what has always been admitted, and what causes all of the difficulty for so many of us who are now questioning this legislation. On page 568, he voluntarily states—and I am quoting from the hearings:

> On October 1, 1954, President Eisenhower wrote to President Diem, offering "to assist the government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

This is a voluntary reference to a letter from the President of the United States, President Eisenhower, to President Diem. The thing about it is that it is pulled out of context. It does not point to the true facts.

The true fact is that when you read that letter, the message to President Diem was a commitment on foreign aid, which got us involved in Vietnam. This was the whole point of it. This is the origin of it, and there is no language to the contrary which denies it.

In fact, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, before he became confronted with this problem that it would affect the foreign aid bill, said differently at Las Vegas, and that is why the Las Vegas speech is so important. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has put that in the record.

But let me read the portion of that statement from President Eisenhower which they do not like to discuss at this time. It is in the background information relating to southeast Asia and Vietnam:

> The Secretary advised the 89th Congress, the Second Session, "the purpose of this offer"—

This is the offer of foreign assistance, right in this letter—

> "is to assist the Government of Vietnam."

You see, he has left out the purpose of the offer. The offer was a commitment on a condition. That offer of foreign aid and the offer of assistance was on a condition. The condition stated here was never met.

But we have gone ahead and put our military forces in to back up this offer. This cannot be denied. It is in the *record*.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas for bringing this to the attention of the Senate. If this is to be the reason for the foreign aid, and we are going to back it up with the lives of American boys, without help from any of the other nations of the world, I think it is high time we call all these people to question, and I will excuse the Senator from New York if he did not understand this full background. I think it is all right to criticize those of us who voted yesterday, but if he wants to have a study, let him have a study. But the time has now come to vote; he is not going to have time to make that study before the vote on final passage of this measure. As for myself, I, for the first time since I have been in the Senate, will cast my vote against it. I am not going to do it with any reluctance, nor am I going to change my mind with any arm-twisting or criticism.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been advised by the able junior Senator from New York that he will seek the floor in his own right. Therefore, I shall close my remarks in order that he may have an opportunity to respond to the statements of the senior Senator from Oregon.

Just briefly, before doing so, since I have referred to interest rates, let me remind the Senate that on yesterday President Johnson held a press conference during which he was asked about high interest rates, slowdown in housing, and related matters. Somehow, from the President's response the impression that Congress was at fault seemed to be conveyed. Secretary Fowler, it seems, a few days ago asked Congress to take some action. As I examine the action he has requested, it is certainly minor if not innocuous. It might actually result in increasing interest rates, rather than in decreasing them.

Where does the fault, the responsibility for these unreasonably high interest rates lie? I should like to remind the Senate that President Roosevelt led this country through World War II with reasonable interest rates. President Truman led this country through the conflict in Korea with reasonable interest rates. Recently, President Johnson had an opportunity to appoint a man to the Federal Reserve Board, a man who would constitute the balance of power between the tight money advocates and those who wish a more reasonable structure and policy. What have we heard from the new man—tighter money, higher interest rates. It is impossible to conclude that this is not administration policy. The evidence is overwhelming.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator asked a question. Is it not true that officially it is our fault, and as a practical matter it is the fault of the President? That is the answer to the question.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am not going to deny responsibility. Under the Constitution it is clearly the responsibility of Congress, but unfortunately this power has devolved upon the President and upon the Federal Reserve Board.

I do not wish to be supercritical. I plead for some relief so that fathers and mothers can build homes, so that communities can build community facilities, schools, hospitals, sewage disposal systems, and fresh water systems, and so that we will be able to stop this trend of concentration of the Nation's wealth into the hands of a mere few.

Who suffers from this policy? It is the people who need to borrow money to build homes and the people who must buy a refrigerator, a stove, and household appliances for their families. It is the people who must buy automobiles with which to go to work and the small businessmen who need to buy trucks and equipment to build buildings.

It is these people, the mass of our people, who are suffering from these policies. Yet we hear the cry in the Senate that we are wrecking the foreign aid program when we raise the interest rate on the foreign loans from 1 percent to 2 percent.

Ask the mother who comes to me and complains that she and her husband, the GI, cannot get a loan to build a home. Ask those few who are able to obtain a home mortgage loan how much they have to pay under the table in discount rates. Even the discount rate is more than 2 percent.

Mr. President, lest I wax warm on this subject, I am going to exercise some self-discipline and listen to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I probably take my own life in my hands, by intervening in the debate between Members of the majority party. I have listened to the debate with interest and some joy. However, I do want to say that I think the Senator from New York has made a very notable speech this afternoon. There is no question that it was a good speech. It has stirred a storm. It has struck sparks and has caused some thinking.

Chiefly, I think it a good speech because he has turned the minds of Senators toward the original purposes of the foreign aid program—purposes which have been enunciated, as the Senator from Rhode Island said, by four Presidents.

I have had the honor of serving in the Senate when President Truman, President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson voiced the same aims which the Senator from New York has recalled so eloquently today.

Its purposes are to help other countries develop and advance the living conditions of their people. And it is in our interest to assist peaceful growth and association of free countries.

I do not think the Senator's speech should be interpreted as neglecting the necessity of reforms and improvements. Every time the foreign aid bill is debated some reforms are included and many are suggested. I pay my tribute to the Senator from Oregon and to the Senator from Arkansas for their efforts toward reform commenced several years ago. Others have proposed reforms.

In 1963 Congress agreed to an amendment which I submitted to establish a special committee similar to the one the Senator from New York proposes. It required an examination of the program in every country and a report whether aid should be continued or discontinued in specific countries.

This year the debate has taken a new turn. The war in Vietnam—and, of course, it overshadows everything else—has entered into the debate, ironically, as an argument to abolish or critically reduce foreign aid as a peaceful arm of foreign policy.

In saying this, I want to make it clear that I believe the cost of the war—approximately $20 billion a year—must be considered as we vote on the total cost of this foreign aid bill.

I did not vote for the cut yesterday because I thought it was too large. However, I will vote for cuts that might be proposed in the days that follow in this debate, if they do not destroy the program.

Another factor has entered this debate and moves against the bill, which I do not think valid in passing judgment on the merits of the bill. It is the resentment against the war in Vietnam and the opposition to certain policies of the administration.

Some in the Congress now argue that the United States has entered new fields of policy and action, internationally. They argue that the U.S. policy is to gain its objectives by armed power.

I have disagreed with some of the specific actions of the administration—the resumption and extension of bombing. I urged negotiation before we were so largely committed, and shall continue to do so.

But I do not believe our country, or the President, has adopted a policy of achieving its objectives by power and force.

If there are those who consider that such a new policy has been adopted by our country—and there are some throughout the world who believe it—then I would argue even more that we ought to support a reasonable program on foreign aid, to hold out a generous and peaceful hand to other nations of the world, and not foster the idea, either in Congress or in the country, or in the world, that the United States has changed its policy of friendship and association with other countries which we believe leads toward peace.

So I congratulate the Senator from New York on what I consider to be a speech which leads us back toward the true basis of our foreign aid program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I will yield, but first I wish to say how much I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, who has not only had experience in the legislative branch of Government but also in the executive branch of Government, and in my opinion is so highly respected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Senator COOPER and I talked about whether we should intervene. As he represents Kentucky, the buffer State, he has decided for both of us that we should.

I should like to say, very briefly, that I believe it is good and salutary and healthy to be called back to our origins.

As Senator COOPER has said, I have been in this program ever since the Marshall plan days. By tricks of fate, though I was the freshman on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I was one of the managers of the original Marshall plan bill, with Dr. Eaton, chairman of the committee.

I feel that we were particularly lucky with respect to the Marshall plan, in that that dealt with the impact of an enormous sum of money. We committed $17 billion for 4 years, at a relatively narrow target of very highly industrialized and skillful people, and all the mechanics worked. I believe this is very illustrative and is a good object lesson of what the Senator from New York has been talking about, for this reason: We have a duty in this regard. That is really what he is saying.

I believe we have a duty, and to my mind the duty remains paramount, not to let the gap between the poor and the less poor in any way grow so great as to be a moral outrage. That is really what we are engaged in.

In addition, we hope thereby to bring most of the nations into the technology of the modern day.

I might say to the Senator from New York that the trouble has been that we have been very inartistic, we have lacked initiative, we have lacked imagination in how this has been done, and we in Congress have been a lot to blame, in so harassing the successive administrations that they never really had the time and the disposition to get down to attempting to work out a better plan.

One of the reasons I am for a multiyear authorization—and I hope that is what will result from conference—is the sheer elementary ability to allow the executive department to catch its breath and to take a totally new look at a totally different plan for foreign aid. There are many component parts of that, especially the private enterprise part. I am grateful to Senator FULBRIGHT for having worked constantly with me over the years in the repeated private enterprise amendments, in the effort to bring private enterprise into effective participation in the foreign aid program, which has not yet been done.

I might also say that other ideas, like the executive service corps of our older executives, the greater utilization of the Peace Corps and of technical assistance generally, the idea of consortia of receiving nations as well as consortia of giving nations—all these ideas have not adequately been explored.

Finally, I point out that foreign aid cannot stand alone. The world today is hung up on a cross of gold, in terms of international trade. Britain is having tremendous problems with the pound. Unless contemporaneous efforts are made to help to deal with those massive problems, no amount of foreign aid would help in many of the underdeveloped areas.

Yet, there has been enormous progress. There would not be even this much of a gap between the rich and the poor—the gap would be infinitely greater—had it not been for foreign aid.

I therefore say this to the Senator from New York: I believe the burden upon him and others who have spoken in general support of that position is not to show that this method is the best, that it is the optimum, that it has been completely successful everywhere it has been used. It is to show that it is necessary, and to show that on balance we are better off doing it than not doing it. I think the burden has been overwhelmingly maintained by the people on our side. I beseech those who are the most ardent opponents of it, whether they have in mind the arguments Senator COOPER has said they have in mind—opposition to the Vietnam war or the traditional opposition to foreign aid—or whatever motivates them—to recognize the intelligence of giving an interregnum of some form of multiyear authorization which would allow us at least to be able to ask, with reason, for a totally different approach, for a different way of handling it, for a more efficient and a tighter ship than has been run up to now.

But even with the losses we have had—I believe that we are probably wasting somewhere in the area of 10 to 20 percent of foreign aid—on balance it is still absolutely indispensable to the future of America, to the security of America, and to America's moral obligation to the world.

I join my colleagues in expressing to the Senator from New York, as his colleague, my satisfaction that he has sparked debate upon this high level of the basic principles which it is always necessary to repair to.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the remarks of the senior Senator from New York. He has said in an eloquent way what many of us have tried to say over some period of time.

The Senator from Oregon has made some statements about me, and I believe he will have more to say about me in a few minutes. I wish to take a little time to talk about some of the remarks he has made. I also wish to refer to something that the Senator from Indiana has said.

I have been accused of many things in my life, and the Senator from Oregon said that I was participating in a blitzkrieg with the administration. That is the first time I have been accused of that, and I thank the Senator from Oregon. Since I have been in the Senate, I have never heard that said about me.

Mr. MORSE. I did not make the speech. The Senator from New York did.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe that the Senator from Indiana spoke about the fact that the aid program and the aid or assistance that has been given to Vietnam might have caused the difficulty that we face in Vietnam at the present time.

I said earlier that if we look back upon the mistakes that have been made over the period of the last 10 years in Vietnam, perhaps by each administration, I believe that if we examine that—even though the Senator from Indiana disagrees with some of the things that are going on in that country now and what we are doing, as I do—I do not believe that we could honestly reach the conclusion that the fact that we gave aid or assistance to that country played a major role.

But even assuming that it did, we should go back to the fact that we gave aid and assistance to France after the Second World War. I believe that was worthwhile. We gave aid and assistance to Germany. We have given aid and assistance to many countries around the world, and this has not involved us in conflicts. It was in our national interest at that time, and it is in our national interest now.

Even assuming that the Senator from Indiana is correct, the fact that we became involved does not seem to me sufficient basis to cut off our whole aid program and to say that our aid program is not effective, any more than because we have not been successful completely in every military program we should decide not to have a military program in the United States.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I did not say that it was the aid program and it was the intention of the aid program, but that President Eisenhower wrote a letter to have us involved in the war.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand that.

Mr. HARTKE. The point was that it was the Secretary of State—the now Secretary of State, in 1966—who has said that the reason that we are there and the reason for the escalation in the continuation of this effort there on a military basis is the commitment which was made by President Eisenhower.

What I pointed out was that there was an obvious omission rather than an intentional oversight. It is hard for me to see how anyone could miss the first few words of a paragraph which was inserted into the supplemental authorization hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Just before these hearings the Secretary of State went to Las Vegas and stated that one of the reasons we are in Vietnam is because of the aid program which started with this commitment by President Eisenhower in 1954.

I do not want to vote foreign aid money with the thought you are going out there and do what I have seen

done in Liberia. There I saw the young doctor go in there at $3,900 a year helping lepers. That is wonderful. I am for that. I am for feeding the hungry and educating the uneducated. But I am not for going ahead and giving many amounts in a foreign aid authorization in which the Secretary of State under this administration, who is to administer the program, says that this is the reason for us to be involved in the internal affairs and in the determination of the future of those people. I think that is wrong. I do not want to be a part of it. I do not ask the Senator from New York to make up his mind. He can cast his vote if he wishes. I do not want anyone to say that I have had a change of heart or attitude until this administration indicates that they are going to change their policies. I do not want to be a part of it.

I want to bring a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. I would like to see the money in foreign aid used for peace. I would like to see it used to build human bodies and human life and not to see it destroy human bodies and human life.

Once we come back to a program of building I will be for it, and not for 1 year but for 4 years—as my dear friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] advocates, who is looking at me.

But I do not want to be there today under a program which is dedicating itself to a policy that I cannot subscribe to in any form whatsoever.

(At this point, Mr. GORE assumed the chair.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should first like to make a comment on the statement of the Senator from Indiana.

I think that we can all reach our conclusions as to why we are involved in Vietnam, and as to when mistakes were made. I do not think that anybody in the Senate feels, even if we disagree with what is going on in Vietnam, that it was the fault of President Eisenhower, or that it all goes back to the fact that we should not have given assistance.

Maybe that was a contributory factor, but certainly it was no more than that.

Moreover, the bill includes on page 2 a statement which places the Congress on record that—

> The furnishing of economic or military assistance is not to be construed as creating a commitment, or as affecting any existing commitment, to use U.S. armed forces to defend another country.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a question in connection with some of the matters about which he spoke. The Senator said that I had not set forth any specific ideas about foreign aid. The Senator remembers that I made a speech on Latin America which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was kind enough to remark about, in which I set forth my thoughts in connection with Latin America. The Senator was kind enough to comment on that speech because I pleaded for some of the programs in connection with suggestions I have in the field of foreign affairs. I would be glad, if the Senator would be interested, in sending him a copy of that speech.

Mr. MORSE. I can almost quote it to the Senator. It is not applicable to the criticism that I made of the speech.

I am asking the Senator to make a bill of particulars with reference with what he proposes to do about abuses. I have made references to abuses in foreign aid which I think must be cleared up before there is voted additional millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, for a large part to be wasted again.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand that a number of those who voted for cuts over the last 48 hours, and a number of those who made statements, said they were in favor of the principle of foreign aid, and that they were in favor of increasing it if it were handled in a different fashion.

Would the Senators who feel that way be willing to offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate that many of us could support—such as the Senator from Oregon, who studied this matter for a long time—increasing assistance in foreign aid and with, perhaps, the safeguards that the Senator feels are necessary?

Would the Senator from Oregon be in favor of increasing the appropriation for aid by a billion dollars?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether it would be by a billion dollars. I do not know whether they could wisely spend that much money in 1 year. But that avoids the major premise of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Woods said they could use $3 or $4 billion more. That is an international organization.

Would the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and others be in favor of offering an amendment to the Senate increasing aid by a billion dollars and having it administered through IDA? I would support that.

Mr. MORSE. I would vote to increase the program for IDA in whatever amount they can show on a plan that they submit to us that they can wisely spend. There would first have to be a condition precedent adopted in this entire foreign aid program, and that is that we eliminate abuses. The Senator admits that there are abuses in the foreign aid program.

I am not going to vote to increase foreign aid or vote for giving the President this foreign aid bill until they first clean up foreign aid. That is the first thing that should be done.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Why does not the Senator offer the amendments? If they are accepted, fine. That is, the amendments that clean it up.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If I may complete my statement. They could be offered up or down, but at the same time, if the Senator from Oregon is in favor of foreign aid, he could offer an amendment and perhaps join with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations—joining with him and offering an amendment to increase foreign aid by $1 billion and have it go to IDA.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator finished?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Temporarily.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator has a good memory, but he is forgetting. The Senator from Oregon has stood on this floor for some 3 or 4 years now offering amendments to try to get reforms in foreign aid. I say regretfully on many of those occasions I did not have the vote of the Senator or many other Senators, other Senators who are objecting because we suceeded in cutting the foreign aid bill yesterday.

I think that what we need to do first is clean up the foreign aid bill and then enlarge the foreign aid money that we appropriate for it.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would be very impressed if those members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who study this problem and find difficulties with foreign aid as it is presently administered would come in with a program—either the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Senator from Oregon, who says he would be in favor of increasing foreign aid—and offer those amendments to increase the foreign aid on a basis which would be acceptable.

I have not seen the amendment, at least not in the last few days, saying that they would increase it under these circumstances.

Mr. MORSE. Last year we came before the Senate with a committee report which set out a bill of particulars for needed reforms. That is why we offered the Fulbright-Morse amendment to amend the foreign aid bill in 1963 which proposed a 2-year period to get reforms.

We got it through the Senate. It was lost in the House. Who blocked it in the House? The Johnson administration blocked it in the House. If we could have gotten that reform program adopted, the Senator from New York and I—I am willing to venture—would not be having any difference of opinion tonight, because our objectives on foreign aid are the same. I am simply not going to go along with him, however, in voting for the request of the administration to continue foreign aid which will only waste additional millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

I am going to set forth, on my own time, shortly, my reasons for that, and I should like to have the Senator from New York in the Chamber when I do. I think that we have an obligation, first, to adopt procedural reforms in the Senate along the lines of the recommendations of the Comptroller General in the stack of adverse reports which stand better than 24 inches high.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Let me say that it would be helpful to me if the Senator from Oregon came in with a positive program—to include in an amendment—not just dealing with what he feels are imperfections in the program in the past, but what he thinks would be the kind of foreign aid program the Senator says he is in favor of.

Mr. MORSE. I have said it with a multiplicity of suggestions——

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If the Senator will permit me to finish—would he?

Mr. MORSE. Go ahead.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Perhaps an appropriation of $4 billion would then be satisfactory to the Senator. I should like to see that from members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who support some of these cuts.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I am going to reply to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. But I have the floor. Of course, I want the Senator from Oregon to have every chance and opportunity to reply.

Mr. MORSE. On my own time, I shall do so. I hope that the Senator will be in the Chamber, so that I can reply to him in detail.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I still have the floor, and I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I realize that we would all like the administrative operations of the Government to be beyond pale and beyond criticism. However, to take the position taken by the Senator from Oregon that he is going to oppose the entire program because the administrative improvements recommended by the General Accounting Office have not been adopted seems to me to be inconsistent.

On some of the major legislative fights I have been side by side with the Senator. I refer specifically to the fight in which the Senator from New York and myself both supported the Senator from Oregon, involving aid to dependent children of unemployed parents in the District of Columbia.

The prime reason why we lost, I might add, is that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was able to bring forth a preponderance of evidence of 2 or 3 years ago, based upon General Accounting Office examinations of the program in the District of Columbia, that there had been extremely poor administration of the program, so poor indeed that a majority of Senators disagreed with the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from New York in our efforts to have it instituted regardless, because we thought that the children of the District of Columbia deserved some help even if there was some poor administration going on in the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia.

We are talking about foreign aid, not just some children in the District of Columbia. We are talking about children on the verge of starvation in many areas of the world. It occurs to me that the argument is not entirely consistent on the part of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to take too much time but with regard to the specific proposal I have already mentioned, I approve of that and the Senate has already approved our providing some aid through IDA. There are provisions in this bill relating to additional aid through the multilateral agencies. I would be willing to provide more aid through the United Nations Special Fund. IDA happens to be ready, willing, and available for this purpose.

The purpose was to develop, in the first instance, a technique and method by which we could make available larger sums than our regular contribution, and they could administer it through IDA, without upsetting its international character.

It is a serious problem. I have talked about it to both Mr. Woods and Mr. Black on several occasions.

I would be willing to join the Senator in an amendment, if he wishes to propose one, to make our bilateral development funds available to IDA. I do not think we will get anywhere with an abrupt approach of that kind, but I will support it. I only took the more modest approach because I thought it more likely to succeed. It was approved during the authorization process but it did not succeed when it ran into the traditional opposition of the Appropriations Committee of the House. The administration was lukewarm about it. I think they might have influenced that committee. Certainly, I could not. But I do not think I made it clear in my statement that AID's trouble is not just a relatively minor thing—there are some serious defects primarily in judgment—which afflict this program. It is the natural character of it.

I do not believe, even if we had better administration today, that I could continue to support a bilateral—unilateral, really—program for intervention in so many countries. Aid should be on a multilateral basis, for the same reasons that the United Nations is more capable than the United States in assuming the role of world policeman.

It is too late for the United States to assume the white man's burden, to try to step into the shoes of Great Britain during the last century, but I think that we want to be doing something in that direction. I disapprove of it. I think that we should rely on the United Nations in that field. We should use the international organizations for the dispensation of aid.

I simply do not approve of this great country continuing to intervene unilaterally in the affairs of other countries through aid, or through any other means, for that matter. However, aid happens to be the subject under consideration. And we have had millions of dollars wasted under this program, but this is inevitable in view of the process by which our aid is dispensed.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator from Arkansas is very highly regarded in this body—especially by me. His views on this subject carry much weight with me. I do not know if it is appropriate to ask the Senator from Arkansas this question. He has been studying this subject. Let me say to him that what I am concerned about is the fact that those who feel they are for foreign aid but do not like the present administration combining with those who are against foreign aid anyway, are going to represent a majority of the Senate, and will continue to represent a majority of the Senate.

The foreign aid program, in my judgment—even though I think changes should be made—has been to our overall interest and the interest of the rest of the world, and will be for the next generation. It should continue, but that program is going to continue to be cut particularly if no major effort is made for better administration.

But what I was going to ask the Senator, was if it would be appropriate for the Senator from Arkansas, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, not this year, perhaps, to come to the Senate with a program that he would accept which would be in the magnitude he has described during the course of the exchanges in this Chamber this afternoon, and which he would also feel would be acceptable to a majority of Senators, or would be acceptable to those in the Senate who are basically in favor of foreign aid, so that the Senator from Arkansas can join with the rest of us who are anxious to have foreign aid but have seen it whittled away as it has been over the period of the last few days. Could that be possible, for the Senator from Arkansas to come in and make a specific proposal?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not this year. I want to refer to one other point to which I referred a moment ago. I do not wish to leave any illusions about the effect of the Vietnamese war. This is the culmination of a long period of incubation, if you like. I do not wish to review the war since it began, but it had its inception even before the administration of President Eisenhower. It had its inception in 1950, with intervention in favor of the French. It has been a long time growing.

The Government of the United States, including the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State, have made statements in recent weeks that have been, to me at least, extremely distressing. I am very concerned about them. I believe the President's most recent speech—the one made in West Virginia—appears to me to mean—that our Nation is moving toward unilateral intervention in Asia on a permanent basis.

The Vice President has described on two occasions our unilateral responsibilities in this area—not those of the United Nations or regional organizations. This seems like a revival of Pax Britannica; only it is Pax United States. This is a very serious involvement. It is intertwined with our aid program. This point will have to be clarified if I am going to continue to support the program. The utilization of the international organizations for providing aid removes at least

one of the strongest temptations and inducements to the expansion of the ambitions of this country. I do not like to see this country go down the road that other great nations of the world have gone. It is a great temptation, because we do have the physical power to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am not questioning what the Senator has said.

In view of the serious way this is taking its course, I think it would be helpful to the rest of the Senate—I know it would to me—if Senators who have studied this program for a long time and are acquainted with it and who have serious reservations about it, were in a position, at some future time, to make specific legislative proposals as to the kind of program that they would think would be acceptable to them. The exchanges had with both Senators indicate that that might be desirable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator from New York that this cut is not as serious as it may seem. We must go to conference, and the probability is that the amount will come out larger that it now is. I think the cut has been grossly exaggerated in the press.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, first let me say I strongly support the position of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in favor of multilateral aid as opposed to bilateral aid.

I would hope very much, as a result of the colloquy of the chairman and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, that there will be brought before this body, if not during the consideration of this bill, then before Congress adjourns this year, a proposal to increase our Nation's contribution to IDA by a minimum of $1 billion. I would be glad to join in that request.

I do not know whether we could get it through the committee, or through the Senate, but we ought, in good conscience, to try.

Second, I have been impressed by the fact that so much of the criticism of the foreign aid bill has been directed against the administration of the AID program, which does not readily lend itself to a remedy through the legislative process. The position of some Senators has been, "We do not like the way the program is being administered. Therefore, we are going to cut it back."

Last year, by a vote of 78 to 1, the Senate adopted an amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and myself saying that it was our responsibility to close the gap between the economically privileged nations and those trying to achieve a developed economy.

I share the belief of the Senator from New York that the gap between promise and fulfillment, between hope and fulfillment, is growing wider rather than narrower.

While this body does not deserve the sole responsibility for that situation, it shares in the responsibility for it.

My hope is that the speech of the Senator from New York will be the opening gun in a campaign to awaken the conscience of Members of this body to the recognition that it is our duty to share in the responsibility to help the underdeveloped nations of the world.

I have no illusions that we will be able to awaken the conscience of the Senate today. That will have to wait for some years because of the atmosphere in which the foreign aid bill has been considered this year and in recent years.

I have read with interest the speech of the Senator from New York. I am in complete agreement with it. I think that the request for foreign aid funds made by the administration was inadequate. That inadequate request is now being cut back by the Senate.

I could go through the speech of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] paragraph by paragraph and express my complete accord with the position which he takes, with the disappointment which he feels, with the urgency of conscience—and a well developed conscience—which he feels because of the failure of the Senate to do its duty to the American people and to the people of the underdeveloped parts of the world. But that would probably be redundant, because the Senator from New York has said it so well.

I invite the attention of the Senate to an amendment, No. 682, intended to be proposed by the Senator from New York and me, which we may call up at a later time during the debate, merely to intensify the debate on this question of conscience, on this question of duty, and on the question of the obligations of the richest country the world has ever known, and involving the moral principles of the great religions of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of amendment No. 682 be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment (No. 682) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following:

"CHAPTER 3—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 203. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to miscellaneous provisions, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 650. AUTHORIZATION FOR AGGREGATE APPROPRIATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for use in the fiscal year 1967, for furnishing assistance and for administrative expenses under this Act, an aggregate amount equal to 1 per centum of the estimated gross national product of the United States for the preceding calendar year as determined by the President. The supplemental authority provided in the preceding sentence shall take effect when (1) the President determines that the expenditure of such additional funds would be in the national interest and (2) transmits a report setting forth the reasons for such determination to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives'."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment provides that notwithstanding any limitations on the authorizations which are contained in other sections of the bill, the President shall have the power to authorize the expenditure of additional funds up to an amount equal to 1 percent of the estimated gross national product of the United States, after he has come before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and explained why the expenditure of such additional funds would be in the national interest.

In the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on this bill, I undertook to set forth my individual views. I ask unanimous consent that those individual views may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the individual views of Mr. CLARK (Rept. No. 1359) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

6. INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. CLARK

Despite my dissent from a number of amendments made in the committee—in particular, the increase in interest rates, the elimination of 5-year authorizations, and the country number limitations—I joined in voting to report the economic assistance bill. My sole purpose in filing these individual views is to express my deeply felt concern and disappointment about the growing disparity between this Nation's dwindling foreign aid effort and the world's increasing need.

During the height of the Marshall plan, more than 15 years ago, the United States annually devoted nearly 2 percent of its gross national product to foreign economic assistance. The program authorized in the pending bill is roughly one-sixth as large, or about one-third of 1 percent of our GNP.

This sharp cutback is justified neither by a decrease in the need for foreign aid, nor by a reduction of this country's capacity to support a foreign aid program. The very opposite is the case on both counts. Our gross national product was $260 billion in 1949. Estimates for 1967 are in the neighborhood of $720 billion—more than 2½ times as great. Meanwhile the need for foreign aid, spurred by the worldwide population explosion, has grown progressively more acute. It is a cliche to observe that the rich nations have been getting richer and the poor nations have been getting poorer—yet that is precisely the case. Nearly a billion human beings, most of them inhabitants of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, have an average annual income of less than $100. The figure for the United States is more than 25 times larger.

In order to prevent the gap between the need and the effort from widening still further, I offered an amendment in the committee granting authority to expend up to 1 percent of our GNP for foreign economic aid. This amendment was designed to implement a recommendation made by the Committee on Technical Cooperation of the White House Conference on International Cooperation, and is consistent with the United Nations resolution which calls on all developed countries to devote 1 percent of their GNP for development assistance. Fourteen votes were cast against the amendment; only one, my own, was cast in favor.

In part I suspect that our backsliding since the days of the Marshall plan has been due to the unrealistic expectation that the need for foreign aid would shortly come to an end. This is simply not going to happen. As James A. Perkins, the distinguished president of Cornell University and Chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Foreign Aid has written: "We are not discussing a problem to be solved in a year or even a decade. We must consciously adopt a program that will last for the rest of the century—and perhaps into the next. The annual debate on the continuation of foreign assistance is both absurd and misleading. It only confuses our purposes, increases impatience, obscures the issues, and inhibits success. We might as well have an annual

review of the wisdom of having a public school system."

I wholeheartedly agree.

It seems to me that a sharp distinction should be made between our foreign economic aid programs and our foreign military aid programs, and for that reason I am pleased that the committee has chosen to report out separate bills. In my judgment the committee has been almost as generous with military aid as it has been niggardly with economic aid. I do not question the need for military assistance programs, but rather the emphasis. In the long run we shall measure both our security and the extent of the acceptance overseas of American principles of freedom and democracy not by the value of the armaments we have given away but by the extent to which the underdeveloped nations of the world have, with our help, achieved a better life for their people.

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in that regard, I should like to stress what the Senator from New York has said: The amount of 1 percent of our gross national product is far less than what the United States was spending at the time of the Marshall plan in order to relieve distress in the rest of the world. The amount of 1 percent was not plucked out of the air; it specifically implements a recommendation made by the Committee on Technical Cooperation of the White House Conference on International Cooperation, held last November and December, to which I had the privilege of being a congressional delegate. It is, moreover, consistent with the United Nations resolution which calls upon all developed countries to devote 1 percent of their gross national product for development assistance.

In order that the gross amount involved in the amendment which the Senator from New York and I intend to propose may be understood, it would be roughly $7 billion. That is 1 percent of our gross national product for this year, whereas we used to spend from 2 to 2½ percent of our gross national product.

It is on the basis of these facts that I make the comment that I do not believe either the administration or the Senate has done its duty to our own citizens and to the people of the underdeveloped parts of the world.

I close by again commending the Senator from New York for the splendid speech he has made. I also commend Senators who take a different view, because for a few brief hours this afternoon the Senate has engaged in a debate worthy of its great traditions.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make only a few comments tonight about the speech of the Senator from New York, but I shall address myself to it at greater length tomorrow.

I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. President, certain sections of the committee report of last year, minority report of last year and my minority report of this year on foreign aid, which set forth a good many of my proposals for reform in foreign aid, and explain why I have not supported foreign aid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. We had better take a look at the present financial status of the bill. The President sent to us a request for economic aid of $2,469 million. The Foreign Relations Committee reduced it to $2,352 million. As of now, it is reduced to $2,102 million.

That is a far cry from scuttling the bill, may I say to my friend from New York. It leaves a substantial amount for foreign economic aid in the bill.

Nor is this the only form of aid. We have many other aid channels that bring the total at least to $5 billion this year.

Of course, what the Senator from New York and the proponents of the administration's program want is that when the President of the United States sends up a bill for $2,469 million, the Senate should automatically rubberstamp it. But then he loses me on that approach, too. We have a responsibility, in the Foreign Relations Committee, to analyze the President's requests, and we have a responsibility here in the Senate to analyze the recommendations of the Foreign Relations Committee. That is what we are doing.

I can well understand that those who were defeated in the votes feel that they should have won; but apparently they belong to a group that is not accustomed to being defeated. They should sit in my seat for awhile, and defeats would not upset them that much. What they would be concerned about is whether or not, when they are defeated, they are right or wrong, and try and try again.

I shall continue to press, may I say to my friend from New York, for the reforms in the administration of foreign aid for which I have been pressing for several years; and I shall not vote for large appropriations for foreign aid until we can get some efficiency in it, and some of its admitted great mistakes and the corruption in foreign countries resulting from it can be stopped.

The appropriation request for 1966, for the economic aspects of foreign aid, was $2.463 billion. I respectfully submit that when we consider the financial problems that confront this country today, we certainly owe it to the American taxpayers to appropriate at least $400 million to $500 million less for foreign economic aid this year than we appropriated last year. Somebody had better start thinking about the American taxpayer's rights and interests in this matter, to have some protection and say something about what the American taxpayer is entitled to by way of a domestic aid program, which he is not going to get if we follow this administration's program.

Take military aid. Last year the military appropriation of 1966 was $1,170 million, including Vietnam. This year, the administration is requesting $917 million, not including Vietnam, which means a greater amount of money than asked for last year, when we take into account Vietnam.

The Foreign Relations Committee has reduced the military aid program to $892 million, which is not enough. As my minority report indicates, I shall ask for further cuts.

But I give these figures for the RECORD because it is my answer to the Senator from New York, whose speech, I am sure, will go out over the wires as indicating that the U.S. Senate, by the amendments that it has adopted, has in some way scuttled the economic aid bill. Mathematics do not sustain the Senator.

Mr. President, I hear not a word from the Senator from New York, in his speech, about the need for a domestic aid program in this country. I wonder if he will support the administration in its denial to the people of this country of what they are entitled to have to protect their rights under the Great Society promises of the Johnson administration.

We in the United States are experiencing very serious domestic problems, and our tremendously complex industrial society probably complicates rather than mitigates them.

We, too, are experiencing a population explosion, as they are in some of the countries for which the Senator from New York wishes to increase our appropriations for foreign aid. We, too, are experiencing the rot of cities incapable of managing a rapidly changing social and economic structure. In Latin America, the beautiful and largely central city areas are increasingly ringed with a strangling urban jungle of shacks and slums, while in the cities of America, the central core has become the economically distressed area as wealth moves out into the suburbs.

The manifestations, I admit are different; but the difficulties faced by the underprivileged of America are much the same as are being faced by the foreign lands with which the Senator is dealing this afternoon, in an attempt to get us to appropriate more and more millions to assist them, while this administration proposes to cut millions and millions more out of a domestic program for our own people, and thereby, in my judgment, in effect place a greater emphasis upon a foreign aid program than a much-needed domestic aid program.

These are the mechanical problems of rapid social and economic change. The human problem that gives rise to them is not only one of numbers but of another quality we have too long attributed to underdeveloped countries—the revolution of rising expectations. That exists in the United States as well as in Latin America or Africa or Asia.

The expectations of racial minorities in the United States have reached an explosive point. The legislation of 1964, which was a monument to human equality unequaled since the Emancipation Proclamation, has been enacted but has not been realized. As we support the Johnson administration's proposal to cut our domestic budget, are we going to deny to hundreds of thousands of Negroes in this country the domestic aid that they are entitled to now, in order to meet their problems, which are very similar to the problems of underprivileged people in some other countries?

But I think, Mr. President, if we are going to keep this Republic strong, if

we are going to protect the greatest security weapon we have, namely, our economy, we must take care of the domestic problem first. Until the administration is willing to adopt the reforms necessary to clean up foreign aid, it ought to be considered secondary to a domestic aid program needed in this country.

Mr. President, the legislation on civil rights of 1964 is far from having been implemented. It has been our custom to read of unrest and riot among young people in Mexico, or in Indonesia, or Colombia. Now we read daily of unrest and riot in Cleveland and Chicago, and the indications are that the trend is growing and not diminishing.

Our problems at home will require massive capital investment to cope with them. There is a limit, Mr. President, to which we can take from the taxpayers of this country. In the field of education alone, and this is where the attack must begin on all the other forms of poverty and racial injustice, we no longer think in terms of millions but in terms of billions.

The Senator from New York sits on my subcommittee. And let me say, on my subcommittee, he points out the great problems that confront him in the State of New York. He has been urging that our financial definition of the poverty limit be raised from $2,000 to $3,000.

I am supporting him. The Johnson administration proposes to cut it. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and his associates are spending hours these days up on the Hill, lobbying to cut it. The administration lobbyists over at the State Department are up here lobbying to increase the amount of the foreign aid bill in order to take care of foreign problems, while at the same time they propose to sell short the problems of the underprivileged and the impoverished here at home.

I say to the Senator from New York that he would make a much stronger appeal to me if he were to do two things, first, if he were to leave no room for doubt as to where he stands on the need for a domestic aid program, and also where he stands with regard to supporting the necessary policy guidelines in the foreign aid program to make it effective.

We had an example this afternoon of where he stands when he voted against a check on assistance to the many tyrants, dictators, and juntas in Latin America, where little of our aid benefits the people.

If the Senator from New York is interested in cleaning up foreign aid, he should have voted with me and not against me on this program. The Senator from New York knows very well that when we give these millions of dollars to military dictators in Latin America, we are not protecting the American taxpayers, and we are not protecting these underprivileged people in the country concerned. We are doing them a great injustice. If we want to support the freedom of those underprivileged people in those countries ruled by the tyrants, we would not do what the Senator from New York did this afternoon and vote to give to the President of the United States unchecked arbitrary and discretionary power to give them foreign aid after he recognizes them. Yet there is nothing that Congress can do about it in view of the position that the Senator from New York took on that matter this afternoon.

Mr. President, if the Senator from New York wanted really to help reform foreign aid, he would not have cast so many votes against the policy amendments that have been offered in the last 2 years. Those of us on the Committee on Foreign Relations have tried to force the AID administration to reform its inefficiency and bring an end to its course of corruption which the Comptroller General has pointed out in report after report. The Senator from New York knows what the Comptroller General has found.

The Senator from New York seeks now, in order to divert attention from what I consider to be his untenable position to divert attention by saying that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the senior Senator from Oregon ought to come in here with some amendments that would seek to clean up foreign aid.

A great many improvements were made in the committee.

We have given him his chance to help clean up foreign aid even further here on the floor. I want to say that I am not going to join him in pouring more millions of dollars into the underdeveloped countries of the world, which he proposes to do, until we can first assure the American taxpayers that the money is going to be wisely and efficiently spent. The Senator himself knows, as I shall show in a moment, that he knows that that does not take place in some instances.

Mr. President, our problems at home will require massive capital investment to cope with them in the field of education alone. The Senator from New York knows that we will have to spend billions of dollars in the next 10 years to be of assistance to the schoolchildren of this country. The demonstration cities program cannot be viewed as anything but the first token installment on the modernization of the core of dozens of cities, located in every State. The war on poverty is on the statute books but its effects on the grassroots, where it must be won. are questionable.

We need increased money to meet the poverty challenge in this country, but this administration, through its Bureau of the Budget report, proposes a cut here as well.

Some of us who have been giving intensive study to our domestic problems recognize that the cost of their remedying will vastly exceed the cost of any aid program to undeveloped countries. And we have scarcely scratched the surface.

Yet, as so many administrations before, this one finds it easier to go abroad to develop great societies than to do it at home. To build, to introduce new techniques, to instruct the ignorant abroad has for half a century had much more appeal to Washington than to rebuild, to reeducate, to rejuvenate, and to modernize the outmoded here at home. For the domestic problems are the problems of politics while the problems of the great society in Asia are problems of international relations. And politicians are seeing to it that they are removed far from the consideration and understanding of their constituents. However, their constituents are catching up with them. Their constituents are beginning to recognize the failure of Congress to reform foreign aid and to save the American taxpayers the millions of dollars that have been wasted.

It is very interesting to hear it said this afternoon by one of the proponents of increasing foreign aid that perhaps 10 to 20 percent of it is being wasted, as though that were a drop in the bucket. Let the record show how much the American taxpayer has had taken from him since the beginning of foreign aid in 1946—$116 billion.

The apologists for the foreign aid, if their figures are correct—and they are dead wrong because their figures are too low—say that 10 to 20 percent, is the amount which very well may have been wasted. Let me say that that is a shocking amount of waste out of $116 billion. However, if one reads the report of the Comptroller General, he cannot escape the conclusion that the figure is more than 20 percent. So again I say to the Senator from New York, to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], and to the others who seek some way to throw a block in the deliberation on the bill on those who seek to get the votes to prevent further needed cuts in the bill; the difficulty with your position is that they are not doing what ought to be done to help those of us who want to join with them in the foreign aid program in strengthening the standards and guidelines of foreign aid administration before we waste additional billions of dollars.

The energies of many administrations before this one, frustrated at home have been turned abroad, where the results of reform programs may be no more discernible but where the political liabilities are minimal. But let me say that the liabilities are just as serious abroad, as far as the rights of the American taxpayers are concerned, as they are here at home.

Many of us who thought that the great unfinished domestic work of Franklin Roosevelt was about to be accomplished through the Great Society, have therefore been deeply disappointed to hear the administration rush into a Great Society program for billions of Asians before it has ever begun to be accomplished here at home.

We have been deeply disappointed to hear the President warn Congress against funds for domestic programs, even as Congress considers his defense budget of $58.6 billion. The increase in the defense budget, and the special supplemental funds to prosecute the war, are adding up to a war cost of some $1.5 billion a month, or $18 billion a year above what was spent before we took over the war in South Vietnam.

Now we are told that we must hold the line on the budget at home so that we can spend increasing amounts for the war in southeast Asia; a war in which we should not be involved at all. We must hold the line at home so that we can increase expenditures for foreign aid in many other places of the world as proposed this afternoon by the Senator from New York, the Senator from Rhode Island, and the other Senators I have already mentioned, thereby laying the groundwork for the great society of southeast Asia, while the Great Society program in the United States goes down the drain.

The Senator from Oregon is not going to be a party to that kind of a legislative program. I am satisfied that what we are going to be faced with in this country if that program is adopted is that increasing millions of Americans are going to be so resentful that we will have a republic characterized by disunity, and what we need in these troubled times is a maximum of unity. If we can work to get unity, we should put first things first.

The first thing we should give our consideration to is adequate support for a domestic aid program and to continue a reasonable foreign aid program. A foreign aid program, let me say, in the neighborhood of $2 billion for economic aid is plenty high. Any military aid program in the neighborhood of $500 million—not including, of course, Vietnam—is reasonably high.

I would be much more impressed with the speech of the Senator from New York if he took the position that we should spend a reasonable sum, not in excess of the sum this year, and if he then gave unquestioned support to the development of a domestic aid program at home.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show my answer to one or two of the comments that the Senator has made, and then tomorrow I shall give further answers, in greater detail, on other aspects of his speech.

The Senator says on page 5 of his speech:

> I believe the American people are ready to recognize that foreign aid is not a "giveaway," but rather a moral obligation and a sound and necessary investment in the future.

I challenge that.

I say to the Senator from New York that, in my judgment, if he and the others who are supporting foreign aid do not help us clean up the administration of foreign aid, the American people will demand from Congress that foreign aid be drastically cut, if not discontinued.

No country has a moral obligation to give away money for its own sake. I am satisfied that the foreign aid program is exceedingly unpopular to the grassroots of America, and for good reason. The principal reason is that neither the administration nor Congress has been willing to clean it up.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York says that we have shown in the Senate that we are willing to spend nearly $2 billion a month for tanks, for planes, for napalm, for other weapons of war—all to save people from communism. I do not know whether he intends to allege that we are in fact saving them from communism at the expenditure of $2 billion a month for tanks, for planes, for napalm, and for other weapons of war.

I may have misinterpreted the Senator from New York in months past, but I believed the Senator from New York was raising serious question as to whether our military outlay in southeast Asia was making any constructive contribution to saving anyone from communism.

I wish the Senator from New York to know that my view is that this great expenditure for military involvement is making Communists by the hundreds of thousands around the world.

The Senator from New York says:

> But we seem reluctant to spend, to save people from the tyranny of starvation and ignorance, as much in a single month—even though we know, in our purest self-interests, that the tyranny of poverty is easily exchanged for the tyranny of communism.

I agree with the principle of that observation. As long as we continue to support the involvement of the United States on a unilateral basis in a war in southeast Asia—which it never should have entered in the first place—we will make no progress, in my judgment, in saving any considerable number of people in the world from the tyranny of poverty or the tyranny of communism.

On the contrary, I believe that as we are building up hatred for us around the world because of the shocking military policy that we are following, and that by taking the position that we are either going to have our program adopted or we are going to move in with U.S. military muscle to force its adoption, we are destroying the hope of achieving the very objective that I assume the Senator from New York has in mind.

If the Senator from New York really wishes to help pave the way for a sound foreign aid program directed at helping the economic lot of the underprivileged of the world, I shall welcome his starting to vote with us, those of us who have sought to modify the State Department's and the Pentagon's foreign policy in southeast Asia.

In my judgment, we must stop and change the image of the United States as a military intervenor, before we shall be able to gain the cooperation and the good will of the millions of people in the other parts of the world. This is necessary before any foreign aid program can be successful.

As I said earlier, the Senator from New York admits in his statement:

> The foreign aid program has not been completely successful. There has been corruption. There have been abuses of other kinds in some of the recipient countries. But if we consider the program as a whole—what is at stake, what has been accomplished—I believe we will conclude that it has been a significant success, and made a major difference in the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

Some of our foreign aid has been successful, but one cannot say that the foreign aid program has been successful overall, when one considers the shocking failures of foreign aid that have been revealed by one investigation after another.

I hope the Senator and I will be able to join in a foreign aid debate in the future. I hope that by next year we will be able to bring about some reforms in the administration of foreign aid so that there will be a justification for those of us who are supporting amendments to the bill this year to support an enlarged foreign aid program.

The argument of false analogy always interests me, and this afternoon, as many times in the past, the Marshall plan has been brought up as justification for our now pouring millions and billions of dollars into underdeveloped areas of the world.

When we joined in the Marshall plan, I was an enthusiastic supporter of it, although, as I have said many times before, if I were to have it to do over again, I would have been more insistent on a loan program rather than a grant program. But we did have an obligation, growing out of World War II, to come to the economic aid of our allies. We were a little belated in entering the war in the first place, and part of that war was the rebuilding of our allies—France, Great Britain, and others—through grant aid.

However, let us not forget that we had tremendous industrial and financial resources. Let us not forget that the balance of payments was all in our favor. Let us not forget that there was great concern in this country about what we were to do about our surplus capacity and the recognition that we had better do something about this or that surplus would rise to plague us and lead to economic stagnation here at home.

If we go back to the speeches and the concerns voiced of the time of the Marshall plan, we find that that was one of the arguments that helped induce us to embark upon a strong grant program under the Marshall plan. The same situation does not exist today. It is just the opposite. The balance of payments is against us. The economy of the country is threatened by inflation.

The Senator from New York and those who are supporting him had better take a long, long look at what the economic situation of this country is, before they go ahead with this drive that they obviously have started today. I am satisfied that this drive will be stopped. I believe the American people will insist that it be stopped, because they do not want to throw additional millions of American taxpayers' dollars in increased foreign aid down ratholes abroad.

I wish to say to the Senator from New York, as I am sure he well knows—in fact, our conversation before he departed left no room for doubt that he recognizes—that our difference is not a personal difference, but a very sincere difference, over what legislative policy should be.

I shall continue to vote for reasonable cuts in this bill, and to vote against any proposal to restore any cuts that have been made. And if the conference committee does not report a foreign aid bill

which, in my opinion, protects the American taxpayer, I shall once again vote against the bill.

Mr. President, I have obtained consent to put into the RECORD certain proposals that we have made in the past in regard to needed reforms.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT, 1965

4. COMMITTEE COMMENTS

The committee this year approached the foreign aid bill with something close to a consensus on three basic points: first, that some kind of foreign assistance program is essential to the national interests of the United States; second, that there is a great deal of profound dissatisfaction with the program conducted under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; and, third, that the Congress has a clear duty to perform in providing policy guidance in the field of foreign relations, including the aid program. At the same time, committee members hold widely differing views about the deficiencies of the current program and advance partial or tentative alternatives which often are mutually contradictory.

It should be stressed in this connection that such views and suggestions usually are aimed at fundamental questions of policy, rather than at administrative and short-term difficulties. For there is general agreement that small adjustments in the administration's proposals could not result in a program which would secure broad public and congressional support. Moreover, some members feel that Congress increasingly in recent years has seen its constitutional role in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy relinquished to or usurped by the executive branch of the Government, regardless of which political party held power. This trend has resulted in a situation in which support or rejection of administration policy have seemed the sole alternatives.

Only by questioning the basic premises behind the foreign aid program, as it has taken shape over the years, can there be a productive discussion of policy alternatives outside the misleading and barren context of being compelled to consider a single thesis and its antithesis.

Accompanying and intertwined with this attitude is the feeling among members that the Committee on Foreign Relations increasingly is being forced into the role of a Committee on Foreign Aid. To a considerable extent the necessity for lengthy and exhausting reviews of the aid program each year is preventing the committee from giving its attention to other equally important or even more significant foreign policy questions, and reducing the time which it can devote to legislative oversight of executive agencies. So long as there is so much criticism of the aid program—whether valid or not—the committee is unable to sponsor or approve a long-term authorization for this program, and is unable to break the dreary cycle of full-scale and time-consuming annual reviews.

These views converge and are reflected in the bill reported by the committee. On the one hand, in part IV of the bill, provision is made: for terminating the foreign aid program in its present form at the end of fiscal year 1967; for establishing a Foreign Aid Planning Committee with two-thirds of its members being drawn from the Congress; for establishing guidelines for that committee's profound scrutiny of the question of foreign assistance; and for having this committee make its findings known to the President, who is requested to submit his recommendations on foreign aid to the Congress on or before July 1, 1966. On the other hand, the bill provides a 2-year authorization for the foreign aid program during the interim period in which the whole issue is exhaustively studied.

These two major provisions are almost indissolubly connected with respect to the committee's heavy vote in favor of the bill. Some committee members are very reluctant to provide an authorization for more than 1 year. They approve this course only on the basis of these two points: first, they recognize that it would be highly confusing and unproductive if the administration and the Congress were simultaneously forced to work on two possibly quite different approaches to the question of foreign assistance; and, second, they recognize no inhibitions on the committee or individual members with respect to raising questions or promoting new views in connection with the program for fiscal 1967. It is clearly understood that the committee will continue to watch the foreign aid program closely in carrying out its functions of legislative oversight under the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Under these circumstances, then, the committee is approving for a 2-year period the program requested by the President for fiscal year 1966. In view of the widespread criticism of the existing foreign aid program, this action may be queried by those who are strongly opposed to the program. The main point here is that intolerable confusion would result if Congress tried in 1966 to review an annual foreign aid program in the traditional format at the same time it was planning a future program. This bill provides that the current program is to end June 30, 1967. The President is to submit his proposals for a new program by July 1, 1966, so that Congress will have ample time to consider them before the cutoff date. Within the guidelines set forth in part IV of the bill, the committee maintains an open mind as to the results of the inquiry provided for.

Meanwhile, despite the criticism which has been directed towards it, there is a great deal that can be said in support and justification for the program authorized in this bill. Indeed, a great deal has been said, and ample material on this score is contained in the hearing record on the bill, as well as in the presentation made to the Congress by the executive branch. Justice cannot be done in this report to all the many persuasive arguments in favor of the bill. The main point here is that the committee reaffirms its belief that a foreign assistance program is essential and that there is no current alternative to considering that program in the light of the basic policies which have prevailed over a number of years and which still prevail. Within this framework the committee has carefully considered the administration proposals at great length and the majority of members are satisfied that this is the best program wihch can be arrived at under existing conditions.

5. SUBSTANTIVE PROVISIONS

* * * * *

*Part IV—Programs for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967*

The bill adds a new part IV to the act which will, the committee believes, lead to substantial changes and improvements in the scope and nature of the foreign assistance program.

First, in the new section 701 it is provided that all assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480), or any extension thereof, shall be terminated as of June 30, 1967. The purpose is to make possible a completely fresh start with a revamped program after that date.

The new section 702 requests the President to submit to Congress by July 1, 1966, his recommendations and legislative proposals for future foreign aid programs taking into account principles which are set forth in the new section 703. The committee also contemplates that the President may wish to take account of the recommendations of the Planning Committee referred to below and to counsel with it.

The principles of section 703 are that assistance should be divided into four distinct categories:

(1) Assistance intended primarily for humanitarian purposes, including famine relief and other assistance under title II of Public Law 480, and assistance extended through worldwide international organizations (as distinct from free world organizations). This would be the means by which the United States meets its obligations as a good citizen of the world—analogous to an individual's contributions to a charity drive.

(2) Development assistance: This would be extended "only to countries in which progress is being made toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise." It would also be extended in furtherance of sound plans for economic and social growth with a view to making the recipient countries self-sufficient as soon as possible. This type of assistance would be aimed directly and exclusively at economic development in countries selected according to the criteria stated. Only in such countries is there a reasonable possibility that economic development can be brought about in a framework compatible with U.S. national interests.

(3) Political or contingency assistance: This would be primarily to advance or protect the mutual interests of the United States and a limited number of recipient countries or areas. This recognizes that, on occasion, a power with the worldwide interests of the United States has to engage in aid for purely political reasons, narrowly defined.

(4) Military assistance: This would be furnished to serve the military defense of the United States as recommended by the Secretary of Defense, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State.

Further principles to be taken into account in proposals for any further aid program are that, except for humanitarian assistance, aid should be extended to no more than 50 countries; and that administration of nonmilitary assistance should be unified, insofar as practicable, under a single agency. Finally, it is provided that any future foreign aid proposals should include recommendations as to the extent to which assistance should be furnished multilaterally or bilaterally and the extent to which it should be extended on a program or a project basis.

The new section 704 creates a Foreign Aid Planning Committee to advise and assist the President upon his request and to make its own independent studies and investigations with a view to submitting recommendations to the Congress.

The committee is to consist of 12 members—four to be appointed by the President, four members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to be appointed by the Vice President, and four members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to be appointed by the Speaker. The committee is given the usual authority to provide itself with a staff, to hold hearings, and to subpena witnesses and documents. Departments and agencies of the Government are directed to furnish the committee, upon its request, such information or other assistance as may be necessary. Not to exceed an aggregate of $400,000 of foreign aid appropriations is to be made available to the committee to carry on its work. The committee's final report is due January 3, 1967.

The Foreign Relations Committee intends for the principles enunciated in these new sections of the bill with respect to any future foreign aid programs to be interpreted

by the President and by the Foreign Aid Planning Committee as broad guidelines. They are not meant to be all-inclusive or as limitations on any recommendations or on any studies which the Foreign Aid Planning Committee may feel desirable. Among other things, the committee should address itself to the question of loan terms, and to the question of separating economic and military assistance.

The Foreign Aid Planning Committee is specifically authorized to submit interim reports prior to the date of its final report. It will have available in July 1966 the President's recommendations to the Congress, and it will take these into account in framing its own recommendations for final submission 6 months later.

The Foreign Relations Committee believes that out of the guidelines which the bill provides and out of the studies which it authorizes, there can be developed a foreign-aid program which is sharper in focus and clearer in purpose than the miscellany of activities presently lumped under the heading of "foreign aid." The committee also believes that the number of countries receiving assistance of one kind or another should be reduced. It recognizes that progress has been made in this direction in recent years, but further reductions are called for. The figure of 50 countries, which is mentioned in the guidelines in the bill, is to be compared with 82 countries for which military or economic aid is programed under the Foreign Assistance Act. The figure of 50 is admittedly arbitrary and may be adjusted upward or downward depending on the recommendations of the President and of the Foreign Aid Planning Committee. Some limitation on the number of aid-recipient countries, however, should have at least two salutary effects: (1) It should induce the executive branch to adopt more stringent priorities and to reconsider its present tendency to view an "AID presence" in a developing country as ipso facto desirable; and (2) it should make aid, where extended, more meaningful.

6. MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. MORSE

I did not vote for the bill in committee because I do not consider that it embodies a worthwhile aid program for the 2 years of aid which it authorizes. Once again, the Foreign Relations Committee has found the program in its existing form to be unsatisfactory. Its report states that: "the committee this year approached the foreign aid bill with something close to a consensus on three basic points: first, that some kind of foreign assistance program is essential to the national interest of the United States; second, that there is a great deal of profound dissatisfaction with the program conducted under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; and third, that the Congress has a clear duty to perform in providing policy guidance in the field of foreign relations including the aid program."

But even as it expressed its "profound dissatisfaction," the committee once again declined to do anything of consequence to improve the program for the 2 years covered by the bill. The most it could bring itself to do was to terminate the program at the end of that time and call for a Foreign Aid Planning Committee to be set up in the meantime to recommend a new program.

Part IV of this bill is a revision of an amendment I first offered 2 years ago. At that time, the Foreign Relations Committee said of it in its 1963 report: "in fact, the committee gave serious consideration to an amendment that would have terminated the program in its present form June 30, 1965, so that both the Congress and the administration could consider a major reorganization and reorientation of the program prior to that date. The committee refrained from adopting this amendment in the expectation which it hopes will not prove unjustified, that the administration will submit a fiscal year 1965 program to Congress which has been revamped in major respects."

Since no revamped program has been received in 2 years, I do not see how the committee can conscionably recommend another 2 years of the existing one.

The 2-year authorization dovetails with the timetable of the Planning Committee, which will make interim reports and a final report by January 3, 1967. I concurred in it for that reason. But establishment of the Planning Committee does not relieve the Foreign Relations Committee or the Congress from their duty to alter the program in *this* bill, for those 2 years.

*Responsibility for aid program rests with Congress*

For too long, the committee, and the Congress as a whole, have failed in their duty to establish clear policy guidelines for the extension of American foreign aid to other nations. This is not an area of foreign policy that the Constitution assigns to the President. If it were, legislation would be unnecessary.

As it is, only Congress is authorized to appropriate money, and that only in pursuance of law. And only Congress is authorized "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." It is only under this provision of the Constitution that foreign aid is possible at all.

The recommendations of a President are as desirable in the enactment of a foreign aid program as they are in the enactment of an antipoverty program or a flood control project. But there is no constitutional basis for the general use of administrative discretion which has rendered the aid program the flabby and unproductive one it is today.

The freehanded extension of aid in the last 15 years has greatly weakened it in all its various purposes. It was the conditioning by the United States that led the United Arab Republic's delegate to announce to the United Nations last December "It [foreign aid] is a right to which the developing countries are entitled."

So long as our administrative officials regard aid as a means of American ingress all over the world, receiving countries will continue to be encouraged to think it comes with diplomatic recognition and requires nothing more from them than their existence.

This lack of standards, and the delegation of its duties and functions, are the fault of Congress. Hence, the failure of foreign aid to return to the American people any results commensurate with their expenditure is also the fault of Congress.

The foreign aid program has operated as though through a ministry changing when its chief executive falls, but otherwise carrying out its activities free from legislative direction. Some authorities prefer that system for the United States, but that is not the system established by the Constitution and I do not believe we should allow ourselves to drift into it by the voluntary relinquishment of its powers on the part of Congress.

*The 2-year authorization*

While I voted with a large majority of the committee members to authorize a 2-year extension of the foreign aid program, I am compelled to make my position on this question completely clear. The sole reason why I went along with this extension, even while voting against final passage, hinges upon committee acceptance of my amendment which is carried in part IV of the bill, and which dictates an end to the program as presently constituted in 1967. I accept the committee consensus that there would be considerable confusion and technical difficulties if my cutoff amendment became law, and if the subsequent special committee and the administration at the same time were working on two possibly very different approaches to the foreign aid problem.

Thus, I agreed to vote for a 2-year authorization—although not for the bill as a whole—with the understanding that this agreement depends on part IV of the bill becoming law.

At the same time I do not believe—and I know the majority of committee members agree with me—that we can relinquish in any way our duty to check into the foreign aid situation each and every year, regardless of whether or not an administration bill is referred to us. In the first place, this duty of legislative oversight is inescapably imposed upon us by the Reorganization Act of 1946, as well as by all historical precedent. Secondly, there is nothing to prevent either the committee or a single member of it from seeking out the facts on foreign aid at any point during any year, and making the resulting information available to the Senate and to the public. In the third place, I would contemplate a situation in which the Foreign Aid Planning Committee established by my cutoff amendment would make interim reports on its findings, whether formal or informal in character. I would further expect the Committee on Foreign Relations to consider such data closely and to press for any necessary changes that might be made by the AID Agency. Should the latter not comply on a voluntary basis, it must be understood that there would be no inhibition against this committee introducing legislation to give mandatory effect to the Planning Committee's recommendations. In sum, no one should be under any illusion that the Foreign Relations Committee by agreeing to a 2-year extension of the program is thereby giving up even the slightest bit of jurisdiction over the operation of the program.

Finally, I want to reemphasize my understanding that the 2-year authorization and the cutoff amendment are indissolubly linked. There should be, if there is not, fierce determination on the part of the Foreign Relations Committee to contest any effort to scuttle my amendment while trying to preserve the 2-year authorization.

* * * * *

*Inflated military assistance*

As in the past years the military assistance element in the foreign aid program is unjustifiably large and scattered in character. This year, even more than in the past, the military aid component appears to be based on an outmoded and ineffective policy framework. It adds insult to injury for the Congress to be asked to authorize $115 million more for fiscal year 1966 than the $1.055 billion appropriated in the current fiscal year. Even the Clay Committee Report of 1963, which did not seriously contest the overall policy governing military aid, but protested the number of countries involved, made it clear that by this stage we should be contemplating a program of no more than $1 billion for military assistance.

We can derive no comfort from the constantly repeated assertion that 72 percent of the military aid funds are concentrated in 11 so-called "forward defense countries": Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, India, Thailand, Laos, Vietnam, Philippines, Taiwan, and Korea. These countries described in the unclassified summary presentation book as bordering on the Soviet Union and Communist China—erroneously in the case of three of them—are, it is true, most exposed to the possibility of Soviet or Communist Chinese aggression. On the other hand, even if one believes, as I do not, that our past heavy infusions of military assistance could help these countries to defend themselves for more than a few days without massive U.S. intervention, the problem is that most of these countries do not appear to share that view of the situation. On the contrary, at least four

of them are far more interested in concentrating their troops in a position to fight each other, rather than to repel any fancied Communist invasion. In the case of the two island nations concerned, there scarcely can be any question but that their security depends almost entirely on American air and sea power in the Pacific, and not on large numbers of ground forces.

Each year, we are told that indigenous armies are cheaper to "field" than an equivalent number of U.S. troops and they will be on hand to help us fight any war in their area. This comforting theory has been voiced in special connection with the Far East. But right now we are fighting a war in the Far East, and where are the troops from South Korea, Thailand, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Taiwan that our taxpayers have been supporting all these years?

The time is long overdue for us to confront the premise that the policy framework for our military aid program depends very largely on obsolescent theory developed a dozen years ago. The hallmark of this theory was a severe case of "pactitis." Because NATO was a real success and totally valid at a time of great peril for Western Europe, it was decided that the success should be emulated in every area that might be threatened by the then monolithic Sino-Soviet bloc. Thus we had the creation of SEATO and CENTO—or the northern tier, as it was often called—and in our period of fondest enthusiasm even thought of creating a southern tier which would make everything tidy if not sensible.

Now we go on today as if nothing had really changed in the last decade. We do so despite the evidence of change on every side. The Sino-Soviet bloc has split into two competing powers, whose only prospect of renewed cohesion probably stems from the pressure exerted by the United States on southeast Asia. The SEATO alliance has been proved virtually useless in the context of the undeclared war in southeast Asia, and may be deserted by France at the first politically opportune moment. CENTO long ago lost its Baghdad headquarters through the withdrawal of Iraq; it now finds that its eastern anchor, Pakistan, is busily making friendly gestures toward Red China while indulging its apparent true vocation of warlike maneuvers on the borders of India. The latter, which has steadfastly refused to play the alliance game, is diverted from the necessary task of guarding its borders against Chinese incursions by the threatening posture of the U.S.-equipped Pakistani Army.

One would think that, with all the transformation which has occurred in Asia, the Pentagon might be inhibited from coming to the Congress with the selfsame story which it has advanced unchanged for these many years. Such is not the case, however. Those of us who have been on the committee for some time can recite the Defense Department's testimony from memory before the hearings on foreign aid even begin.

*"Obsolescence" theory will lead to permanent military aid*

Another argument we have heard with wearying frequency in this regard concerns the purported need for us to replace obsolete equipment with up-to-date weapons in these forward defense countries. This is the case, even though there is growing evidence that the more modern American equipment being used in Vietnam is not suited to the nature of the conflict there. For example, we seem to be finding that propeller-driven aircraft are far more useful than modern jets; indeed, it may not be too farfetched to envisage us buying back some of the "obsolete" equipment which we furnished to the forward defense countries. In any event, if our policy dictates that we must constantly keep replacing obsolete equipment in every country receiving large amounts of military aid, then we can anticipate the likelihood of our being forced to conduct such a program in the year 2000—if the world reaches that year intact. In the name of sanity, that policy should be promptly overhauled except for certain specific limited applications.

The reason for this great emphasis on such countries as Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, Taiwan, and Korea comes from two themes presented by the executive branch. In the first place, we are told that the military aid funds for southeast Asia in the bill not only cannot be curtailed, but should be subject to constant increase. As I note elsewhere in these remarks, the full cost of our undeclared war in Vietnam should be broken out of the foreign assistance bill and justified in a separate authorization which calls things by their right names. As matters stand, the argument afforded by the urgent situation in Vietnam is used by the Pentagon on every occasion to resist any cuts whatsoever in the military aid component.

* * * * *

*Vietnam aid should be authorized separately*

Our military activities in Vietnam and our national interests in Vietnam and Laos have burgeoned far beyond the intents and purposes of a foreign aid, and should be authorized in separate legislation.

It was an aid program unchecked and unsupervised by Congress that drew us into an undeclared war in that part of the world, but the war has reached the stage where it should no longer be lumped in with foreign aid.

Moreover, the proposal for an "open-end" authorization for Vietnam is a very bad precedent to put into a foreign aid bill. It represents the kind of authorization that will be sought for other areas if Congress approves this one, and will mark a further renunciation of congressional control over a legislative program.

*Summary*

Because the authorization continues for 2 years aid programs for an excessive number of countries, because it increases military aid to countries where it will do American interests more harm than good, and because it promotes an increase in funds for international lending agencies sight unseen by Congress, I believe at least half a billion dollars should be cut from this bill for each of the 2 years.

WAYNE MORSE.

---

EXCERPTS FROM COMMITTEE REPORT, 1966

Section 101

This section would amend the statement of policy relating to economic assistance contained in section 102 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, by adding the following sentence:

"This Act, or the furnishing of economic, military, or other assistance under this Act or the Military Assistance and Sales Act of 1966, shall not be construed as creating a new commitment or as affecting any existing commitment to use armed forces of the United States for defense of any foreign country.

In the nearly two decades this committee has studied aid bills each year it never considered that economic or military assistance to another country could in any way constitute a commitment of U.S. military forces. However, administration officials have in recent months suggested that the provision of foreign assistance to Vietnam over the years is one component of the overall U.S. commitment to that country. The committee cannot agree with any such interpretation of its intent in recommending the Senate's approval of aid legislation each year. It was recommending aid, and nothing more.

The committee's statement of policy makes it clear that it is intended in no way to detract from any existing commitment to Vietnam or to any other country. Neither is the foreign asisstance program to be used in the future as a substitute for a treaty or other constitutional commitment of U.S. military forces regardless of the size, scope or duration of the aid program in any country.

The American people must be reassured that furnishing foreign aid does not constitute a back-door commitment of military forces to a potential series of brushfire wars in countries throughout the world. In addition, aid recipients need to be put on notice that regardless of the extent of aid, they should in no way interpret U.S. generosity as a promise to help with military forces in time of trouble.

This statement of policy should help clear the air for the public, the Congress, the executive branch, and every country which is or may become a recipient under the foreign assistance program.

CHAPTER 2.—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

*Title I—Development Loan Fund*

Section 102(a)(1). Loan Criteria

This section amends section 201(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act by adding the following three new criteria to the factors to be taken into account in making development loans:

(1) The degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise.

(2) The degree to which the recipient country is taking steps to improve its climate for private investment, both domestic and foreign, through encouragement of maximum private ownership in new and existing industry, through nondiscriminatory treatment between national and nonnational and between public and private enterprises and products, through adequate protection of industrial property rights (such as patents and trademarks).

(3) Whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to the achievement of self-sustaining growth.

These criteria are self-explanatory and are in addition to the six criteria now in the act. Two of the new criteria were included in last year's Senate foreign assistance bill as principles to be taken into account in shaping a new aid program. The committee believes that the new criteria are reasonable objectives for the aid program.

Section 102(a)(2). Limitation on Countries to Which Loans Can Be Made

This section limits to 10 the number of countries outside Latin America to which development loans can be made except through the World Bank and its affiliates. AID has firm plans to make loans to only 10 countries in fiscal 1967. Three additional countries are "eligible" for development lending and the committee was advised that the total countries to which loans might be made in fiscal 1967 might be 18 or 19 after distribution of $18,200,000 programed for lending to several unspecified African countries. AID made development loans to 19 countries in the 1966 fiscal year.

The committee bill incorporates a procedure which will permit loans to be made to additional countries above the limit of 10 if (1) the President makes a finding that the loan to the country is in the national interest and submits a report giving his reasons therefor to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and (2) each of these committees adopts a resolution approving the making of the loan or loans to that country. This will provide flexibility to make loans in countries above the basic limit of 10 but

only after the appropriate committees of the Congress have approved the proposal. The requirement follows the pattern under existing law for approval of certain public building and watershed projects by congressional committees.

The committee hopes that the adoption of this amendment will encourage AID officials to concentrate their efforts by providing assistance to a smaller group of countries which are in a position to use aid most effectively. The committee does not believe that the national interest is served merely by establishing, as AID does in too many countries, an aid "presence" that makes little, if any, permanent contribution toward solving economic and social problems. It is the view of the committee that maximum effectiveness per dollar of aid can be achieved only by concentration of effort. This limitation is a modest step in that direction. It does not apply to assistance provided through the multilateral lending agencies and the committee hopes that its imposition will have the effect of stimulating greater interest in channeling more aid through the World Bank group.

Section 102(b). Interest Rate on Development Loans

Under existing law there are two interest rates for development loans. A rate of not less than 1 percent is charged for the period no longer than 10 years from the time the loan is made, and for the remainder of the loan term a rate of not less than 2½ percent is required. This section amends section 201(d) of the act to increase the minimum interest rate for the second stage of the loan from 2½ to 3 percent.

The committee considered at some length a proposal to raise the interest rate to that which would equal the cost to the Federal Government of its long-term borrowings. Although no long-term Treasury bonds are being issued at the present, the market yield on outstanding issues with 20-year maturities averaged 4⅜ percent for the first 11 months of the 1966 fiscal year. The committee recognized that an increase of this magnitude would have a considerable impact on the development loan program and would in effect place the program on a self-sustaining basis after the 10-year grace period minus administrative costs and assuming no losses. However, the committee does believe that the prevailing high interest rates in this country call for adjusting the minimum interest on development loans to narrow the gap between what the Federal Government and the American taxpayer must pay on money they borrow and the interest the foreign government must pay for loans under the program.

The subsidization rate on development loans, on the basis of the 4⅜ percent average rate in fiscal 1966 on long-term Treasury issues, is 3⅜ percent for the first 10 years and 1⅞ percent for the remaining period of the loan. Market yields on long-term Treasury issues are actually about 4¾ percent at present. In 1964, when the Congress raised the minimum rate on the second stage of development loans from 2 to 2½ percent, the average rate for long-term Treasury borrowings was 4⅛ percent. In view of the significant increase in the cost of Government and private borrowings since then, the committee believes that the increase of one-half of 1 percent is fully justified.

* * * * *

Section 102(d). Use of International Lending Organizations

This section would amend section 205 of the Foreign Assistance Act relating to the use of international lending agencies for the channeling of development loan funds to underdeveloped countries. Section 205 now authorizes the President, at his discretion, to transfer up to 15 percent of the funds made available for development lending for use through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development or its affiliates, the International Development Association and the International Finance Corporation. The amendment to this section would permit use of 15 percent of the development loan funds only through these organizations. In other words, 15 percent of the loan funds would be available only for transfer to the multilateral lending agencies and could not be used for regular bilateral lending by AID.

Last year the committee recommended that the President be authorized to use up to 20 percent of the Development Loan Fund through the World Bank group. This figure was reduced to 15 percent in the authorization bill as finally enacted. The committee believed then, as it does now, that there are compelling reasons for placing more aid on a multilateral basis through the international lending agencies. These agencies are able to enforce higher economic standards and also to avoid the political pitfalls inherent in a bilateral aid relationship. Unfortunately, last year, as has been the case in previous years, restrictive language in the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act prevented the use of the transfer authority by the President.

The committee hopes that its action in earmarking funds may be helpful in stimulating the Congress to be consistent on both the authorization and the appropriation bills and allow the President to use the facilities and expertise of the World Bank group in administering a small portion of the total aid effort.

*Title II—Technical cooperation and development grants*

Section 103(a)(1). Additional Criteria for Technical Cooperation and Development Grants

This section amends section 211(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, which contains the general authority for technical cooperation and development grants, by adding the following two new criteria for the President to consider in determining a country's eligibility for this type of aid: (1) The degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise, and (2) whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to the achievement of self-sustaining growth.

The criteria are self-explanatory and are the same as two of the three new criteria to be added to the Development Loan Fund program by section 102(a)(1) of this bill. They were approved by the Senate in last year's foreign aid bill as principles to be taken into account in the formulation of a new aid program.

Section 103(a)(2). Limitation on Countries

This section amends section 211(a) of the act by limiting to 40 the number of countries which may be provided technical cooperation and development grants in 1 year. However, countries can be added above the limit if the President recommends such action to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and each of the two committees adopts a resolution approving the addition of the country. It is the same procedure prescribed in section 102(a)(2) of the bill for making additional countries above the limit of 10 eligible for development loans. The procedure requiring approval by committee resolution is adopted from that followed for approval of certain public buildings and watershed projects.

This limitation does not include the nations of Latin America programed to receive technical assistance under the Alliance for Progress. Outside of Latin America AID proposed technical cooperation and development grant programs in 47 countries in fiscal 1967—plus 6 regional programs. Of the 47 country programs proposed, 19 are for less than $1 million.

The committee believes that the program could be more effective if it were not so diffuse. The amounts programed for many countries in the 1967 fiscal year are so small that the result can be little more than an American aid "presence." The committee cannot support this concept of spreading a little aid to a large number of countries. This small cutback in countries will make the program more effective in the long run.

The committee points out that this limit does not apply to assistance through the multilateral agencies and hopes that this action will serve to emphasize the advantages of administering a greater portion of the aid program through the international agencies.

* * * * *

*Title VI—Alliance for Progress*

Section 105(a)(1)(i). New Criteria for Aid Under the Alliance for Progress

Additional criteria for the President to consider furnishing assistance under the Alliance for Progress, identical, with one exception, to that approved for the development loan program, have been recommended by the committee. The exception is aimed at Latin America and is designed to encourage economic and political integration of the region. The new criteria to be added to the four now in the act are—

(1) The degree to which the recipient country is making progress toward respect for the rule of law, freedom of expression and of the press, and recognition of the importance of individual freedom, initiative, and private enterprise;

(2) The degree to which the recipient country is taking steps to improve its climate for private investment, both domestic and foreign, through encouragement of maximum private ownership in new and existing industry, through nondiscriminatory treatment between national and nonnational and between public and private enterprises and products, and through adequate protection of industrial property rights (such as patents and trademarks);

(3) Whether or not the activity to be financed will contribute to the achievement of self-sustaining growth; and

(4) The extent to which the activity to be financed will contribute to the economic or political integration of Latin America.

The committee believes that these are reasonable and desirable objectives which the President should take into account in making aid determinations under the Alliance for Progress.

* * * * *

Section 105(a)(2). Emphasis on Multilateralism in Alliance for Progress

This section would introduce two new elements into the Alliance for Progress, both designed to move it further in the direction of multilateralism.

First, it would provide that Alliance for Progress loans may be made only to support national economic plans approved by the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress (CIAP). The effect would be that before a country could participate fully in the Alliance it would have to make a national economic plan which would be approved by the Alliance's international body. CIAP would not be given the power to control American aid; it would be given only a limited veto in the sense that if it did not approve a country's plan, that country could receive no U.S. loans. CIAP, consisting of six distinguished Latin Americans and one North American is in a better position than AID or the State Department to insist on rigorous Latin American compliance with the

standards of the Alliance. The requirement would not apply to grant aid; i.e., to technical assistance or to emergency assistance to meet unforeseen contingencies.

Second, the section would authorize the transfer of up to 15 percent of Alliance for Progress funds to the Inter-American Development Bank or to the World Bank or its affiliates. This is analogous to the authority presently existing in section 205 for the transfer of development loan funds to the World Bank or its affiliates.

The President would be given discretion to transfer loan funds for distribution through the international lending agencies, whereas under the amendment to section 205 of the act contained in section 102(a)(2) of this bill, relating to the development loan program, 15 percent of the funds appropriated would be available only for transfer to the international institutions.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 4.—SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

Section 108(a). Limitation on Countries To Receive Assistance

This section amends section 401, relating to general authority for the supporting assistance program, by placing a limit of 10 on the number of countries which can be provided assistance in any fiscal year. However, the President can add more countries when he determines that it is in the national interest. The determination, and the reasons for it, are to be reported to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The administration proposed to provide supporting assistance to 13 countries in 1967. By adopting the limitation of 10, the committee hopes to encourage retrenchment in the number of countries included in this program. On the basis of the information presented thus far, the committee is unable to appreciate the importance of continuing supporting assistance to several of the countries programed for 1967. But the committee recognizes that unforeseen situations may occur. It has, therefore, approved a procedure which will permit the addition of other countries by the President.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 6.—ASSISTANCE TO NONINDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES

Section 110. Population Control

Section 110 of the bill adds a new section 462 to the act, to authorize specifically the use of funds for furnishing a country, at its request, with technical or other assistance for the control of population growth. Section 241(b) of the act now authorizes research into the problems of population growth but the committee believes that AID officials have taken too conservative an attitude toward use of this authority. About $10 million is programed for work on population control problems in fiscal year 1967.

The committee is deeply concerned about the impact of population growth on the developing countries. Many of the benefits from aid are offset by population growth. Unless greater progress is made in control programs even massive aid will be relatively ineffective in raising living standards in many underdeveloped countries. Because of population growth too many developing nations are like the country described by the Queen in "Alice in Wonderland" where "it takes all the running (they) can do, to keep in the same place."

This new authority, plus that contained in section 201(c) of the bill, is intended to give impetus to efforts in this field. The committee will follow closely the work of the Agency for International Development in implementing these sections and will expect to see a significant increase in activity by the time of the next Congressional presentation.

CHAPTER 7.—JOINT COMMISSIONS ON RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

Section 111 of the bill adds a new chapter authorizing the President to conclude agreements with underdeveloped countries in Asia and Africa for the establishment of Joint Commissions on Rural Reconstruction. If any such agreements are concluded, the President can make up to 10 percent of the total development grant and technical cooperation funds available for use by such joint commissions. For fiscal year 1967 the amount that could be used for this purpose could not exceed $21 million.

The committee was motivated to include this provision in the bill because of the success of this type of arrangement in connection with U.S. aid programs to Nationalist China. The Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction in China, authorized by the China Aid Act of 1948, has been one of the most successful ventures of the United States in aiding underdeveloped countries. Had the program been started earlier in mainland China, it might have helped weaken the appeal to the peasants of the Chinese Communists.

The advantages of this approach are twofold. First, the organizational technique can become a practical means for isolating efforts at agricultural development from the vagaries of political change so common in the newer nations of Asia and Africa. Second, it can provide a means whereby American aid can be made available directly to the people of a recipient country without being channeled through bureaucracies.

The language of this chapter is permissive. But the committee expects the administration to examine the methods of the Chinese program of rural reconstruction, to consult with individuals who had experience in that program, and to explore with vigor the possibility of adapting this method for dealing with rural problems in such countries as South Vietnam. The committee will expect a full report on experience with this approach before acting on the fiscal year 1968 aid bill so that it may be determined whether the language should be made mandatory.

PART III, CHAPTER 1.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * *

Section 201(c). Use of Excess Foreign Currencies for Population Control

This section would amend section 612 of the act, which relates to the use of foreign currencies, by authorizing use of excess foreign currences by friendly foreign governments and private, nonprofit U.S. organizations for carrying out voluntary family planning programs. The President must be assured that reasonable precautions will be taken to see that assistance is given only to persons who desire help. A maximum of 5 percent of the total excess foreign currencies on hand in all countries could be made available in any year for the program in one or more countries.

The committee hopes that this amendment will stimulate greater efforts in population control in those countries where we hold excess currencies, though it is not contemplated that these programs will be carried on in each such country. The following are the countries in which the United States holds excess foreign currencies: Burma, Ceylon, Guinea, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia.

This amendment was considered by the committee at the same time as the amendment in section 110(b) of the bill and the comments under that subsection apply here also.

Section 201(d). Reports by the President

This provision would amend section 614(c) of the act by requiring the President to report to the Speaker of the House and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on his use of the confidential funds which are now authorized in the amount of $50 million by section 614(c). The committee, in the military assistance bill, approved the reduction of this amount to $25 million in economic and $25 million in military funds.

The law authorizes the President to use these funds "pursuant to his certification that it is inadvisable to specify the nature of the use of such funds, which certification shall be deemed to be a sufficient voucher for such amounts."

This is the only important provision of the act on which the President is not required to make some kind of report to Congress. Most of these reports, many of which are classified, are made to the Speaker of the House and to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Relations of the Senate. In view of the sensitivity of the subject matter, the proposed amendment would require reports on the use of confidential funds only to the Speaker and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Section 201(e). Prohibition of Assistance on Large Projects Without Approval of Congress

This provision would amend section 620(k) of the act to broaden and make permanent the temporary prohibition against the initiation of very large projects.

This prohibition had its origin in 1963 in the concern of Congress over the proposed Bokaro steel mill in India. As originally enacted in 1963, the subsection read as follows:

"Until the enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 or other general legislation, during the calendar year 1964, authorizing additional appropriations to carry out programs of assistance under this Act, no assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country for construction of any productive enterprise with respect to which the aggregate value of such assistance to be furnished by the United States will exceed $100,000,000. No other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

In 1964, this prohibition was extended to 1965; but it has not been again extended and has not been operative since September 6, 1965, the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of that year.

The new provision would require, from now on, the express approval of Congress for the initiation of these very large projects.

It would also broaden the existing law to include grant military assistance programs which will amount in aggregate to more than $100 million. The purpose is to attempt to provide an additional safeguard against programs which begin small and grow to major commitments.

With respect to military assistance, the committee intends the restriction to apply to executive agreements for new programs or for substantial modifications of existing programs where the U.S. commitment is for more than $100 million even though spread over several years. The agreements for military assistance to Spain and Pakistan are historical examples.

* * * * *

7. MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. MORSE (1966)

*Foreign aid and foreign policy*

To the extent that foreign aid has been a tool of American foreign policy, it has been a costly and highly ineffective tool. At best, it has helped some countries at an extravagant price to the American taxpayer; at worst, it has sucked the military forces of the United States into foreign lands where we believed our prestige was involved because we had expended lavish aid on a particular political faction.

The Congress cannot escape the full responsibility for the direction, the effectiveness, and the cost of economic assistance. This is not foreign policy of the kind that the Constitution vests in the Executive. If it were, no legislation would be involved.

Economic assistance from the United States to any foreign country requires legislation, and while wide discretion may be given to the executive branch for its administration, the responsibility for its successes and failures will always lie with Congress.

In the recent past, indiscriminate aid programs have served to stimulate and underwrite the war between India and Pakistan, the near war between Greece and Turkey, the growing arms race in the Middle East, widespread corruption in numerous countries, and a rash of military juntas in Latin America. So long as Congress fails to prescribe the terms and conditions that will curtail or suspend aid in these situations, and impose guidelines that will discourage our involvement in them in the future, we do not fulfill our legislative duty.

If there are those who regard legislative conditions and guidelines as undue interference in foreign policy, it must be pointed out that the only way to take Congress out of this field is to have no foreign aid at all.

Aside from partisans of aid who view it as an obligation owed the poor by the rich, there are partisans who view it as furnishing the United States a toehold for intervention. These partisans argue that aid is simply a tool of foreign policy which gives us the means to deal with situations which may occur in a foreign country. This is a cynical exploitation of foreign people for alleged security interests of the United States. Worse, it will delay rather than advance the time when the people of these countries will have the home-grown institutions and conditions that will enable them to resist the lures or pressures of Communism.

The only realistic test of sound economic aid is results. The major way to test results is to measure them against what was planned or anticipated when an aid program was begun. Where the results fail to measure up, Congress must write corrective measures into the program, for the American people will not support permanently a multibillion dollar program that does not produce what is advertised for it.

This year, public confidence in foreign aid is sagging lower than ever. Results from many years of the program are coming in at a time of crisis in American foreign policy, and the public does not like what it sees. Public confidence will deteriorate further if Congress continues to relax its already lax guidance of the program.

*Advances and shortcomings in committee bill*

The committee has made some improvements in this year's bill. Fixing the number of countries in each category is the only way to assure that our financial efforts will be concentrated on countries where they have the best prospects for achievement.

But no loophole should have been left for supporting assistance to additional countries, for this is the worst rathole in the whole program. Moreover, the development, lending, and technical assistance country limits are exclusive of Alliance for Progress countries. American foreign policy officials are so accustomed to offering money as an integral part of diplomatic relations with poor countries that $2 million for Guyana was announced before it had been independent a week and before a U.S. Ambassador had been confirmed. This assumption that establishing diplomatic relations or recognizing a government means adding that country to the U.S. dole is not one that will be abandoned readily by any administration. It can only be abandoned by strong congressional action.

Retaining annual review at the authorizing stage as well as the appropriation stage is the only way to notify recipients that the American people want performance and not promises as a condition of aid.

Restoration of the $100 million limit on new programs or projects that may be undertaken without specific authorization by Congress will enable Congress to consider new directions or major new obligations of the aid program.

The bill's chief shortcoming is its failure to reduce the amounts in each category. Expansion of other channels of lending, the demands of the war, the threat to the balance of payments, and the lack of performance by many recipients, justify marked reductions in all aid categories in the bill.

As reported, it also fails to put limits on economic aid to nations using our substance as a foundation for military establishments beyond their needs, and adventures aimed at non-Communist neighbors.

*Economic aid on the rise*

The separate provision of funds for southeast Asia and the Asian bank have raised total economic assistance well above last year's level. It is, in fact, a device increasingly used to leave the single aid bill at the same level while getting more funds from new sources.

There is no place in the Federal Government where the American citizen can go to get a reliable dollar figure on the total cost to the United States of our annual foreign activities. But the economic bill before the Senate, in the amount of $2.46 billion is but a small portion of this Government's outlay for what are essentially economic aid purposes—or which have that effect.

*Funds available or requested for fiscal year 1967*

| | |
|---|---|
| Agency for international development | $2.460 |
| Food for peace | 1.600 |
| Anticipated supplemental for southeast Asia | .500 |
| Asian Bank | .120 |
| Inter-American Bank | .250 |
| International Development Association | .104 |
| Total | 5.034 |

This still does not include the Peace Corps, the World Bank subscriptions sold to private investors, United Nations development agencies, or Federal Reserve and Export-Import Bank contingency support of the British pound sterling. Nor does it include any military aid or expenditure abroad by 800,000 American servicemen and their families.

I take this occasion to serve notice that next year I will ask that the administration present the Senate with a bill of particulars and include in it the total amount of assistance of this kind.

I believe that the annual foreign drain on the budget of the United States, exclusive of the war in Vietnam, is in the magnitude of $10 billion per year. It is an educated guess. Let the administration prove the figure is too high, or too low. They have the figures and the personnel to do the job.

*Effect on U.S. balance of payments*

As the costs of the Vietnam war accentuate the problem with our deficient international financial accounts, the Congress must examine more closely than ever the extent to which the aid program contributes to that problem. Here is one of the key areas where we cannot afford a "business as usual" attitude toward foreign aid.

That sector of American business which enjoys AID contracts to send its goods abroad at taxpayer expense has largely dominated the foreign aid debate within the business community. But American business which exports for sale is making a stronger case each year against the effect of assistance which mean loss of cash business.

The International Economic Policy Association sets forth evidence on this point that Congress can continue to ignore only at real peril. The association's spokesman, N. R. Danielian, pointed out to the committee that voluntary restraint in overseas investment by U.S. business helped bring our deficit in 1965 down to $1.3 billion, compared with $2.8 billion in 1964.

But outlays for the Vietnam war, plus increased imports resulting from a high level of economic activity for which the war is also partly responsible, have worsened the outlook.

Despite assertions that AID lending is tied to American industry, the flight of foreign cash business away from the United States through substitution is alarming. Geographically, it is most acute in Latin America, and it is most acute financially where "program lending" is used.

Latin America, the Near East, and south Asian countries received 90 percent of program loans in fiscal 1964 and 1965. In 1965, 58 percent of U.S. aid in these areas took the form of program loans.

During the years 1958–64, our economic assistance exceeded our trade deficit by amounts running between $1.1 and $1.5 billion a year. Increased efforts to "tie" our assistance has not changed this picture.

Mr. Danielian stated the case in a nutshell when he said:

"Since we put a line of credit at their disposal against which they can charge anything they buy in this country, except some questionable items like luxury goods, they shift their cash purchases to purchases with aid money, and they use the resulting savings of their own foreign exchange to buy in other countries. * * *

"I think the first important point to realize is that development loans should be used for development purposes, and development is the creation of industrial capacity for production. This can only be accomplished by projects, whether they are powerplants, shoe factories, food processing plants, and so on, and if this is the purpose of the aid program, then let us put our money into these kinds of projects, incremental projects, that add to the capacity of the country to increase its production."

* * * * *

*Economic aid and military assistance are inseparable*

One of the tragedies of the American economic aid program is the degree to which there has developed a direct relationship between economic assistance and military expenditures of recipient countries. It argues convincingly against separating economic and military aid in the legislative process.

Economic aid often supports the creation of military machines in countries which cannot support them. The administration and the Congress have not come to grips with this problem.

The classic case involves the assistance which the United States has given to India and Pakistan. When the United States agreed to arm Pakistan on the theory that it would be a bulwark against possible Communist aggression, India complained. The Indians were worried that U.S.-supplied arms would enable Pakistan to use force some day against India, rather than against a Communist onslaught as the United States feared. India, therefore, used its own budgetary resources to purchase and manufacture arms with which to meet potential threats not only from China, but from Pakistan.

But with India putting funds into armaments, there was little left over for food and other necessary imports. So the United States provided economic aid in the amount

of $5.8 billion from 1949 until 1965, thus freeing Indian funds for armament.

Those in India and Pakistan who suffered from this arrangement were the people—the little people—the ones who needed food and fertilizer. Then, of course, there were the soldiers who served in the armies which finally clashed last August in battles which pitted American-supplied Patton tanks manned by Pakistanis, against British Centurion tanks purchased from the British and manned by Indians.

Much the same thing is happening in the Middle East. We supply arms directly by grant to Jordan and sell them to Israel and Saudi Arabia. Meanwhile, Egypt's economic base for a Soviet-supplied military establishment is strengthened by our munificent extension of food. Our policymakers believe they are balancing these forces against each other. What they are doing is building a house of matchsticks. When it collapses, the United States will once again be encouraged to believe that military intervention by the United States is the only thing that can save the situation.

*What do we owe to developing countries?*

Grants and loans for development purposes, as contrasted with reconstruction, began about 15 years ago. Enough time has elapsed to arrive at some firm judgments about the value and effectiveness such programs can have in undeveloped countries.

The first conclusion must surely be that local interest, determination, and leadership are the essential ingredients for development and not American capital. Our loans and grants can supplement but can never replace those ingredients.

Our 15-year experience surely demolishes the worst fallacy about foreign aid. This fallacy holds that wealthy, industrial countries owe some obligation to contribute a fixed percentage of their national wealth to the poor nations. Yet the advocates of this theory would be horrified to see it applied within the United States. It would mean taxing the rich States in order to give money to the poor States just because they are poor, without providing extensive guidelines on how it is to be used, intensive supervision to see that the purposes of the program are carried out, and prompt suspension of assistance when specifications of the national purpose are not carried out.

The first and foremost obligation to the undeveloped countries lies with the people of the undeveloped countries, and their governments. It is the obligation to use outside financial help as effectively as possible. Too much American money is simply foisted on them for purposes and projects in which they have no interest and which they merely tolerate because the United States wants them to have it.

Proponents of the "we owe you a fixed percentage of our gross national product" theory give little attention to the real needs of poor nations. The one thing the people of these nations do not need is American subsidization of their old, semifeudal ways of doing things. Such subsidizing is not sound policy for the United States, either, for it induces us to throw more and more resources—even military forces—behind an unpopular and precarious government in the effort to justify our initial bad judgment.

Secondly, in our zeal to push funds into many of these countries we have found it much easier to push products and commodities than to promote or finance the development of natural and human resources. Much of this development probably calls for grants rather than loans. But it is being dangerously neglected by both borrowers and lenders.

Education in too many poor countries remains the mark of the privileged. In some, sending sons abroad for degrees from America or Britain is a sine qua non of the upper classes. Too much of our AID education assistance simply accommodates them in this neglect of their total national human resources. Despite the overcrowding of American campuses with American students, we continue to jam foreign students into them instead of concentrating on building education centers in their home countries.

We are also neglecting in our aid programs the basic education that we would call elementary and secondary. Figures for the Alliance for Progress, which is the most purely development program of any we have, show a distressing lack of emphasis on education.

*Alliance for Progress breakdown of total fiscal year 1966 technical cooperation funds*

| | Amount (thousands) | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Basic education | $8,471 | 10.8 |
| Technical training in industry and agriculture | 6,012 | 7.7 |
| Natural resources development-land reform | [1] 4,369 | 5.6 |
| Other | 59,148 | 75.9 |
| Total | [2] 78,000 | 100.0 |

[1] Natural resources development including land reform as shown above is restricted to natural resource surveys, forest management, land settlement, agrarian reform, and related activities. Excluded are overall agricultural productivity programs such as agricultural extension, crop research and development, cooperatives development, rural community development, agricultural marketing, agricultural diversification, etc. If the category of natural resources development is expanded to include all food and agricultural activities, including technical training in agriculture, the total TC funds would be 13,629 and the percentage would be 17.4.

[2] Total of $78,000,000 excludes $10,000,000 for Alliance for Progress share of nonregional costs.

*Breakdown of total fiscal year 1966 development loan program funds*

| | Amount (millions) | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Basic education | $3.2 | (1) |
| Technical training in industry and agriculture | | |
| Natural resources development-land reform | [2] 111.4 | 22 |
| Commodity imports (nonproject) | 305.0 | [3] 62 |
| Other | 73.5 | 15 |
| Total | 493.1 | 100 |

[1] Less than 1 percent.

[2] Includes loans for supervised agricultural credit; livestock, agricultural, and mining banks; access roads fertilizer imports; and related activities.

[3] Local currency counterpart also programed in many cases for education, agriculture, and other natural resources development.

The use to which proceeds of nonproject, or program, loans are put are not included in the above table. But the breakdown of the proceeds from program loans to Chile shows that about 9 percent of the 1963 loan went for education, about 5 percent of the 1964 loan, and about 16 percent of the 1965 loan. This is a meager allotment relative to need.

Although Chile has a high literacy rate relative to other South American countries, 40 percent of its total population is under 15 years of age. Literacy rates in many of these countries experiencing a population explosion will not even be maintained, much less reduced, unless faster progress is made to expand teaching facilities.

Education is perhaps the most important key to the development of poor nations. It cannot be forced on them; it cannot be financed by the United States on our say-so and without their enthusiastic cooperation.

Unless recipients move much faster and further in this field, they will never achieve sufficient productive capacity of their own to sustain growth or repay our loans.

CONCLUSION

We will not have a useful and effective aid program of the kind that seeks to build stable and autonomous governments until we learn that a massive American presence is not the key to this process. It can be a great hindrance. The Wall Street Journal of June 10, 1966, reports from Tokyo the high returns that Japan is enjoying from its modest aid efforts:

"Compared to exportable great societies, massive U.S. overseas spending and America's awesome foreign military commitments, Japan's modest approach to international affairs may seem, to some Americans, almost amusing. Yet Asian recipients of even small Japanese offerings, tied as they are to goods made in Japan, are nonetheless grateful. In fact, some appear more appreciative of small Japanese help than they are of infinitely more lavish U.S. gifts.

"And if Japan isn't hailed as Asia's new political precursor, she at least isn't damned, as is the United States so often, for meddling in others' internal affairs or supporting unpopular regimes."

General Ne Win, of Burma, a country which needs capital and technical assistance, took the initiative a few years ago to throw us out. Recently he was quoted (New York Times, June 20, 1966) as saying:

"Unless we Burmans can learn to run our own country we will lose it. Of course there are hardships. But we must put our own house in order."

He referred to some of his southeast Asian neighbors staggering under loads of money from the United States. The general said:

"This kind of aid does not help. It cripples. It paralyzes. The recipients never learn to do for themselves. They rely more and more on foreign experts and foreign money. In the end they lose control of their country."

Very well put. The Burmese are poor but not much worse off than Indonesians, Thai, Laotians, Indians, Pakistanis, and Vietnamese, all of whom have been deluged with U.S. aid.

George Kennan stated the case very well before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East when he said:

"I do feel very strongly that the only people really worth helping in this world are the people who say: We propose to survive whether you help us or not, but it will be a little easier for us if you help. The ones who come along and say to us: 'If you don't help us, we are going to go Communist, and then where would you be?' I think by definition are beyond helping."

But there is another side to the aid coin. Not only do we alienate the people we are trying to help, but we alienate those we are not trying to help. The latter are likely to

view us as meddlesome neighbors anxious to tell others how to act and what to do. There is a further effect on the United States when it assumes responsibilities everywhere.

This point was made a few days ago by Dr. Henry Kissinger, of Harvard University, when he testified on June 27 before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Although he was referring specifically to the American attitude toward Europe, his comment is equally applicable to our posture toward Asia and toward recipient aid countries generally. He said in part:

Some critics of American policy argue that the attempt to play a role simultaneously in every part of the globe is beyond our physical resources. It seems to me clearly beyond our psychological resources. If we insist on assuming the principal responsibility for every square mile of territory at every moment of time, we will tear ourselves to pieces inwardly. The continent closest to us culturally, with similar political traditions and substantial economic resources should—for our sake as well as its own—assume a greater responsibility for its policy and defense. It is neither in our interest nor that of Europe that Europe become the Greece to our Rome—a political backwater, interesting culturally but unable to play an active role. This would not be healthy for us because hegemony is demoralizing in the long run.

"Painful as it may be to admit, we could benefit from a counterweight to discipline our occasional impetuosity and to supply historical perspective to our penchant for abstract and 'final' solutions."

I have made this extensive report to buttress what seem to me to be two fundamental points: first, that aid as such does not necessarily advance our foreign policy interests but as presently conceived may actually damage our interests abroad; and second, that even when we pour in economic aid, it too often does not bring economic results—to use the words of the Senator from Michigan, Mr. GRIFFIN, it often makes the rich richer and the poor poorer.

Furthermore, it often creates an unhealthy dependency upon the United States at the very time when recipient countries should begin to make way on their own. Sooner or later the spoon-fed baby will knock the spoon out of his mother's hand; and that is what is going to happen to the United States if we continue present policies.

I would not begrudge the expenditure of 1 cent of these sums were I convinced that the American people were getting their money's worth. But they are not. Much of our aid—military as well as economic—is creating abroad societies which will be ever resentful of the United States. Their resentment will be focused on military forces we have created which stifle change and often promote military domination. Their resentment will be focused on our unilateral interference, financial or military, in their internal affairs, when there were international institutions available. Their resentment will well up from their desire to be independent and to do things for themselves—or at least not under the benign thumb of the United States.

WAYNE MORSE.

## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 10104. An act to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Employees", codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and to its civilian officers and employees (Rept. No. 1380).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 849. A bill for the relief of Arminda Padua Viseu (Rept. No. 1390);

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy (Rept. No. 1389);

S. 2770. A bill to control the use of the design of the great seal of the United States and of the seal of the President of the United States (Rept. No. 1396);

H.R. 1407. An act for the relief of Leonardo Russo (Rept. No. 1388);

H.R. 1414. An act for the relief of Jacobo Temel (Rept. No. 1387);

H.R. 4083. An act for the relief of Mr. Leonardo Tusa (Rept. No. 1386);

H.R. 4437. An act for the relief of Bryan George Simpson (Rept. No. 1385);

H.R. 4458. An act for the relief of Michel Fahim Daniel (Rept. No. 1384);

H.R. 4584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Michalska Holoweckyj (formerly Mrs. Anna Zalewski) (Rept. No. 1383);

H.R. 7508. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Bossio (Rept. No. 1382); and

H.R. 11718. An act for the relief of Jack L. Philippot (Rept. No. 1381).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.R. 10220. An act for the relief of Abdul Wohabe (Rept. No. 1391).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3272. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacobo Albo (Rept. No. 1392).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4602. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald W. Ottaway, U.S. Air Force (Rept. No. 1394); and

H.R. 8865. An act for the relief of Ronald Poirier, a minor (Rept. No. 1393).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 8317. An act to amend section 116 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma (Rept. No. 1395).

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 2681. An act for the relief of Shirley Shapiro (Rept. No. 1397).

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 3051. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the compact between Missouri and Kansas creating the Kansas City Area Transportation District and the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (Rept. No. 1398).

## TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING OF REPORT ON AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 285); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document the fourth semiannual report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the problem of air pollution caused by motor vehicles and measures taken toward its alleviation, dated June 23, 1966, in compliance with Public Law 88-206, The Clean Air Act, as amended by Public Law 89-272.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed two thousand five hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Vance W. Collins, of Kansas, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Kansas;

Leo A. Mault, of New Jersey, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Jersey;

Lloyd P. LaFountain, of Maine, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Maine;

John W. Peck, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge, sixth circuit;

Ben Hardeman, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Alabama;

Jesse L. Dobbs, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Texas;

Joseph P. Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio;

Jackie V. Robertson, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Oklahoma;

Woodrow B. Seals, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas;

Ernest Guinn, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas;

Irving L. Goldberg, of Texas, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit;

Robert A. Ainsworth, Jr., of Louisiana, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit;

John C. Godbold, of Alabama, to be U.S. circuit judge, fifth circuit;

William M. Taylor, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas;

Jack Roberts, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas; and

John V. Singleton, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for Mr. SMATHERS), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

C. Clyde Atkins, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Florida.

By Mr. HRUSKA, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Donald P. Lay, of Nebraska, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Samuel M. Nabrit, of Texas, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Wilfrid E. Johnson, of Washington, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

## ADDITIONAL BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

The following additional bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 3633. A bill for the relief of Neil B. Poole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

S. 3634. A bill to promote rail-highway safety by requiring light reflecting markings on railroad locomotives and cars; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3635. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos G. Kalaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. SIMPSON):

S. 3636. A bill to establish a national mining and minerals policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3637. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bambran Aravind Adyanthaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 3638. A bill to assist nonprofit corporations in the provision of specific projects for cultural centers and to remove certain restrictions and limitations on similar assistance to municipalities, other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of one or more States, and Indian tribes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

## EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL HELD CAPTIVE IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 102); which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. CON. RES. 102

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress:

(a) that all United States military personnel held captive in Vietnam are prisoners of war entitled to all the benefits of the Geneva Conventions of 1949;

(b) that the trial, punishment or execution of any such personnel by the Communist regime in North Vietnam would be contrary to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, accepted concepts of international law and standards of international behavior;

(c) that any such action undertaken by the Communist regime in North Vietnam in regard to United States military personnel would be an inhumanitarian act and a reprehensible offense against the peoples of the world;

(d) that the trial, punishment or execution of such United States personnel by the Communist regime in North Vietnam would seriously diminish the opportunity for the achievement of a just and secure peace in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, which is the objective of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is hereby requested to convey the sense of the Congress expressed in this resolution to the Communist regime in North Vietnam, to the participating states of the Geneva Conferences of 1954 and 1962, to the states adhering to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and to the member states of the United Nations.

## RESOLUTION

## TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING OF REPORT ON AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION

Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 285) to authorize the printing of report on automotive air pollution, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. RANDOLPH, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

## PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE NEEDLESS RAIL-HIGHWAY GRADE-CROSSING ACCIDENTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to promote rail-highway safety by requiring light reflecting markings on railroad locomotives and railroad cars.

Every day, every hour, every minute Americans are killed or maimed on our Nation's highways. More than 50,000 of them will die this year alone.

Public concern over this carnage on our highways and the senseless human tragedy which it involves has never been greater. States and local communities all across the country are taking action to cut down the highway death toll. The U.S. Congress too has begun to recognize its responsibilities. Within the last few weeks the Senate has passed two important bills, one dealing with traffic safety, the other with highway safety.

Mr. President, actions such as these designed to make our highways safer are most gratifying. Some serious problems remain unresolved, however.

One of these is the alarming number of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents every year in the United States. In 1964, collisions at grade crossings involving trains and motor vehicles totaled 3,539. These collisions involving motor vehicles accounted for 1,432 deaths and 3,676 persons injured. Preliminary figures for 1965 indicate more than 3,600 such accidents, with more than 1,400 persons killed and over 3,600 injured.

Particularly disturbing among these accidents are those in which motor vehicles run into the sides of trains. Here the preliminary 1965 figures show 1,215 accidents, in which 359 persons have been killed and 1,419 injured. Most of these accidents occur at night, when cars strike moving trains. Often they involve unlit railroad cars, particularly freight cars.

Several years ago at a dark railroad crossing in Indiana my family and I narrowly missed death when the car in which we were riding barely avoided striking the side of an unmarked, unlit freight train. I can assure my colleagues that it was a terrifying experience.

I am firmly convinced that many lives would be saved by using reflective paint on unlit railroad cars to make this equipment more readily visible at night, thus eliminating the hazards of motor vehicles striking the sides of freight cars moving over rail-highway grade crossings. I have discussed this idea with the Interstate Commerce Commission and they believe it has merit.

The bill which I am introducing is a very simple one. It provides the Interstate Commerce Commission with the authority to establish such orders as may be necessary to require each railroad carrier to place, prior to such date as is established in such orders, on all of its locomotives and cars in service such light-reflecting paint or other reflector markings as the Commission determines to be best suited to promote safety at rail-highway crossings. These orders shall also require proper maintenance of such markings and installation of such markings on locomotives and cars placed in service after such date.

In light of the increased concern of the Congress for safety on our highways, I very much hope that action will be taken at an early date on this bill designed to save additional lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from one of my constituents on this matter and a letter which I have received from the Interstate Commerce Commission may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3634) to promote rail-highway safety by requiring light-reflecting marking on railroad locomotives and cars, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letters, presented by Mr. McGOVERN, are as follows:

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
*May 23, 1966.*

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR GEORGE: I'm writing you to pass on an idea which came to me some time ago as we read in the papers about several costly accidents which occurred on South Dakota highways. People drove into moving trains at night. If we could cut down this particular kind of accident, it would greatly reduce fatalities on our highways.

I recall one time when I was driving at night on a backtop road which was just a little bit slippery. I was probably going about 45 miles per hour. Suddenly I realized that a train was crossing the road probably 120 yards in front of me. There was no light of any kind on that train visible to my area. No shiny part to reflect my own lights. Fortunately I was able to stop, with not too much to go on.

If every car which made up that train had been marked with a large X, made with reflector paint, I would have been warned at least a quarter of a mile away. I believe a federal regulation, requiring all freight cars to be marked with reflector paint will save more lives on our highways than any other regulation which might be passed.

I hope you will give this suggestion thoughtful consideration, and that you will start action through the proper channels to bring about reflector paint identification markings on all railroad cars that are not otherwise lighted, such as passenger coaches.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL CARLSEN.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
*Washington, D.C., May 27, 1966.*

Hon. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: This has reference to your communication of May 25, 1966, enclosing a letter from Reverend Samuel Carlsen of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, suggesting that many lives would be saved by using reflective paint on railroad freight cars

to make this equipment more readily visible at night, and thus eliminate the hazards of motor vehicles striking the sides of freight trains or cars moving over rail-highway grade crossings. Reflectorized materials or paints have been successfully used in highway signs and markers for a considerable period of time. Congress, several times in the past, has evinced interest in bills which would require reflectors or reflectorized markings on the sides of railroad cars, but took no action on any of the proposed measures. Perhaps now with the growing public awareness and concern for traffic safety at rail-highway grade crossings, introduction of a bill to effect such legislation might receive more favorable consideration.

The suggestion as to applying reflective paint or reflectorized markings to the sides of railroad equipment has merit. At the present time, several railroads have made limited applications of such materials on cars and locomotives. We are studying the effectiveness of these applications which show some promise of eliminating or reducing the type of accident in which the visibility of trains or cars moving over a rail-highway crossing at night is an important factor. Certainly consideration must be given to new concepts and to newly developed materials to make railroad equipment more readily visible and to advance safety in this field.

Thank you for inviting my comments on these suggestions toward the prevention of rail-highway grade-crossing accidents. We appreciate the interest which you and your constituent have in these matters. Anything which will reduce or eliminate these tragic accidents is of vital interest to this Commission.

Reverend Carlsen's letter is returned herewith for your records.

Sincerely.

JOHN W. BUSH,
*Chairman.*

## BILL TO MAKE COMMUNITY FACILITIES LOANS AVAILABLE FOR CULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, to make community facilities loans available to municipalities and nonprofit organizations who desire to build or remodel structures for cultural purposes.

Under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, the Federal Government is currently authorized through the Community Facilities Administration to extend credit for the construction of basic public works to those municipalities who could not otherwise find credit on reasonable terms and conditions. This title is based on a recognition by Congress that in many instances municipalities or other political subdivisions of the States are unable to raise elsewhere the funds necessary to provide for essential public works and physical facilities.

The bill that I offer today would expand the coverage of this credit assistance so that private municipalities can receive community facilities loans for the construction and remodeling of arts and museum facilities. It would also make these loans available to private nonprofit corporations which are seeking funds for such purposes.

Mr. President, the strength of a democratic society is in part a function of the value placed on the creative expression of the human spirit. For the quality of artistic and intellectual life which a society creates and supports determines in large measure the character of its people and the richness of their lives.

Consequently, I believe, development of our Nation's cultural facilities, without which artistic expression cannot flourish or be enjoyed, deserves the same kind of support as the water works and the street improvement projects which now receive primary emphasis and assistance under the community facilities program.

The need for such assistance is clear. From the day that the National Endowment for the Arts was established, it has received numerous inquiries and requests for assistance for construction, remodeling or preservation of arts and museum facilities. There have been over 200 requests in the last year from municipalities seeking capital funds. Among these inquiries were requests for:

| | |
|---|---|
| Theaters (including studios, workshops, storage rooms, etc.) | 57 |
| Centers for the visual arts (including galleries, studios, sculpture gardens, lecture rooms, etc.) | 49 |
| Centers for the performing arts (including theaters, auditoriums, opera houses, and rehearsal and studio facilities) | 33 |
| Museums | 16 |
| Remodeling or expansion funds for theaters, museums, opera houses | 16 |
| Historic preservation for cultural purposes (including museums, opera houses, art centers) | 6 |
| Music, drama or art schools | 8 |

As the interest in the arts continues to grow in our society, the number of such requests will continue to grow. This burgeoning interest in the arts is already manifest in the 40,000 community theater groups, 750 opera companies, 200 nonprofessional dance groups, and over 1,000 community orchestras that have sprung up all over America. Many of these groups have the talent resources to provide great educational and cultural opportunities for our Nation's citizens. Yet they suffer from a lack of adequate facilities. Some communities have wisely sought to combine the need for such facilities with a desire to renovate, maintain, and preserve structures of historic and esthetic significance to the community. These old buildings, with a modest investment, can often be easily converted into museums, art centers, and galleries.

A large number of the requests for assistance are from private nonprofit organizations. Although these organizations have traditionally played an important role in the development of the arts and education, their contribution to the cultural life of this country has been severely hampered by a lack of adequate physical facilities. With the passage of this amendment these private organizations could acquire and expand cultural facilities, and become more deeply involved in community education programs. The net result would be that the private, cultural organizations could receive more community support, and in turn could offer to the community a more stimulating and challenging program of artistic, cultural, and educational activities.

Let me point out that extending credit assistance to such groups will not involve any substantial risk to the Federal purse. Many of these nonprofit groups have a steady source of income from tuition, membership, and admission fees, making it possible for them to undertake and meet Community Facilities Loan commitments. Furthermore, my amendment stipulates that loans to such nonprofit private organizations would be made with the same safeguards and limitations as are currently made with respect to municipalities.

Mr. President, the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts signified a recognition on the part of the Congress of the role of the Federal Government in supporting the arts—a recognition that we must seek to make the fruits of culture available to all our citizens just as we are trying to make the fruits of economic abundance available to them. I am hopeful that this bill will help in the attainment of this goal.

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

The bill (S. 3638) to assist nonprofit corporations in the provision of specific projects for cultural centers and to remove certain restrictions and limitations on similar assistance to municipalities, other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of one or more States, and Indian tribes; introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 694

Mr. BYRD of Virginia submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 695

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) proposed an amendment to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 696

Mr. KENNEDY of New York submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. KENNEDY of New York, which appears under a separate heading.)

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 12, 1966, the names of Mr. GRUENING and Mr. HARTKE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3608) to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the

chemical compound known as DDT, introduced by Mr. NELSON on July 12, 1966.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3430) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1966, in order to authorize the approval of courses in flight training under such act.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as cosponsors of S. 3602, a bill to preserve the U.S. Capitol and to establish a Commission to study the existing and future needs of the Congress with respect to the Capitol, and that their names appear on the bill at its next printing.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 3565, relating to educational expenses of teachers, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor.

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

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION SUPPLEMENTAL FINANCING

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Agricultural Credit and Rural Electrification of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee will begin hearings on legislation authorizing supplemental financing for rural electrification systems on Monday, August 15.

The subcommittee plans to hear departmental and organizational witnesses at length, but will limit individual testimony to 10 minutes.

Testimony should be directed to the draft bill proposed by the Department of Agriculture and S. 3337, introduced by Senator BASS and others.

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 21, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 822) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public land in Wyoming to Clara Dozier Wire.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House further insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. REINECKE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2948) to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

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

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

## MORAL RE-ARMAMENT "SING-OUT, '66"

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, some Members of the Senate may have had the pleasure of seeing either a live performance or television version of the "Sing-Out, '66" program organized by the Moral Re-Armament movement.

Beginning with the first sing-out group organized in 1965, this project has captivated audiences throughout our country. The original group of 130 high school and college students, with their entertaining narrative and musical presentation of traditional American ideals, has caught on to such an extent that more than 5,000 young Americans are now participating in 53 local "sing-out" casts—all proudly dedicated to spreading the fundamental themes of freedom and citizen responsibility.

I am informed that during the last year, upwards of two million persons in the United States and several foreign countries have taken an enthusiastic and active part in patriotic rallies featuring the sing-out group. These performances have taken place in more than 50 cities, on more than 300 college and high school campuses, and on many of our military bases.

Even more heartening has been the response of peoples in many foreign lands. Tens of thousands of young people in Japan, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and Germany—to mention only a few of the countries—are participating in "sing-out" casts modeled after the original group's presentation of our cherished ideals.

More recently, a 1-hour television film production of "Sing-out '66" has been shown in many of our major cities as a public service feature, with the television time underwritten by the Schick Safety Razor Co.

Literally millions of our people have seen and greatly enjoyed this wholesome hour of fine entertainment, which is all the more appealing at a time when a small but noisy minority of anti-American demonstrators are constantly in the news with their disgusting and often illegal behavior.

Throughout the sing-out program, the themes of duty, sacrifice, honor, loyalty, and responsibility are emphasized. These are among the virtues that made America great—and in my opinion they need emphasizing.

Regrettably, the management of one major network saw fit to refuse this sponsored program for telecasting on its network stations in St. Louis, Chicago, and Philadelphia.

The sponsor understandably has complained to the Federal Communications Commission about this matter, and it is my hope that the Commission will carefully examine the content of the program. I am sure they will find that it is an inspiring, patriotic presentation that should not offend any loyal American's sensibilities.

Public response to the sing-out groups helps place in proper perspective the antics of the few who have been unduly publicized for anti-American demonstrations. The continuing work of those who are dedicated to the objectives of the Moral Re-Armament movement gives all of us cause to hope that our historic pride and idealism as a united people continue to exert a powerful appeal.

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I join in the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week.

First. Because I share in the aspirations and yearnings of those brave citizens of the captive nations which have for years experienced the yoke of foreign domination, I regret the necessity of once again merely calling attention to their plight. Second. However, I consider it entirely fitting that Congress set aside a week during which the Members of Congress and the citizens of this country express their recognition and support for the dreams and hopes of these captive people to once again secure their rightful place among the community of free nations.

The annual observance of Captive Nations Week takes on added significance

this year as we experience and resist the attempt to forcefully subjugate a free people in South Vietnam.

The desire of freedom-loving peoples throughout the world to assist Vietnam in maintaining its independence should be no greater than its desire to assist the people of the captive nations to once again secure their freedom. Although the individuals of the captive nations have been subjugated and dominated for many years, the awesome force of totalitarian rule has failed to extinguish the flame of liberty which burns within the hearts of the captive people.

The people of the United States and the Government of the United States should not limit recognition of and assistance to the people of the captive nations to the 1 week set aside each year for observance of Captive Nations Week. Every effort should be made all year round to assist these people to secure the freedom to choose their own destiny. This Government should avoid taking steps to more firmly entrench the governments in power in these countries. Attempts to expand trade and commercial transactions should be firmly resisted because in the final analysis, such trade would serve to benefit the rulers in power rather than the people subject to their totalitarian rule.

In addition, the United States should take positive steps to bring the plight of these people to the attention of the whole world. Our representatives to the United Nations should be instructed to place this question on the agenda of the United Nations for discussion and debate. A free and democratic referendum of the people to express their political aspirations should be demanded.

All the governments of the free world must pledge to use all peaceful means to restore and protect the right of freedom of choice for the oppressed people of captive nations everywhere. Dedication and constant devotion to the cause of liberty on the part of all freedom-loving people would, I am convinced, soon result in tangible accomplishments toward self-determination for the people of the captive nations.

## MISSOURI IDLE ACRES THAT COULD PRODUCE NEEDED SUGAR ARE AGAIN PASSED OVER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, farmers in Missouri who have cropland idle as a result of their desire to cooperate with Federal programs will read with interest the announcement by the Department of Agriculture issued July 18 reporting an increase of 125,000 tons in the quota for sugar for 1966. Of this increase, 98,247 tons will come from foreign countries, but not a pound, apparently, from the mainland, U.S.A.

For the past 5 years many of the farmers and some of the farm organizations in Missouri, with the cooperation of the University of Missouri, have been conducting tests which clearly show that sugarbeets can be produced commercially in the parts of Missouri where the acreage reduction has been heaviest, on some of our domestic crops in surplus, particularly cotton.

We would hope the time will come in the not too distant future when these farmers in Missouri will have the opportunity to share in the needed increases in sugar production.

I ask unanimous consent that the Department of Agriculture release on the increase in sugar quotas be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington, July 18, 1966.*

USDA ANNOUNCES INCREASE IN SUGAR QUOTAS

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced an increase of 125,000 tons in the estimate of total sugar requirements for 1966—from 10.1 million tons to 10,225,000 short tons, raw value.

Today's action increases the quota for Hawaii by 26,753 tons and the quotas for foreign countries by 98,247 tons.

A portion of the statement of bases and considerations is quoted below:

"Section 201 of the Act directs the Secretary to revise the determination of sugar requirements at such times during the calendar year as he deems necessary in order to meet the needs of consumers. Prior to the current period of hot weather over most of the Nation, it was apparent that sugar was being sold at a rate slightly higher than that expected on a seasonally adjusted basis. The hot weather now prevailing has added impetus to that tendency. At this point it appears likely that sugar consumption during the calendar year will exceed the 10.1 million short tons, raw value, which was estimated at the time 1966 sugar requirements were initially established in December of last year. With the heavy consuming season at hand, augmented by the current high temperatures, additional sugar supplies will be required to adequately serve the needs of the market. Accordingly, total sugar requirements for the calendar year 1966 are hereby increased to a total of 10,225,000 short tons, raw value."

"* * * Section 202(a)(2)(B) provides that the quota otherwise established for Hawaii shall be increased within prescribed limits on the basis of the quantity of sugar available for marketing in the continental United States stemming from increased production. A determination of the amount of sugar so available for marketing under the statute has been under consideration. Such determination has been made and the Hawaiian quota is increased in accordance with the requirements of the statute. The quota for Hawaii for calendar year 1966 is hereby established at 1,200,227 short tons, raw value."

Quota increases and revised quotas are shown in the following table:

[Short tons, raw value]

| Production area | Change in quotas | Basic quotas | Temporary quotas and prorations pursuant to sec. 202(d)[1] | Deficits and deficit prorations | Total quotas and prorations |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Domestic beet area | | 3,025,000 | | | 3,025,000 |
| Mainland cane area | | 1,100,000 | | | 1,100,000 |
| Hawaii | 26,753 | 1,200,227 | | | [2] 1,200,227 |
| Puerto Rico | | 1,140,000 | | −410,000 | [2] 730,000 |
| Virgin Islands | | 15,000 | | −5,000 | 10,000 |
| Total, domestic areas | | 6,480,227 | | | 6,065,227 |
| Republic of Philippines | 13,575 | 1,107,015 | | 195,963 | [2] 1,302,978 |
| Mexico | 16,471 | 203,485 | 210,582 | 42,010 | 456,077 |
| Dominican Republic | 16,107 | 199,010 | 205,950 | 41,086 | 446,046 |
| Brazil | 16,107 | 199,010 | 205,950 | 41,086 | 446,046 |
| Peru | 12,848 | 158,734 | 164,270 | 32,771 | 355,775 |
| British West Indies | 1,332 | 79,499 | 73,909 | 15,565 | 168,973 |
| Ecuador | 2,344 | 28,956 | 29,967 | 5,978 | 64,901 |
| French West Indies | 419 | 25,008 | 23,249 | 4,896 | 53,153 |
| Argentina | 1,980 | 24,482 | 25,335 | 5,054 | 54,871 |
| Costa Rica | 1,952 | 23,428 | 25,639 | 4,978 | 54,045 |
| Nicaragua | 1,952 | 23,428 | 25,639 | 4,978 | 54,045 |
| Colombia | 1,704 | 21,059 | 21,794 | 4,348 | 47,201 |
| Guatemala | 1,644 | 19,743 | 21,605 | 4,195 | 45,543 |
| Panama | 1,194 | 14,742 | 15,255 | 3,044 | 33,041 |
| El Salvador | 1,208 | 14,479 | 15,844 | 3,077 | [2] 33,400 |
| Haiti | 896 | 11,056 | 11,442 | 2,283 | 24,781 |
| Venezuela | 809 | 10,003 | 10,351 | 2,065 | 22,419 |
| British Honduras | 96 | 5,791 | 5,384 | 1,134 | 12,309 |
| Bolivia | 192 | 2,369 | 82,452 | 489 | 5,310 |
| Australia | 2,086 | 94,767 | 87,546 | | 182,313 |
| Republic of China | 869 | 39,486 | 36,478 | | 75,964 |
| India | 835 | 37,907 | 35,019 | | 72,926 |
| South Africa | 614 | 27,903 | 25,778 | | 53,681 |
| Fiji Islands | 458 | 20,796 | 19,212 | | 40,008 |
| Thailand | 191 | 8,687 | 8,025 | | 16,712 |
| Mauritius | 191 | 8,687 | 8,025 | | 16,712 |
| Malagasy Republic | 98 | 4,475 | 4,134 | | 8,609 |
| Swaziland | 75 | 3,422 | 3,161 | | 6,583 |
| Ireland | | 5,351 | | | [2] 5,351 |
| Total | 125,000 | 8,903,005 | 1,321,995 | 0 | 10,225,000 |

[1] Includes the proration of quotas withheld from Cuba and Southern Rhodesia and the proration of the quota for Honduras to Central American Common Market countries.

[2] Direct-consumption portion: Hawaii, 34,970 tons; Puerto Rico, 153,375 tons; Republic of the Philippines, 59,920 tons; Panama, 3,817 tons; and Ireland, 5,351 tons.

## HOUSE COMMERCE COMMITTEE ADOPTS HARTKE-MACKAY TRAFFIC PROPOSAL

Mr. HARTKE. I was delighted to learn from my colleague of the House of Representatives, Congressman JAMES MACKAY, of Georgia, that the deliberations of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House have resulted in a decision to recommend one more major feature of the Hartke-Mackay amendments to the bill for safety on the highways. That is a proposal, which was a feature of the original Hartke-Mackay traffic safety bill introduced before the administration measure, to center the Federal safety

drive in a separate Traffic Safety Agency under an Administrator.

This is surely a desirable move, and I commend the House committee for receiving the amendment favorably, since it will give a stature and a standing and a degree of independent action to the operations of the Agency which it could not attain in the same way as a subordinate operation within the Department of Commerce. Our intention is to give the Traffic Safety Agency, as the operating arm of the legislative action, a status equivalent to that, for example, of the Federal Aviation Agency. It should, I believe, become a vital part of the Department of Transportation if and when the new Cabinet agency is established.

It is my understanding that the Administrator of the Traffic Safety Agency will be recommended in the House proposal for level IV of the Federal executive scale. This is certainly none too high a rank for such a most important post. As we said in the section-by-section analysis which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD upon the introduction of the comprehensive Hartke-Mackay amendments:

> The bill proposes a comprehensive traffic safety plan, but its various parts are vitally interconnected and they must, to be effective, be coordinated under an Administrator of appropriate eminence.

While a large number of the proposals which we made earlier became a part of the Senate-passed bill, this was one area in which the Senate Commerce Committee did not take action. Since it was one of the suggestions we made which I believe would be a substantial improvement, I want to congratulate Congressman MACKAY and the House committee for their adoption of a valuable change. I hope the Senate will see fit to accept it if it becomes a part of the House version upon passage.

## BILLY GRAHAM'S PLEA TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON FOR ACTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, crime in the streets; murder at night; riots in the heat of summer; arrogant leaders of offbeat organizations virtually calling for bloodshed, violence, or revolutionary measures; and a growing manifestation of contempt for law and order have combined to make this a sad and disillusioning era of American history.

Action is needed and courageous leadership is required to bring this great Nation back to the pathways of commonsense and good behavior. As the leader of the free world and a Nation of people quick to find fault with undesirable policies and practices in other countries, it is imperative in my opinion that President Johnson and Congress take action now to bring respect for law and order back into practice in America. Every church and school and home should also help meet this challenge to decency by exerting special efforts to restore domestic tranquillity to these United States.

It is a known fact which this administration unfortunately seems reluctant or unwilling to proclaim that the Communist Party and other undesirable and lawless elements are back of some of the riots, and marches, and violence now shocking the conscience of dedicated Americans. In some instance these attacks upon the order, the reputation, and the prestige of the United States have only the most remote—if any—connection with racial tensions or injustices but slap-happy headline writers fail to distinguish between actions resembling anarchy itself and legitimate protests against specific injustices.

Rev. Billy Graham has made a public appeal to President Johnson to do something specific to slow down or stop this mad march toward the self-destruction of America, Congress, I am sure, is willing to respond to any leadership the President properly exerts in this long neglected field.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a column by widely read and respected David Lawrence relating to the subject matter of my remarks be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

BILLY GRAHAM'S PLEA TO JOHNSON

(By David Lawrence)

The Rev. Dr. Billy Graham, evangelist of world renown, has appealed publicly to President Johnson—his close friend—to identify the groups inside America "who are teaching and advocating violence, training in guerrilla tactics and defying authority."

The famous Baptist minister declares that, "incredible as it may seem, we are on the road to anarchy in some of the large cities in this country, and the symptoms are ominous and dangerous." He says that "our leaders should not ignore this threat any longer."

Recently, Congress has been studying the Ku Klux Klan and is about to consider legislation dealing with "clandestine organizations." But this does not go far enough. For it is becoming known that some of the persons with considerable influence in the terroristic activities being carried on in the name of the "civil rights" movement in America either are Communists themselves, or are sympathetic to communism.

Dr. Graham points out that many of the demonstrations have "the pattern of defiance of authority," and he emphasizes that "they are organized and planned by a hard core of extremists who are taking advantage of just grievances by people living in the frustrations of ghettoes." He adds that "the FBI and the President know who they (the extremist leaders) are and what they are up to. Now the people need to know. Congress has no more urgent business than to pass laws with teeth in them."

Police Superintendent O. W. Wilson in Chicago says the recent riots there were intensified by militant groups which courted violence. So far as is known, not one of the principal leaders of the civil rights groups is himself accused of being a Communist. But among the different organizations are said to be top advisers with a wide knowledge of Communist tactics who are accomplishing what the Communists want—namely, to produce a state of anarchy by means of violence, as mobs are incited and collisions with the police are stimulated.

Nearly every day the newspapers are reporting hundreds of Negroes shouting either "Black Power!" or other provocative slogans, as they clash with the police. Innocent bystanders have been hurt and lives have been lost. Big riots have occurred not only in Chicago and New York, but also in many other cities in nearly every section of the country, from Los Angeles to Jacksonville, Fla., and from Memphis, Tenn., to South Bend, Ind.

It is difficult for the President himself to reveal individual identifications. He can only denounce in general terms the types of organizations which are guilty of what amounts to a process of subversion. Congressional committees, on the other hand, have the power to subpoena witnesses and to expose the inner workings of Communist and other groups. But there has been a tendency in recent months to deal gently with civil rights organizations for fear of alienating votes. The theory is that Negroes themselves would resent such accusations and that this would be considered as a blanket indictment of the Negro cause.

The time has come, however, in the opinion of many observers—particularly those who agree with Dr. Graham—for the administration to initiate hearings in Congress and tell the people what is going on that has caused much of the rioting and mob violence, allegedly in support of the civil-rights movement. Actually the result has been a disturbing of the peace generally and a heating up of friction between the races.

Dr. Graham's appeal expresses the viewpoint of many citizens who have been hopeful that Congress would forget about politics, courageously tackle the problem of mob violence, and make it a crime to impair the safety of citizens anywhere in the United States by incitements to violence. Many people are unable to traverse the city streets nowadays and go to and from their homes without being subjected to the risks and dangers of physical violence.

In these days of increased reliance on the federal government there has been a strange indifference here to the use of those powers which could be lawfully exercised to stop the wave of mobocracy that has been developing throughout the country.

## ONE-SIDED CREDIT LAWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there has recently been brought to my attention an excellent article which appeared in the March 1966 issue of Consumer Reports. This article reveals in detail practices used by some retailers who sell on the installment plan, particularly used car dealers, to bilk American servicemen. Many of the examples used were turned up by the investigations last year conducted by a House Banking and Currency Subcommittee.

The article convincingly shows that under the present inadequate protections for consumers, "soldiers and civilians alike leave their consumer sovereignty at the door when they buy on credit."

One of the reforms endorsed in the article is the truth-in-lending bill which would require the seller or lender to make full disclosure of the finance charges before a contract is signed. The article concludes that "the foundation stone" of Federal protection for consumers in the credit field should be the truth-in-lending act.

I point out that, in the time which has passed since this article was published, the Department of Defense has corrected some of the deficiencies in its consumer affairs directive, one of these actions being the requirement that those who lend or sell on time to servicemen must make a truth-in-lending disclosure if they hope to use military channels to collect debts owed them. Also, the Massachusetts State Legislature has

passed a retail sales credit act which includes truth-in-lending disclosure.

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:

ARE CHANGES COMING IN THOSE ONE-SIDED CREDIT LAWS?—EASY PAYMENT DEALS GIVE SELLERS FAR MORE RIGHTS TO YOUR PROPERTY THAN YOU MAY REALIZE—BUT THERE'S A RAY OF HOPE

It came as a nasty shock to a Congressional subcommittee last year, at a time when the casualty lists from Vietnam were beginning to rise, to learn that right here at home many members of the Armed Forces were being bled white by credit sellers.

Buy-now-pay-later promotions were sweeping servicemen into a sea of financial obligations in which hundreds of thousands of others, soldiers and civilians alike, were already floundering. The laws of the land, instead of helping them survive, seemed to be buoying up the sellers and lenders: automobile dealers, department stores, banks, finance companies—in fact, every kind of retailer and installment lender. "Extortion, pure and simple," was the way an Army legal officer described what was happening to his men. But, technically speaking, it wasn't extortion at all, for what the debt collectors were doing was quite legal.

After a House Banking and Currency subcommittee had exposed some details of the harassment of servicemen by their creditors, the Pentagon went to the defense of its 2,600,000 people in uniform by instituting some new regulations aimed at curbing unrestrained collection and repossession tactics. The subcommittee's hearings had dealt with only one lender, Federal Services Finance Corp., specializing in loans to the military and boasting a board of directors heavily laden with retired generals and admirals. But the testimony made it plain that credit company harassment is by no means confined to one company's dealings with one class of borrower but that it menaces everyone who buys on credit. Thus the impact of what went into the hearing record may, or at least should, be felt everywhere from Capitol Hill to the legislatures of the 50 states.

SOLDIERS WITHOUT WEAPONS

Lt. Col. Clyde Griffith, a judge advocate at Fort Myer, Va., described to the subcommittee a hypothetical but, so he said, typical case: An enlisted man in need of a car finds one to his liking on a used car lot, and the car dealer writes a no-down-payment deal for $600. The dealer promptly sells the installment contract to a finance company closely affiliated with the used-car sales operation. What the soldier may not know is that he will be paying the finance company instead of the car dealer.

Under a peculiar rule of credit law, this resale of debt deprives the borrower of his most effective recourse against mistreatment—the threat to withhold payment. This is no threat at all to an unscrupulous seller who already has converted credit obligations into cash by selling them. Nor is it likely to be effective against the finance company. In legal parlance, this lender may be an innocent "holder in due course" and under the laws of a majority of states, a buyer cannot bring against a holder-in-due-course many of the claims he might have brought against the seller.

The installment sale contract with the enlisted man's signature on it has a good many other hookers in it, which led to the Army lawyer's charge of "extortion, pure and simple." Col. Griffith explained how the gouging can go.

His soldier's purchase of a $600 used car, plus car insurance loaded with dealer and lender commissions, plus credit life insurance, plus finance charges for two or three years at upwards of 30% true annual interest, results in a debt package of $1200—double the price of the car. The soldier supports a wife and children. After paying off about $200 on his debt, he finds that he cannot afford the car any longer and asks the finance company to take it back. The finance company amiably agrees to do so. It promptly sells the repossessed car to a dummy bidder for $200. The dummy bidder, an alter ego of the finance company and the used car lot, is then free to market the car all over again at something like the original $600 price, plus a new load of insurance and finance charges. Meanwhile, the finance company credits the soldier with only $200 on its resale, plus the $200 in payments made, and bills him for $800 in further installments.

"In other words," Col. Griffith testified, they could sue on this note and this soldier can't even go in and say: But this $800 represents two and a half years of unused interest, unused insurance. . . . It is a very vicious circle and it hurts the serviceman badly and it is certainly something which should be controlled, but I regret to say it is rather a general practice among finance companies, particularly those that finance automobiles."

Members of the Armed Forces would seem to have a little more protection in some areas of debt collection than ordinary customers. A serviceman's pay cannot be garnisheed, and within the civil jurisdiction his defenses against court judgments are stronger than those of a civilian. But until recently finance companies dealing with service personnel have had something much more convincing than garnishments and sheriffs working for them, as Col. Griffith explained:

"[Under] the Uniform Code of Military Justice . . . it is a criminal offense for a soldier to willfully and dishonorably fail to pay a debt. . . . He can be court-martialed and, in many instances, . . . [the finance] companies will write to the company commander and say, "Why haven't you court-martialed this man? . . . You know that the criminal code requires you to do so." . . . [It does] if the debt is an honest, genuine debt, and he is willfully and dishonorably failing to pay it. But when you start out with a debt that is of questionable integrity and you use military command channels to try to collect that debt, I can't think of anything more vicious."

According to the testimony of Col. Griffith and others, a number of servicemen have been dishonorably discharged under just such circumstances. Back in civilian life, they find the finance company waiting with lawsuits and all the other pressures in its arsenal of civilian collection methods. If the disgraced serviceman is fortunate enough to get a job, garnishments may follow him. Many companies discharge employees whose wages have been garnisheed. And so the vicious circle continues round.

REPOSSESSION IS NINE-TENTHS OF THE LAW

The large number of servicemen squeezed in the vise of debt can be attributed partly to the fact that many unscrupulous merchants—especially car salesmen—prey on them at lots and salesrooms fringing military bases. The low pay of an enlisted man doesn't disqualify him at all as a credit risk for these operators. People in low-income groups are prime target of salesmen with installment contracts. Naturally, too, they show up conspicuously in the list of those whose debts have gone sour. But a significant percentage of the names on such lists belong to members of the supposedly prospering middle class. The Federal Reserve Board has found to its surprise that of a sampling of people in financial trouble in Mobile, Ala., 25% were solid citizens with records of at least eight years' continuous employment with the same firm.

The runaway rise in consumer debt, which CU deplored in last September's CONSUMER REPORTS, is worrying others as well. *Business Week* quotes the president of the Atlas Finance Company of Atlanta as saying, "The economy has expanded and opened the door for credit to a lot of people who haven't attained credit worthiness," and a Houston department store executive as saying that "a lot more customers . . . are getting into extended revolving credit accounts and some of them are taking on bigger payments than they can handle."

These businessmen are concerned, of course, primarily about the soundness of their own lending operations. Government economists are worried by the sudden, snowballing effect on the nation's economy that an overload of consumer debt could produce with any downturn in the national prosperity. But the cold statistics of debt failure find their most immediate reality in hardship for the individuals and families who are the flesh and blood behind the statistics. And what happens to them has to do with the carefully contrived structure of state installment credit laws.

Although sometimes enacted in the name of consumer protection, these laws generally condone grossly unfair collection tactics. Under many laws, for example, an installment-sale contract may empower the seller to repossess items bought on credit whenever he deems the debt insecure. Only a handful of states, moreover, prohibit installment-sale contract provisions giving the lender arbitrary power to demand accelerated payment. With this weapon, a lender can actually force a borrower into default if it suits his purpose to repossess a car or other goods. Still another contract clause sanctioned under certain laws makes it a breach of contract to drive a credit-financed car out of the state where it was financed.

There are also states in which a revolving-credit charge account may give the merchant or holder of debt "conditional title" to everything financed through the account, so long as any balance remains unpaid. Items long since bought and, so the buyer thought, paid for may be repossessed by virtue of this hooker in a contract.

With the retail installment contracts generally used in many states, the borrower turns over to the lender his power of attorney. Any time the borrower fails to meet his obligations in the slightest degree (such as making one payment a single day late), the lender may, if he wishes, simply go to court and "confess" the borrower's inability to pay. Then he may receive an assignment of the borrower's wages or get a judgment that gives him legal access to any of the borrower's assets for purposes of collecting the entire balance immediately.

It may come as a shock to many people, too, that in most states the lender can set up his contract so that he is, in effect, authorized to break into the borrower's home or car in order to grab his security. Only in California, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, and Pennsylvania do retail installment-sales acts specifically prohibit this legalized theft.

Every now and then it is acknowledged that laws set up to permit lenders such extraordinary powers as these are not really in the public interest. Pennsylvania legislators, for example, wrote the following in the preamble to a motor vehicle installment-sales act passed in 1958: "the extension of credit to the purchaser has been so inextricably entwined with the alleged bailment of the motor vehicle as to deprive the consumer of the benefit of existing laws. . . . Consumers, because of these legal technicalities and because of their unequal bargaining position, are at the mercy of unscrupulous persons and

are being intolerably exploited in the installment purchase of motor vehicles. Such exploitation is evident in the unfair provisions of the installment sale contract, exorbitant charges for credit, extortionate default, extension, collection, repossession and other charges, unconscionable practices respecting execution of contracts, refinancing of contracts, prepayment, refunds insurance, repossession and redemption."

The law that followed this irate preamble remedied some abuses on the list but left others untouched.

Really good credit laws are as yet nonexistent, and even fairly good ones are very scarce. Because lenders may go along quite far with an installment purchaser before invoking their powers, most people are not aware of how thoroughly they put themselves in the lender's hands with that name on the dotted line. The harsh truth is this: Soldier and civilian alike leave their consumer sovereignty at the door when they buy on credit. There are only two choices—take the contract or leave it.

THE SOLDIERS GET SOME WEAPONS

The Pentagon, stung by the public revelations of what was happening to its predominantly young and inexperienced enlisted personnel, has struck back with Defense Department Directive 1344.7. This document, which attempts to remedy most of the abuses brought to light by the Congressional hearings, is in some respects a landmark in the annals of consumer credit.

The directive represents probably the first attempt by a Federal agency to define standards of fairness in the execution of retail credit contracts. Seen in this context, it reaches, potentially, beyond the military to the entire consumer economy. Here are some of its salient provisions:

Any fair contract, by the new Armed Forces standards, should, among other things, agree that repossession of security—a car, for instance—will serve as payment in full, no matter how little the finance company gets by selling the item. In other words, the lender can sue for the balance due or repossess the purchase. But he can no longer do both.

"Will this not provide encouragement to servicemen to buy more expensive cars . . . and . . . to be less responsible with respect to payment . . .?" a credit trade group asked the Pentagon. It replied: "The Department of Defense anticipates that the opposite effect will be achieved . . . in that lenders may require larger down payments and be more selective in granting credit."

Another standard, aimed at insurance charges heaped on borrowers to pay for nonexistent or mispresented policies, states that insurance premiums and interest on money borrowed to pay premiums should not be collectible unless the borrower is given, within 30 days of signing his contract, evidence of an insurance policy reflecting the promised coverage. (But, in our opinion, it is not a good idea under ordinary circumstances ever to buy car insurance as part of a credit deal.)

The Pentagon has also set standards for such penalties as fees for late payment (no more than 5% of the overdue amount) or attorneys' fees (no more than 10% of the balance declared due in a court judgment). A high official in the Defense Department told CU that in a good many instances finance companies have exacted "atrocious" fees. He knew of some charges running as high as 30% or 40%, which he called "punitive in their impact and unjust enrichment of the lender."

There are nine standards in all, and at the heart of them are what we believe to be two crucial rights for all credit buyers. The first is that, in the eyes of the Pentagon, a fair credit contract will renounce the holder-in-due-course doctrine and substitute its exact opposite—namely, the doctrine that any valid defense that the borrower may be able to use against the seller or original lender will be equally valid against all subsequent holders of the debt. The laws of a few states, most notably those of Massachusetts, provide precedent for this new doctrine, although the pro-lender version is far more often perpetuated.

The second crucial standard of fairness states that, except when a product is being custom-made, a serviceman should be free to cancel an order for goods or services at any time before the goods are delivered or the service is performed. In other words, he should have a chance to change his mind even though he has been signed to a credit deal. This cooling-off period takes aim not so much at car lots and over-the-counter deals as at fast-talking door-to-door salesmen, who are skilled at blitzing their prospects into signing up before they can think twice. In California and Massachusetts, the most vehement opponents of bills with similar intent have been, not surprisingly encyclopedia salesmen.

INTEREST RATES NEGLECTED

The Pentagon directive also calls for an itemized breakdown of all finance charges. But on this score, as a standard for truth in lending, it is a dismal failure. It does not call for disclosure of true annual interest rates (or rates in any form, for that matter). Yet, unless the borrower can easily determine lending rates, he cannot shop intelligently for credit. The Truth-in-Lending bills before Congress have recognized this fact by making disclosure of true annual interest their main objective. The credit industry has fought the bills all the way down the line, and you get a good idea of the issue at stake from information filed with the House Banking and Currency subcommittee by Clayton Norris, the president of Federal Services Finance Corp. His company's average loan in Colorado, where interest ceilings are among the highest in the country, carries "an annual rate of return [true annual interest] of 32.17%." At best, this is an understatement, omitting as it does credit life insurance premiums equal to 1% of the amount borrowed (about 2% true annual interest on installment loans), insurance commissions, and any other hidden (through still legal) finance charges.

But the Pentagon's standards do call for disclosure of actual finance charges. For instance, all insurance commissions must be itemized separately from the premiums themselves. The seller must also indicate that the price of the goods or services to the buyer-on-credit is no higher than to a cash customer—information more pertinent to some types of sales than to others. Salesmen on car lots are more likely to *reduce* prices for credit customers than to raise them because they often profit more in the financing than in the car sale as such. On the other hand, freezer-food plans often bury an exorbitantly high price for the freezer in monthly payments for the freezer and food.

Military authority cannot, of course, overrule civil law. Therefore, the directive is in full force only when applied to companies doing business directly on a military post or to unofficial military publications, such as the Army, Navy, and Air Force *Times*, which are now expected to see that all credit advertisements disclose their terms and describe their wares with "the highest probity."

Reaching beyond the immediate military confines, the directive permits military commanders to declare merchants and finance companies off-limits to service personnel because of flagrant violations of the standards. But in other respects the Pentagon concedes to the finance companies more ground than we think it should. Although it can't countermand state laws, it *can* turn its back on debt collectors who refuse to live up to its standards, leaving them with little recourse against delinquent servicemen, whose pay cannot be garnisheed. And, in fact, the directive does brandish the weapon of noncooperation. But it seems overly cautious about the use of it. For instance, the weapon will not be used at all, the directive states, if an off-the-base lender makes his contract comply with *either* the full-disclosure *or* the fairness standards. He does not have to live up to both.

Acknowledging that the directive has some shortcomings, a Pentagon spokesman told us it has nevertheless managed to put the heat on the finance companies for the time being and has caused them to mend some of their more abusive ways. We can add that the directive has also served as a strong argument for credit reform in at least one state. Consumer groups backing a very good retail installment-sales bill in Massachusetts say that the Defense Department's action has won them some important supporters in the legislature.

THE CREDIT INDUSTRY COUNTERATTACK

This sort of ammunition comes none too soon, for the credit industry has not been neglecting its own interests. Far from being satisfied with the powers already at its disposal, it wants still more. For one thing, there is a move afoot to undermine the citizen's right of voluntary bankruptcy, the last refuge available to debtors, some of whom are being hounded by holders of contracts about as savory as those described to the House subcommittee. Personal bankruptcies zoomed 60% from 1960 to 1964; in the latter year more than 155,000 petitions were filed, and, as a result, lenders had to write off $1.2 billion in bad debts.

Seeking to cut their heavy losses, credit men are backing H.R. 292 and S. 613, House and Senate versions of a bill to take away an individual's unrestricted right to obtain a discharge of debts through bankruptcy and to require him instead, at the discretion of the court, to file under Chapter XIII, the so-called wage-earner plan. The court would then decide what proportion of the debtor's future pay checks should go to paying off the debt, and it would collect this amount each week for doling out to the creditors.

On another front, the credit industry has raised well over $100,000 to help finance the writing of a Uniform Consumer Credit Code as a model for state legislation. One avowed purpose of the industry is to head off a Federal "invasion of State regulation of consumer credit"—i.e., the Federal Truth-in-Lending bill.

The Uniform Consumer Credit Code has been scheduled for completion in time for action by some state legislatures in 1968. No word has come from the drafting committee as to the substance of any recommendations thus far agreed on, but there is very little reason to expect that standards of fairness similar to those drawn up by the Pentagon are being considered.

Yet these standards are less than the bare minimum of consumer protection that any model code or state law should provide. Disclosure of true annual interest, plus total finance charges in dollars, is essential. We would also put high on the list of needs a ban against garnishments as a means of collecting overdue installments (Texas has already banned them), against balloon notes (in which the final payment is far larger than the rest), and against contracts giving the seller the buyer's power of attorney in lawsuits against the buyer or giving the seller the authority to breach the peace.

Above all, state laws should do more than merely proclaim a list of buyers' rights. They should give the state itself responsibility for policing the unconscionable practices of credit merchants and the tools for doing the job.

Additional protection is badly needed in the Federal domain. Credit abuses are widespread in interstate mail-order lending and selling and in interstate advertising of credit, and regulatory power parallel to that of the states should be established to govern these transactions. The foundation stone of all credit regulation, of course, should be a Federal Truth-in-Lending law. Despite a general air of gloom about the prospects for this law in 1966, President Johnson at least has not forsaken it. He called for its passage in his state of the Union message, and he has a way of getting what he wants—if not this year, then next year or the year after.

## U.S. COKING COAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the ministers of the European Coal and Steel Community nations have decided against a subsidy program that would have made it difficult for U.S. coal to compete in European markets. I am inclined to believe the expressions of concern voiced by my colleagues were instrumental in impressing upon representatives of the ECSC member states the wisdom of the course of action they have taken.

As a result of the decision reached in the ECSC meeting in Luxembourg earlier this month, the steel mills of the six-nation area will continue to have access to competitively priced, high-quality coking coal mined in the United States. Consumers of goods produced in Europe will not be forced to pay higher prices, which would have been the result if the subsidy program proposed by the High Authority had been adopted. And certainly, the men who mine U.S. coking coal, and their families, in West Virginia and its sister coal-producing States, will continue to benefit by being able to continue serving European markets.

The action taken by the ESCS ministers is not final, however. According to reports, they have directed the High Authority and subordinate representatives of the six member states to draft an alternative plan, possibly for consideration at the next ministerial meeting scheduled for September 27. We, of course, have no indication now concerning the alternatives being considered, but the fact that the issue is not entirely dead places us on warning that we must continue our diligent efforts to safeguard American coal's ability to compete abroad.

It is my opinion, and I believe it is shared by others who are well versed in the philosophies of the ECSC nations, that this subsidy scheme will not be adopted. We cannot relax, however, and we cannot fail to take advantage of every opportunity to remind our friends abroad of the truly significant contributions U.S. coal makes to the maintenance of a strong economy in Europe.

Under the plan proposed by the ECSC High Authority, and rejected at the Luxembourg meeting, members would have been required to pay into a Community fund a stated amount per ton of U.S. coking coal imported for steel mill consumption. Payments would be made from the fund on coking coal mined in one ESCS country and consumed in steel mills in another. Payments into and from the fund would have represented, as I understand it, about 80 percent of the $4 per ton favorable price advantage which U.S. coal now enjoys on the continent.

The reasons behind the ministers' decision to block the subsidy plan perhaps are not important to us, for they represent the views and positions of the respective individual governments with respect to the whole idea of importing U.S. coal. It is obvious that, in the majority, they wisely prefer to use coal which our Nation can provide in abundance and at low cost. It is equally obvious, in my opinion, that they wish to maintain the present economic strength of the six-nation area and that they realize the importance of U.S. coal in this respect.

There is a lesson to be learned in this situation, as I see it. While our coal is important to us here at home, in terms of the energy it produces and the jobs it provides, it is equally important to our friends abroad who have come to rely on U.S. coal as a dependable and economical source of abundant, low-cost energy. We can point with justifiable pride to this fact, for when we export U.S. coal we send abroad one of the fruits of the free enterprise system which has made our own Nation so great and so strong. And in the bargain, of course, we see that the coal industry contributes $500 million a year to our own balance of payments.

Senators and Members of the other body have many opportunities to meet with citizens and official representatives of foreign nations who visit our Nation's capital. In our official and private talks with these welcome visitors, we have every reason to extol the virtues of U.S. coal, and certainly we should avail ourselves of every chance to do so.

## THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, this the fifth time I have risen in the Senate to speak on the airline mechanics strike, now in its 14th day.

On these previous occasions, I have made my position clear. Beginning a week ago yesterday and repeatedly since, I have urged President Johnson to call the parties to this costly dispute into around-the-clock sessions at the White House until a settlement is reached.

I have also urged the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the chairman of the Labor Subcommittee, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to initiate steps toward a legislative remedy in the strike should Congress have to move in to settle it.

I have also urged these committees to begin a comprehensive study of feasible alternatives to protect the American people in labor-management disputes affecting the public interest.

Mr. President, the current strike is a bread-and-butter matter to millions of Americans who are affected directly and indirectly by this costly and damaging strike.

The vice president of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, Mr. Robert C. Allen, recently said the tourist industry in Hawaii is losing "well above $2¼ million a week" because of this strike.

Losses to industries allied with tourism in Hawaii are losing well above $2 million a week and the State of Hawaii is losing $200,000.

It is reported hotels in Waikiki have dropped to 90-percent occupancy, when ordinarily they would be 100-percent occupied at this tourist season peak. Hotels on our neighbor islands are down to 85-percent occupancy.

One interisland airline reports passenger cancellations at the rate of $1,500 a day since the strike began.

Another interisland airline reports it has lost $75,000 in passenger revenue during the strike. Not only that, it is estimated the effects of the strike will be felt for about 10 days after the strike ends.

But the devastating economic impact is not the only tragedy.

Thousands of American workers have been made idle by the strike.

Thousands of American people have suffered hardship. In Honolulu, every day sees hundreds of people stranded at our airport, some with only a few pennies in their pockets. Some cannot even buy their meals and have been subsisting on coffee and cookies distributed by Host International.

A recent article in the Honolulu Advertiser of July 19 reports one mother stranded at the airport with a sick baby and only 35 cents in her purse. The longer this strike continues, the greater will be the human misery. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to a prompt settlement in this situation. I call on those in control of the executive branch and those in control of Congress to use all the resources at their command to get the planes flying once more.

I ask unanimous consent that several news articles on the strike which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Honolulu Advertiser 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 Honolulu Advertiser, July 18, 1966]

STRIKE ENTERS 11TH DAY . . . TIME FLIES, OTHERS DON'T

(By Leonard Lueras)

As the airlines strike is entering its 11th day, hundreds of would-be jet setters are still standing by at Honolulu International Airport.

Pan American Airlines, the only commercial airline flying from Honolulu to the U.S. points on the Mainland, flew 15 regularly scheduled flights and an extra flight to the West Coast yesterday. All were filled.

As of yesterday afternoon, 80 stand-bys had been accommodated on 10 flights. A Pan Am spokesman reported that "July's weekend traffic is full under normal circumstances, and in this strike situation it's worse."

Pan Am's offices continue to be flooded with phone calls, but there are only scattered

single seats available. No group blocks can be obtained. Extra flights may be added to the daily schedule, but Pan Am officials will not know until 6 or 7 a.m. today.

Terminals at Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland and Seattle all have full flights coming to Hawaii, and they are limiting their stand-by lists to 55 persons, United Press International reported.

Hawaii-bound persons have been told not to go to the airports unless they are on a stand-by list or feel a trip to Honolulu is an emergency. Five San Francisco-to-Honolulu flights yesterday were able to accommodate 31 stand-bys.

UPI also said the Civil Aeronautics Board has granted World Airways of Oakland permission to sell tickets to Hawaii, but a World spokesman said. "Our planes are all tied up so we have to wait until we can spring one loose."

World Airways usually carries only cargo and soldiers on charter.

Meanwhile, Honolulu stand-bys are trying to dream up new ways to get to the Mainland.

Ideas include buying a ticket to an international location outside the United States, stopping over in San Francisco, and using the rest of the flight later.

The most practical air route, as far as expenses go, is Qantas Airlines' flight to Vancouver via San Francisco. Qantas is booked until Wednesday, but persons can still get a reservation for Thursday or later.

The only other alternative, via Qantas, is to buy a ticket to London or some other locale via San Francisco. Whichever final location one chooses, he has a year in which to use the complete ticket, if he stops over on the West Coast.

---

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 18, 1966]

AIR STRIKE HAS SLOWED ISLE TOURISM

The lengthening airline strike cut sharply into Hawaii's visitor industry over the weekend, spokesmen for the industry said today.

"I would place the loss at well above $2¼ million a week," Robert C. Allen, vice-president of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, said today.

Hotels at Waikiki will be dropping to 90 percent occupancy or a little lower by tomorrow, Allen said. He said Neighbor Island hotels will be down to 85 percent occupancy.

Two major sightseeing companies and some concessionaires at Honolulu Airport have begun to furlough employees, Allen said.

Inter-island airlines and resorts felt the pinch of the strike this weekend.

Aloha Airlines reservations are down, a spokesman said, and passenger traffic fell off sharply after early flights Saturday.

Cancellations have come in at the rate of $1,500 worth a day since the strike began, a spokesman said.

Hawaiian Airlines has lost about $75,000 in passenger revenue since the strike started.

Inter-Island Resorts has lost about 700 guest bookings for the month of July. The strike has not yet begun to cut into August bookings, but probably will by the end of this week.

"We think the effects probably will continue to be felt for about 10 days after the strike," said Jack Tobin, vice-president of Hawaiian Airlines, predicting additional loss of business.

"It's a tough period for us. The Inter-Island carriers make their profits during the summer months," he said.

Aloha Airlines has been getting only 15 to 25 members of tour groups of 30 to 40 which hold bookings on the airline.

"We can't tell who's going to arrive," a spokesman said.

Today the first of United Air Line's layoffs went into effect, idling 63 stewards, most of whom are Hawaii-based personnel.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, July 18, 1966]

NO END OF STRIKE LIKELY FOR AT LEAST A WEEK: AIRLINES, UNION STILL FAR APART

WASHINGTON.—Pessimistic negotiators predicted today the strike against five major airlines probably will last for at least another week.

Struck are United, Northwest, Trans World, Eastern and National airlines.

Now in its 11th day, the strike has shut down all but national defense operations of the five lines and has inconvenienced travelers throughout the nation who have besieged other airlines as well as railroads and bus lines in an effort to carry out summer travel plans.

The chief union negotiator blamed the airlines for the slow pace of the talks.

"They keep their feet planted in the concrete," said Vice-President Joseph Ramsey of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. International Association of Machinists.

Ramsey said extensive layoffs and closing of ticket offices indicate the strike could go on "for an extended period of time."

Chief airline negotiator William Curtin said "we are a long way apart" as the negotiators walked into a meeting with Assistant Secretary of Labor James J. Reynolds.

Reynolds, who yesterday compared the pace of the negotiations with the speed of two turtles, had no comment today.

Curtin said he saw no reason to expect an early settlement.

He also said he could not dispute estimates that the strike is costing the five airlines $7 million a day in revenue losses.

Ramsey said of the estimated strike losses: "That's their funeral, not ours."

Ramsey accused the airline negotiators of taking the attitude of "the public be damned."

He added "we are not attempting to drag our feet."

Ramsey said there has been no progress on one key point—the union's demand for a 36-month contract. The airlines want a 42-month agreement.

The carriers announced last night that 65,880 airline personnel would be out of work today because of the strike. The figure included striking members of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. International Association of Machinists and other workers who have been furloughed.

But some 1,100 Trans World Airlines employees, who walked off the job at Cape Kennedy, Florida, when the strike began July 8, voted yesterday by a 3-2 margin to return to work today.

T.W.A. holds the prime contract for the nation's Moon launch operations on Merritt Island, adjacent to Cape Kennedy. It provides manpower for supply, maintenance and other housekeeping tasks.

The T.W.A. workers agreed to work under terms of their old contract until a new one is agreed upon. Union officials said last night picket lines around the installation would be removed immediately.

In addition to T.W.A., the struck lines are United, Eastern, National and Northwest.

Reynolds, presiding over the talks in Washington, said last night the only progress yesterday was a free exchange of views on the "substantive issues—certain of the national issues."

There are eight of these major problems, including wages, pensions, hospitalization, vacations, overtime and holiday pay.

Another, separate issue caused the joint negotiations to be broken off Saturday until noon yesterday. It, in substance, is an I.A.M. accusation that Northwest is carrying on commercial operations under the guise of authorized military flights which the union has pledged not to stop.

Although a union spokesman did not specify what the I.A.M. might do if Northwest does not halt the practices, he promised "appropriate action." This presumably would mean again breaking off the talks.

Northwest has not commented on the union's accusation.

The airlines gave these figures of the number of employes affected by strike:

United 21,780 off, 17,000 working.

T.W.A.—13,700 out of work, 17,800 still working.

Eastern—19,200 off, 3,750 working.

National—5,400 off, 250 working.

Northwest—5,400 off, 250 working.

The union is seeking wage increases of about 53 cents hourly over 36 months. The company has indicated it is willing to offer slightly more than the 44-to-48 cents recommended by a presidential panel over the same period.

Pay levels now range from $2.25 hourly for janitors to $3.52 hourly for top-rated machinists.

The struck airlines agreed to bargain jointly with the union last August. Braniff, Continental and Northeast airlines, with employes represented by the machinists, did not enter into the agreement and were not struck.

Other non-struck airlines, such as American, have contracts with mechanics represented by the A.F.L.-C.I.O. Transport Workers Union.

---

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, July 19, 1966]

ALOHA HELPS EASE PLIGHT OF STRANDED PASSENGERS

(By Bob Krauss)

Hawaii's Aloha Spirit, battered by the airline strike, was fighting back at the Honolulu International Airport yesterday.

Here's the latest battle report:

An unidentified local housewife brought a picnic basketfull of Japanese kau kau, spread a beach mat on the floor of the terminal and invited half a dozen stranded haole passengers to eat.

Mrs. Jane Kakelaka, a ground hostess for Canadian Pacific Airlines, gave all the money she had to a woman with a sick baby who had only 35 cents left in her purse.

Mrs. Aggie Napuunoa, a janitress at the airport, regularly unlocks the pay toilets in the women's restroom when the lines get too long, as her contribution to the Aloha Spirit.

Two airline workers volunteered to donate their time to circulate among the waiting passengers and find those who need help but are too bashful to ask for it.

Meanwhile, Host International has given away 402 gallons of coffee and 20,468 cookies to stand-by travelers. State Hostesses are giving out pineapple juice. A hula troupe performs for an hour every morning in the terminal.

Even so, the discomforts of waiting up to three days for a seat on an airplane make it pretty difficult for most passengers to smile at the end of the day.

"There are never enough seats to go around at night," said Robina Chong of the State Information Center. "There are about 300 seats here in the main terminal and a few more in the baggage areas. But there are sometimes 500 people waiting for flights."

Miss Chong said the stranded travelers sleep on beach mats spread on the floor, on piles of suitcases, on baggage counters and on the lawn outside.

One middle-aged woman, after spending two nights in a chair at the air terminal, called the Red Cross and asked for a blanket, Miss Chong said.

There are repeated reports of travelers who have run out of funds because of the delay.

Porter Robert McKandes said he met three girls who were penniless after waiting for three days at the airport. "If it hadn't been for the free coffee and cookies, I don't know what they'd have done," he said.

Janitress Mrs. Rita Homanaunui said she met people who had run out of money. The State Information Center Hostesses have reported the same thing.

Mrs. Kakelaka, the ground hostess, said she met an almost penniless mother in the women's rest room last Friday.

"She was bathing her baby in a sink because he was feverish," Mr. Kakelaka said. "All she had was 35 cents in her purse. I gave her all I had, $1.50, and sent her down to the nursery."

Few stranded mothers seem to be aware of the complete free nursery, equipped with washers and driers and cribs, on the ground floor of the terminal, the custodians told me.

One result of the sudden increase in guests at the airport terminal is a bigger workload for the airport janitors. They said they have to mop constantly to clean up spilled Coke and ice cream. But the staff doesn't seem to mind.

"Those poor women," said Mrs. Napuunoa, a motherly Hawaiian. "When there's a big crowd in the women's rest room, I unlock the pay toilets. I just have to. I can't stand seeing them wait so long."

Mrs. Kakelaka, also Hawaiian, has offered her services along with those of Mrs. Ella Corea, ground hostess for Northwest Airlines, to circulate among the crowds and look for people who need help.

"If somebody will get an Operation Aloha going, Mrs. Corea and I will be glad to volunteer," said Mrs. Kakelaka.

She said that, in spite of the inconveniences, most of the stand-by travelers manage to stay in good spirits. These included two girls who stripped to their bikinis in the garden area yesterday and took sun baths.

## HISTORY OF RESPONSIBLE FISCAL ACTION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the final budget results of our Government for fiscal year 1966 are heartening—to both the Congress and the American people. The administration's diligence in keeping Government finances appropriate to the national needs has been amply demonstrated. Budgetary stimulus was provided in past years, when needed; now, restraint is being employed when the need for such action is appropriate. For example.

In 1964, our budget deficit was more than $8 billion, when more than 5 percent of our labor force was unemployed.

In 1966, our deficit dropped to $2.3 billion, as we increased employment until now we have only about 4-percent unemployment.

I think the means employed to exercise restraint are as laudable as the end result:

First. Because the administration's earlier economic policy choices were sound, the economy advanced rapidly—producing higher revenues as it went.

Second. Even though Defense spending unavoidably increased by $1.1 billion since the January budget estimate, total expenditures rose less than one-half billion dollars. This was accomplished by reducing nondefense expenditures by about $600 million.

Third. Finally, the choice of program reductions in the civilian agencies were as appropriate to the needs of the Nation as the reduced deficit is to the requirements of the economy. We did not ignore the hopes of our disadvantaged citizens for a better future. The Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development spent nearly $9½ billion in 1966—$120 million more than the amount estimated last January, and $3.2 billion more than in 1965.

In retrospect, I think we can rightly conclude that the 1966 budget advanced the needs of the economy as a whole, and the opportunities of its individual citizens as well. We may be certain that the budget for the current fiscal year is as well conceived.

## AMERICA AS A PACIFIC POWER—WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a column of characteristic lucidity, that distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, sets straight the historic record of the U.S. concern for an activity in the Pacific. As there is much misconception concerning the why and wherefore of our current involvement in southeast Asia, it is well that some of the background and origin of what is going on there be spelled out and clarified. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Walter Lippmann's column from the Washington Post entitled "America as a Pacific Power," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICA AS A PACIFIC POWER

(By Walter Lippmann)

Recently the White House has been pushing the notion that we now have a President who is ready to meet our obligations as a great power in the Pacific. In the President's speech at White Sulphur Springs on July 12, he said that his critics are opposed to the "determination of the United States to meet our obligations in Asia as a Pacific power" and "claim that we have no business but business interests in Asia; that Europe, not the Far East, is our proper 'sphere of interest.'" This line of talk does nothing to clarify and everything to befuddle the discussion of high policy.

For the historic truth of the matter is that the United States began to play the part of a great power in the Pacific long before it began to recognize a vital interest across the Atlantic. Since the beginning of the Republic—since the days of the clipper ships in the China trade and the opening of Japan more than a century ago by Commodore Perry's naval ships—the American nation has maintained and expanded its presence in the Pacific. We bought Alaska, we annexed Hawaii, we occupied the Philippines. Indeed, American isolationism, which stems from President Washington and was formulated in the Monroe Doctrine, has always been directed against Europe.

Nor has the United States defaulted on its obligations as a Pacific power. We became involved in the Second World War by the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and the reason for that attack was our refusal to give Japan a free hand in the conquest of China and of southeast Asia. In the light of the historic record, it sounds strange indeed to be told that there is a new revelation at the White House about our obligations and our role in the Pacific.

The President himself served in the Pacific war, and his feeling that his critics today are interested only in Europe is almost certainly an echo of the great debate during the war about the strategy of "Hitler first." In that debate Churchill and Roosevelt prevailed over General MacArthur and Admiral King, and gave first priority to the war in Europe. This was deeply resented by the so called "Pacific firsters." But the record shows that Churchill and Roosevelt were right. Not only was Nazi Germany a more dangerous enemy than Japan, but in Europe we had a formidable ally in the Soviet Union, already at war with Hitler and probable enemy of Japan.

Many of the critics of the Johnson policy in Vietnam today were strong supporters of the Churchill-Roosevelt strategy in the World War. To say that they do not care about Asia and are interested only in Europe is, to put it mildly, uninformed nonsense.

The critics of President Johnson's conduct of the Vietnamese war hold that by involving the United States in a great land war in Asia, he is breaking with the fundamental conception of America's role as a power in the Pacific and in the Far East. They do not regard the Korean war, which was a fairly big Asian land war, as a precedent which justifies the abandonment of the established American doctrine. For the Korean war, unlike the Vietnamese, was authorized by the United Nations and was participated in by 17 nations of Europe and Asia. It nevertheless came close to being a great military disaster, and was finally brought to an end by a compromise peace without victory.

Moreover, it was brought to an end by General Eisenhower who was educated in the American tradition against land wars in Asia, and as President, consistently refused to commit American troops to fight on the mainland. President Johnson has broken with this American tradition in order, as he supposes, to carry out our obligations as a great power in the Pacific. Twenty months ago, when he was campaigning against Senator Goldwater, Mr. Johnson was still talking about not sending "American boys" to fight "Asian boys."

On top of the strategic error of involving ourselves in an Asian land war, the President has piled the political error of insisting that the formulae for making peace are the same in Asia as they were in Europe when Hitler erupted. They are not the same. The European problem in 1939 was posed by the attempted conquest by the Nazis of the old established nations of the European continent. The Asian problem today rises from the militant Communist social revolution which has been sweeping the undeveloped and backward parts of the earth.

Insofar as there is any analogy between our problem in Asia today and our problem in Europe, it is not that we are facing a case of aggression as with Hitler, but that southeastern Asia and China are in the throes of a revolution today as was the Soviet Union after 1917. The threat of Communist expansion into Western Europe was dealt with without fighting a land war in Eastern Europe.

A serious debate about high policy in the Pacific is very much needed. But there will be no such debate if the President continues to befog the question by saying that his critics want "to ignore threats to peace in Asia." If he reduces the discourse to that level, there will not be a serious debate.

## DEDUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES FROM INCOME TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I rise today in protest to the proposed ruling by the Internal Revenue Service which would deny deduction of educational expenses from individual income tax payments.

For more than 20 years, the teachers of our Nation through the National Education Association and Texas State Teachers Association have fought to win recognition of the tax deduction procedure. This policy has been accepted in principal by the Treasury Department since a ruling on the subject in 1960. It certainly seems strange to me that all of a sudden, this policy is no longer acceptable to those who set the policy.

The effect of this ruling, if applied to teachers, will be detrimental to the schoolchildren of this Nation. The ruling will certainly discourage teachers from seeking additional training which they constantly need to keep abreast of latest educational developments in their field of specialization.

In my State of Texas, out of 112,000 teachers, approximately 26,000 are attending summer school in order to upgrade their competency, thus benefiting their pupils. This is a remarkable record. Over one-fourth of the teachers each year, at their own expense in time and money, are enrolled in summer programs.

Another 200 or so Texas teachers are engaged in educational travel to improve their understanding of the culture and language of other countries, thus making them better teachers.

Such practices should be encouraged, not discouraged, by short-sighted policies of an administration that, on the one hand, talks about upgrading American education, and on the other hand places obstacles in the teachers' path toward excellence. In the long run the children in our schools who are our future citizens will pay the penalty for this arbitrary action of the Internal Revenue Service.

The Nation will be better served if, instead of Federal control of education which is becoming increasingly apparent as the objective of the U.S. Office of Education, we use sound tax policies to encourage states and individuals to invest their own resources into improving educational quality. Certainly permitting teachers to deduct the expenses incurred in improving their educational competence is justified in light of the far-reaching value to the Nation that such a policy will produce.

For many months now we have been concerned about the consequences of inflation. We have clearly recognized the most apparent manifestation of inflation—the cost-of-living increase that is running at about a 5 percent annual rate now.

Everyone has found that it costs more than it used to for food, clothing, and other necessities. And, it has become obvious that the unwise, deficit spending of the Federal Government is the principle cause of this inflation.

However, we now have skidded into added inflationary troubles—troubles not so readily apparent, but, if anything, more serious than the progressive price increases on retail goods. We now are seeing the first seeds of the recession threat which is part and parcel of any serious inflationary trend. And, we are seeing some unusual, hectic scrambling by the Federal Government in its attempts to fight inflation without really admitting that there is inflation.

Certainly, teachers cannot be regarded as the persons causing inflation. Yet, teachers find themselves singled out to suffer.

Here's how it happened.

You will recall that there has been considerable talk in Washington of increasing taxes to fight the high cost of living. The Federal Government, rather than cut back its own unnecesary spending, has hit on this method—even though a tax increase would simply further increase the American family's cost of living.

Since the logic of raising the cost of living to fight the rising cost of living has been somewhat lost on the taxpayers, the Internal Revenue Service has had to cast about for some way to increase taxes without calling it a tax increase. One way it found to do this was the curtailing of customary tax deductions which our tax laws provide many classes of citizens for many different reasons.

It was this attempt at a hidden tax increase which caught our teachers.

The Internal Revenue Service has decided that contrary to past practice, contrary to reason, and contrary to the intent of Congress teachers will no longer be allowed tax deductions for study courses they take to improve their teaching qualifications.

Both the Texas State Teachers Association and the National Education Association have protested this arbitrary Federal tax action, pointing out that the curtailment would wipe out 25 years of programs aimed at encouraging and helping our teachers to train themselves so they may better train our children.

Thus, we see surprising and shocking consequences of our inflation. Because of inflation we find our Federal Government actually discouraging teachers from improving their teaching knowledge and from undertaking educational travel.

Let it be noted also that this curtailment of tax deductions for education expenses also will strike at other Americans such as doctors, lawyers, dentists, accountants, and skilled technicians.

I have called on the Internal Revenue Service to reverse itself and to restore the education-expense deductions. There is no doubt we have inflation, but teachers are not to blame and should not be singled out as victims.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is certainly in order that we here in the Senate now proceed to give careful consideration to two measures, S. 3581 and S. 1203, which I have cosponsored, giving the teachers a legal safeguard for their tax deductions and credits.

This legal guarantee is made necessary by the proposed rules change in the recent IRS ruling. This ruling will result in much confusion among the teachers of the Nation as to just what their rights are; let us say here and now that we approve of giving tax-credits to teachers so that they might further their educational skills and that the education of our Nation might thus benefit.

Mr. President, I have long supported the tax credit program for teachers. If it had not been for a ruling by the IRS giving the teachers certain rights in 1958 and again in a supplemental ruling of 1960, we would have had a bill long before now to do just that. We have thus learned the hard way that legislation of this nature is needed if the teachers are to be able to plan ahead, knowing that once they are in school, they will be able to deduct their expenses. This measure will provide equal treatment for all teachers and they will not have to come to the Federal Government for a handout. All universities will benefit as will all school systems, without the fear of losing a Federal grant or of complying with sometimes harassing regulations.

In closing, may I point out also that I and many other Senators remain of the opinion that a further education tax credit is vital for all American taxpayers for all of their education costs from elementary school through college. Each American taxpayer should be granted tax relief so that he can apply more of his funds to education, rather than to taxes.

In this way we can take a major step toward meeting the financial needs of our schools, while maintaining the local, State, and institution control we all regard as so important.

---

## MEDICARE ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one of the responsibilities of the Senate is to act as a local legislature for the District of Columbia. Until home rule is granted, this is a responsibility we cannot avoid. But the inaction of this Congress on a bill which is of vital importance to our "other constituency"—Washington, D.C. residents—is keeping thousands of local residents from obtaining badly needed medical assistance.

I am referring to Senator Morse's bill S. 3469, which would make certain changes in the eligibility requirements for medical aid. By making these minor changes, the District would qualify for participation in title 19 of the Medicare Act. But this Congress must pass the enabling legislation to permit the District Commissioners to make these changes. Maryland and many other States have already developed programs under title 19.

Participation under 19, as a recent article in the Washington Star pointed out, would make 40 percent of the District population eligible for assistance with burdensome medical expenses. A family of four with a gross income less than $4,800 a year would be eligible for this assistance.

Part of the cost would be paid out of the District government's funds, and the rest would come from matching "medicaid" grants from the Federal Government. But unless we act on this enabling legislation, the District of Columbia will not be able to participate fully. And unless District participates fully, many thousands of residents—including many

children—will go without the medical care they need.

I urge my colleagues to give this matter some attention this session, and not to leave their Washington constituents without medical care for another year.

## MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR WORTH BINGHAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this afternoon a short memorial service was held at the parish house of St. John's Episcopal Church for Worth Bingham, the son of Mary and Barry Bingham of Louisville, who was killed in an accident last week.

I saw Senator DOUGLAS there, and my colleague Senator MORTON, and Senator BAYH and Senator CLARK—and many young friends of Worth Bingham from the news field and from government.

Robert Riggs, bureau chief of the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times told of Worth's 2 years in the bureau here, his seasoning in government and political reporting, and then he read Worth's obituary, which had been written by the Louisville papers' executive editor, Norman Isaacs.

Ward Just, of the Washington Post, read from some of Worth's editorial essays, fine pieces, human and remembrable pieces.

We heard another obituary from the Kentucky Irish-American—a unique example of personal journalism—read by Clayton Fritchey. It was written by Mike Barry, and it had that Irish keening to it.

Walter Pincus of the Washington Post told us that an annual prize is being established in Worth's name for Washington reporters who do an exemplary job of disclosing congressional or executive waste. Worth won a high award for a series like that when he was a Washington reporter.

Then it was over—a short service. We will grieve for a longer time, but we will remember Worth Bingham.

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, each year at this time we observe Captive Nations Week. With sadness we direct our thought to the oppression that hangs over many nations of the world. With admiration we recognize the spirit of freedom that continues to inspire people, though they live under the yoke of Communism.

The history of the Eastern European countries is the story of people struggling for freedom and independence. Yet, today a hundred million people are denied the right of self-determination. They cannot speak or publish the thoughts that hold meaning for them. Many cannot worship as they choose.

We are deeply concerned about the fate of these millions of people. As a Nation, we are dedicated to the ideas of freedom and justice, and it is our solemn hope that these may also serve as a guiding principle for the captive nations in the years ahead.

## OHIO'S UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the Cleveland Press issue of Saturday, July 16, 1966, in the column of Richard L. Maher appears the statement:

> Ohio's unemployment compensation fund, the barometer of the state's economy, was near bankruptcy 3½ years ago.
>
> Today the fund is up to $434,000,000 and is approaching a point where it is possible that a cut in the rates assessed employers can be made.

I call especial attention to that statement of Mr. Maher "that a cut in the rates assessed employers can be made."

I hope ardently that no cut in the assessment will be approved either by administrative or legislative action.

While I was Governor with a smaller population and a lesser scale of wages, the fund hit the all time high of $679 million. At that time representatives of industry and leaders of labor unions proposed that a rebate of approximately $70 million be made to the employers. I opposed the proposal; however, in the end agreed that one-half of the amount be rebated. The legislature went beyond my recommendation and authorized the total requested rebate of $70 million. By March 1963, the fund had dropped from a high of $679 million to the sum of $68 million necessitating legislative action upping the rates to employers.

This fund should be kept amply large to insure that any future lack in employment will not deplete the fund to the dangerously low proportionate levels that they reached in 1963. If a mistake is to be made, the fund should be kept too high rather than too low.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column of Mr. Richard L. Maher under the title "Jobless Fund at $434 million; Cuts Seen" be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOBLESS FUND AT $434 MILLION; CUTS SEEN

(By Richard L. Maher)

Ohio's unemployment compensation fund, the barometer of the state's economy, was near bankruptcy 3½ years ago.

Today the fund is up to $434,000,000 and is approaching a point where it is possible that a cut in the rates assessed employers can be made.

In March 1963, the fund had dropped to $68,000,000. BUC officials were afraid that it was approaching a point which might endanger payments to the jobless.

The Legislature upped rates to employers. Within a year $60,000,000 had been added to the fund.

BUC Administrator Willard Dudley says that the minimum safe level for the fund is $377,000,000. When the fund passes that mark, the state can consider lifting the additional half of 1% increase imposed by the lawmakers in 1963.

A year ago Dudley estimated that if collections continued at the then current rate, the fund would reach $377,000,000 by July 1. The growth has been faster than he anticipated. If it continues to grow until Jan. 1, employers can look for a rate reduction.

In March, 1963, there were 148,000 workers drawing compensation. Today the figure stands at 20,000.

The $434,000,000 figure is not a record. In 1954, the fund hit $679,000,000. In nine years, $601,000,000 of that surplus was paid out.

## AN OPEN LETTER FROM CHICAGO

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a column by Paul Harvey, titled "An Open Letter From Chicago," appeared in the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register of July 19, 1966. I ask unanimous consent that this interesting conversation piece be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONVERSATION PIECE: AN OPEN LETTER FROM CHICAGO

(By Paul Harvey)

DEAR DIXIE: Can you possibly find it in your heart to accept our sincere apology? When there was race rioting in Little Rock, Arkansas, we were convinced that the cause was callousness. Our public officials and our press in Chicago insisted that the only two reasons for Negro restiveness were your segregated schools and your stubborn governor. We in Chicago, with integrated schools and a very liberal governor are now writhing in the agony of race rioting. And as we seek to set our house in order, we hope your headlines will be kinder to us than ours were to you.

And when a Mississippi Negro boy was found drowned, we in Chicago called this the "inevitable result of a white-supremacy tradition." Now a Negro girl, 14 and pregnant, has been shot to death on the front porch of her own home in Chicago—and we are confused and ashamed—and frightened.

What are we doing wrong that has made eight square miles of our city a battleground? Help us, if you can find it in your own hurt heart to help.

And Alabama, when your state police were photographed subduing rioters with night sticks, Chicago's bold-face front pages condemned you for "indefensible brutality." Now Illinois State Police have resorted to armored cars and cracking skulls and shooting to kill. . .

Your governor has alleged that "Communists are fomenting this strife." We scoffed.

Now 13 Negroes on Chicago's West Side have been charged with "plotting treason." We are sweeping admittedly Communist literature from our littered streets.

Forgive us for not knowing what we were talking about.

Georgia: When you were photographed in the act of turning back crowds of marching children—we could not control ourselves. "The very idea," the Chicago press editorialized, "that youngsters should be considered a menace sufficient to justify the use of tear gas!"

Now, in our own asphalt jungle, we have seen Negro youngsters of 9, 10, 11—advance on police with drawn guns or broken bottles—screaming, "Kill Whitey!"

And we used gas and clubs and dogs and guns and, God forgive us, what else could we do! Can you, Georgia, forgive us, too?

We tried the patience we had preached. Honest, we did. We tried so desperately that seven policemen were shot the other night, two of them through the back. So, in the end, we resorted to methods more brutal than yours. But, don't you see, we had to!

And our mayor listened to the Negroes' leaders, as he so often admonished you to do. He had listened, he had made compromises and concessions and he had offered sacrificial police officials and school officials—but they kept coming from so many directions

with so many demands—and then—demanded to keep the fire hydrants gushing for their playing children during the city's most critical drought—

Dear Dixie, perhaps we have not yet learned fully to appreciate what you have been trying to do to effect evolution without revolution—but for whatever belated comfort it may be, from our glass house we will not be throwing any more stones at you . . . for a while.

## AUTO SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, earlier today I addressed the International Platform Association which is meeting in the Nation's Capital. 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:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT P. GRIFFIN BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL PLATFORM ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 21, 1966

Members and friends of this great Association: Following Ralph Nader on the subject of auto safety is not exactly an enviable assignment. It's a bit like trying to succeed Jimmy Brown as fullback for Cleveland.

It is safe—at any speed—(I think) to say that there is no one—anywhere—who deserves more credit than Ralph Nader for stirring up public interest and generating legislative support for auto safety legislation—no one, that is, unless it might be the General Motors executive who put the private detectives on Mr. Nader's tail.

Let me make it clear at the outset that I am not an automotive engineer; I am not an expert on auto safety; in fact, I'm not even a member of the Commerce Committee which handled the auto safety legislation in the Senate. However, as the junior Senator from Michigan, I am very proud of the automobile as the major product and the symbol of progress of my great State.

I do not come here to apologize for automobile manufacturers, and why should I? The Board Chairman of the Ford Motor Company is an active supporter of one of my opponents in the current Michigan campaign battle that involves my political life.

You may wonder about my credentials if you are aware of the fact that I was one of only six members of the House (the only one from Michigan) to vote against reducing the auto excise tax in 1965. However, in view of the situation facing us in Vietnam, I felt we had no business reducing the level of federal revenues. Later, you will recall, President Johnson changed his mind and called on Congress to restore the excise tax cut. Let me emphasize that I would have been glad then, and certainly I would be delighted now, to substitute a general revenue measure of some kind for the very discriminatory auto excise tax which operates as a special burden on my State.

I grew up in the family of an automobile factory worker in the Detroit area, and I worked on the automobile assembly lines myself to earn enough money to go to college. I suspect that my background may have something to do with the resentment I feel when sweeping charges are thrown out against the quality and safety of American-made automobiles. To be sure, the indictments are aimed primarily at corporate executives, but they also prick the pride of thousands of automobile workers who put those automobiles together.

Regardless of what the program for this meeting may seem to suggest, I am not here to debate Mr. Nader on the need or the merits of auto safety; and I see little point in haggling at great length about the record of previous neglect.

Arguments can be made about who should bear the most blame for the alarmingly high rate of auto accidents and injuries—the auto manufacturers, the highway builders, the drivers, the State and local governments, or the Federal Government. Frankly, I think there is more than enough blame to go around.

I believe it is important to focus on the meaning and impact of safety legislation from the viewpoint of a balanced recognition that, although there are some shortcomings in the modern automobile, those shortcomings are but a part of a total problem.

The problem of traffic safety has been with us since the first recorded traffic fatality in 1899. In the 1950's the dimensions of the problem attained frightening proportions. It has been pointed out that more people are killed in one year in automobile accidents than were killed in the entire Korean War.

In 1965, more than 2,100 people died in the State of Michigan in automobile accidents. Another 156,000 were injured.

This shocking increase in traffic accidents finally led to important moves. It precipitated a series of hearings by Congressional committees, it sparked action by the automobile industry and by its critics such as Mr. Nader—and this activity is now culminating in the legislative measures we are so interested in at the present time.

In our discussion today, I think it is important to focus on the broad and growing *agreement* that has developed on the subject of automotive safety—agreement which is shared by an unusual cross-section of opinion, both inside and outside of government. Almost everyone now agrees that effective government action must be taken on a broad front to curb accidents, injuries and death on the highway. And, almost everyone seems to agree now that the Federal Government—as well as State and local government—has a vital role to play.

Indeed, the extent of agreement on this subject was indicated when the comprehensive auto safety legislation passed by the Senate last month was highly praised by President Johnson, by Senator RIBICOFF, by leading spokesmen for the automobile industry—and it even came in for a bit of praise from Mr. Nader himself. Where can you find a better "consensus" than that?

The Traffic Safety bill of 1966 and the Highway Safety bill of 1966 are milestones in safety legislation. And they result from more than a decade of discussion, investigation, hearings and consideration. Those who have contributed toward bringing these laws about are to be complimented.

Socrates once said that he regarded himself as a gadfly and the State as a noble steed that occasionally had to be stung into action. Perhaps Mr. Nader has been the gadfly that has been needed to sting the nation and the automobile industry into action.

The Senate has already passed two wide-sweeping bills. One deals with Federal standards for safety performance of vehicles. The other very important (but less publicized) bill deals with the road, the driver, law enforcement, highway lighting, uniform markers and signals and auto inspection. Similar bills are now pending in House committees and should reach the House Floor in the next few weeks.

There is widespread agreement regarding the Traffic Safety bill of 1966, but I am concerned that there may be disappointment with the results of it. Traffic safety *does* involve far more than the vehicle itself. As with most social problems, a single factor is not solely responsible.

There is danger, in my opinion, that overemphasis in the public mind on one feature of the total problem will build expectation out of proportion. Treatment of one factor alone will not solve the problem.

It may be true that safety has not been the only—and perhaps not the major—consideration in the design of automobiles. Businesses do operate for the purpose of making a profit—and profit is made by efficient production and volume sales.

Products are sold through their appeal to the people. Most people—for better or worse—have wanted style and horsepower in their automobiles. Unfortunately, too few people have considered safety as a key factor in the decision to purchase an automobile.

Yet, aside from a few regrettable instances of stupid advertising, the auto industry has not been irresponsible. One need only to consider what the industry could have done with the speed and power of the automobile—or what it could have failed to do in respect to safety—to realize the many positive safety accomplishments have been made.

To say the least, the automobile industry is a vital factor in the American economy. Furthermore, I think it is important to recall that the automobile has played a large role in the social revolution that has taken place in modern America. Through the automobile industry's ingenuity and efficiency, we have developed revolutionary techniques of mass production; we have made available an enormously complex product at a relatively low cost to most people; we have developed a working force that is well paid and technically sophisticated. These significant accomplishments are the envy of the world and we should look upon them lightly.

There is a need, I think, to make sure that the public receives the maximum increase in safety for each dollar spent—and that the cost increases involved in every proposed safety regulation will be justified in terms of actual improvement in automotive safety. As the government issues each new auto safety regulation, it is important to realize that the bureaucracy will be intervening in the operations of the number one consumer industry in the United States. I believe good and sufficient reason has been shown for the Federal Government to intervene—but it is exeremely essential that the responsible government officials have a full awareness and understanding at all times of the economic and social impact of each action that is taken or proposed.

In Michigan alone, the automotive industry *directly* employs 407,000 workers. It accounts—directly—for 17 percent, or roughly $4 billion of the personal income received by Michigan residents. In the Nation as a whole, the auto industry is responsible, directly and indirectly, for the employment of one out of every seven persons in the labor force.

Any responsible person should think long and hard before attempting to make the automobile industry the scapegoat for a complicated social problem. For, if we punish the industry haphazardly, or if we cripple its efficiency needlessly, we will only punish ourselves.

Because the Congress has recognized that vehicle safety is only a part of the answer, it passed the Highway Safety bill of 1966 which addresses itself to other factors in the total, complex problem. Although the general public has heard little about it, the Highway Safety bill was companion legislation which is likely, in the long run, to prove to be of more importance than the auto safety bill.

The Highway Safety bill and the Auto Safety bill form a two-pronged attack to deal with the four major elements in the safety problem—the driver, the roads, law enforcement, and the car. Together, these two pieces of legislation comprise a balanced and unified systems approach to the total problem.

It is essential to realize that unwise administration of our safety efforts can result in serious damage to the automobile industry and to the economy of the nation as a whole. It is critically important, for example, that basic engineering changes which

may be ordered to improve safety characteristics of vehicles be announced with sufficient lead time to allow manufacturers to phase the new designs into their model change-over schedules. If Government officials should blithely ignore the realities of production scheduling, thousands of workers could be thrown out of their jobs needlessly.

Under even the wisest guidance, safety will cost money; and each new addition of cost will eventually be borne by the consumer. To be sure, many safety features will cost relatively little; and manufacturers have been installing new features with each new model change. It is important to realize that if basic engineering changes are ordered they will, undoubtedly, add appreciably to the price of the automobile. This factor should be taken into consideration by those who will administer this program, and every reasonable opportunity should be afforded the industry to put required changes into effect at a reasonable cost to the consumer.

From the standpoint of the national interest, progress on traffic safety cannot take place in a vacuum. There must be a balance and a recognition of the legitimate interests of the automobile industry, its thousands of workers, and the millions of other Americans whose livelihood depends on the automobile.

There may be some who would actively favor a decline in U.S. automobile production and consumption. There are probably others who would demand that production be limited to crash-proof cars—never mind the cost. But neither of these objectives is the intended goal of the legislation which Congress is now in the process of enacting.

As approved by the Senate, the Traffic Safety Act of 1966 explicity requires the Secretary of Commerce to consider whether a proposed safety standard is "reasonable, practicable and appropriate." The criteria to be applied, according to the Senate Committee on Commerce, include "cost, feasibility and leadtime."

The companion bill, Highway Safety Act, authorizes research and development in highway safety systems—with attention directed to characteristics of the vehicle, highway and driver, communications, accident investigation methods, and care and transportation of the injured. It provides Federal assistance for State motor vehicle inspection and driver education programs. It sets up an advisory mechanism to recommend Federal standards for State highway safety programs.

And it authorizes funds necessary to put these improvements into effect—$160 million to assist the States over a three-year period—$55 million for research—$15 million for motor vehicle inspection programs—$70 million for driver education—and $160 million for community safety programs.

The Highway Safety bill of 1966 is comprehensive legislation for a comprehensive social problem. Its results will depend upon the efficiency of the research, the willingness of officials to translate knowledge and standards into effective action and, finally, the cooperation of the public.

The importance of cooperation by an informed public cannot be stressed too much. A free people must bear a responsibility for their freedom.

It might be possible to sit idly by and permit an all-embracing, unbridled bureaucracy to promulgate rules and regulations for all aspects of our behavior which might "solve" most of our social problems—but not without the loss of our freedom.

The crises in traffic safety is part of a total problem which includes personal irresponsibility in our society. Irresponsibility plays a large role in the misuse of the modern miracle of technical and scientific ingenuity—the automobile. The automobile is, and will remain, a powerful instrument. But it is—and despite our laws it will remain—a dangerous, a lethal weapon in the hands of those who have no respect or concern for the rights of others.

Obviously, there are many facets and many approaches to this complex, growing problem of safety. I am convinced there is hope for great improvement if we keep this immense challenge in perspective. If we do not approach it from that standpoint, then there is danger that we will only fasten upon a scapegoat and drive it into the desert. That course may provide a way to vent anger or to secure emotional release, but the problem, its causes and its effects will still be with us.

Thank you.

---

## BRITISH CRISIS: U.S. RESPONSIBILITY FOR NEW CONTROLS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during recent weeks, Britain has once again entered a period of acute financial crisis. The parity of the pound and the stability of the present international monetary system have once again been called into question. On Wednesday, July 20, Prime Minister Wilson moved to meet this crisis and preserve the pound by setting in motion the most severe restrictions on British economic activity since the rationing of the immediate post-World War II period.

The extent and depth of the British crisis can be measured by the fact that Mr. Wilson has instituted a system of price and wage controls throughout the economy. Balance-of-payments figures have a way of appearing abstract and distant from the lives of ordinary men and women. But the action that Mr. Wilson has taken demonstrates dramatically—to Americans as well as to Britons—the all-pervasive impact of a real financial crisis.

Mr. President, I cannot express too strongly my distress and sympathy at the lengths to which the British Government has been driven in the current crisis. This is not only because in our interrelated free world economy, deflation and recession in one country threatens the prosperity of every other country. It is also because of the role of American authorities in bringing this British crisis to a head. Nearly 1 year ago, I joined with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] in a joint statement to the Interantional Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. At that time, we warned that too great a restriction on the outflow of U.S. dollars in a misguided effort to oversolve our balance-of-payments problem could have a disastrous impact upon the rest of the free world, above all upon Britain. "No doubt," we then said—

> that Britain's fundamental problem of uncompetitiveness in the world market can only be solved, over time, by Britain herself. But no doubt as well, that Britain must have the time—as well as the determination now manifest—to undertake the fundamental reforms modernization requires. . . . It is certain that the United States cannot afford to see Britain go under; it is equally certain that we cannot afford to contribute, in any degree, to Britain's present difficulties.

One year later, that danger we warned against has come true. Prime Minister Wilson began his speech to the House of Commons announcing the new restrictions with the statement that:

> Action taken by the United States' authorities to strengthen the American balance of payments has led to an acute shortage of dollars and Euro-dollars in world trade and this has led to a progressive rise in interest rates in most financial centers, and to the selling of sterling to replenish dollar balances.

What we do here in America does affect the world. It is to our own benefit to act correctly for all concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Prime Minister Wilson's speech to the House of Commons, dated July 20, 1966, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

BRITISH PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON THE U.K. ECONOMIC SITUATION, JULY 20, 1966

Sterling has been under pressure for the past two and a half weeks. After improvement in the early weeks of May, we were blown off course by the seven week seamen's strike and when the bill for that strike was presented in terms of the gold and convertible currency figures in June, the Foreign Exchange markets reacted adversely. But there were deeper and more fundamental causes. Many have been at home and of these I shall speak in a moment. Several have been overseas. For several weeks past, there has been an increasing pressure on liquidity in the world's financial centres. Action taken by the United States' authorities to strengthen the American balance of payments has led to an acute shortage of dollars and Euro-dollars in world trade and this has led to a progressive rise in interest rates in most financial centres, and to the selling of sterling to replenish dollar balances. Last Thursday action was taken by the Bank of England to raise its discount rate and to double its call on the clearing banks for special deposits. On that day, I informed the House that I would shortly be announcing further measures to deal not only with the short-run pressure on sterling, but also with the underlying economic situation.

Action is needed for the purpose of making a direct impact on our payments balance, and particularly on certain parts of our overseas expenditure which in recent years has been growing rapidly. Action is needed equally, to deal with the problem of internal demand, public and private, and to redeploy resources, both manpower and capacity, according to national priorities and check inflation.

Exports until the seamen's strike have been rising. By value in the first five months of this year they were 9% higher than in the same period last year. By volume, the increase over the same period last year was 6%, a rate of increase higher than that laid down in the National Plan. But, abundant market opportunities abroad for British products—which are competitive enough in terms of quality, performance and price—are being lost owing to the shortage of labour. Order books are too long, and delivery dates excessively protracted. Hours of work have been reduced and incomes have been rising faster than productivity.

What is needed is a shake out which will release the national manpower, skilled and unskilled and lead to a more purposive use of labour for the sake of increasing exports and giving effect to other national priorities.

This redeployment can be achieved only by cuts in the present inflated level of demand, both in the private and public sectors. Not until we can get this redeployment through an attack on the problem of demand can we confidently expect growth in industrial production which is needed to realise our economic and social policies.

I will begin with the measures needed to restrain private demand at home. The economy is carrying too heavy a burden of production financed by hire purchase, which means that too high a proportion of today's production is being paid for by a mortgage on tomorrow's earnings.

My Rt. Hon. Friend, the President of the Board of Trade, has today made orders, which will come into effect at midnight tonight, tightening up still further the regulations governing hire purchase. The down payment on cars, motor cycles and caravans is raised to 40% and the repayment period shortened to 24 months. The down payment on domestic appliances is raised to 33⅓%: the repayment period remains at 24 months. There is no change in the present regulations for cookers and water heaters. Corresponding changes are made in the regulations governing rental payments. It is estimated that this will cut hire purchase borrowing by £160 million.

This of itself is not enough. The Government have therefore decided to activate the regulator created under Section 9 of the Finance Act of 1961, renewed insuccessive Finance Acts and given greater flexibility in Section 8 of the Finance Act, 1964.

The Treasury has today made an Order, the effect of which is to put a surcharge of 10% on the duties on beer, wines and spirits: on hydrocarbon oils, petrol substitutes and power methylated spirits: and on purchase tax.

I wish to make it clear that in the case of purchase tax the increase is the equivalent of 10% of the existing rates. Thus for goods now chargeable at 10% the new effective charge will be at 11%: for goods chargeable at 15% it will be 16½%: and for goods chargeable at 25% it will be 27½%. The surcharge will take effect from midnight tonight.

Its effect will be further to increase the revenue at the rate of about £150 million in a full year. This is a net figure after allowing for the effect of the hire purchase proposals and for the additional export rebate which will become payable following the increase in oil duty and purchase tax.

The increase in the duty on petrol and derivatives will, following the precedent set last year, be refunded to bus operators. The necessary administrative arrangements will be made as soon as possible and Parliamentary authority sought in the ordinary way. In addition a further £20 million will be taken out of the economy as a result of changes announced today by my Rt. Hon. Friend, the Postmaster General, in certain postal and telecommunications tariffs: parcels, registration and overseas rates will be increased from 3 October. The telecommunications changes affecting certain call charges will involve no net increase in Post Office revenue but will be designed to rationalise changes on a basis more closely related to costs. These will take effect from 1 January next. In addition my Rt. Hon. Friend will be requiring a year's rental in advance for new telephones instead of a quarter's rental as at present. This will apply to orders accepted from tomorrow. Details will be published in the official report and are now available in the Vote Office.

In the field of direct taxation the Government propose that a one-year surcharge of 10% be imposed on surtax.

This will be levied on surtax liabilities for 1965/66 for payment on 1 September, 1967. The necessary legislation will be introduced in next year's Finance Bill. The extra yield is estimated at £26 million.

These measures on private current expenditure will be reinforced by action to restrain private sector building outside the housing and industrial fields and outside the development areas. The Government has decided to intensify the control on less essential building work and thus to reinforce the priority accorded to building programmes in the fields of housing, schools, hospitals—and new factories. When the Building Control Bill now before Parliament receives the Royal Assent, the Minister of Public Building and Works will make an Order reducing the cost limit above which a project is subject to control from £100,000 to £50,000. The Order will require an affirmative Resolution by both Houses. As before, this control will not apply in the development areas as now defined. With a cost limit of £100,000 the control would affect about 500 projects worth £180 million in a year. The lowering of the limit to £50,000 will extend control to cover a total of about 1,000 projects worth £220 million in a year.

This will give the Government more power to adjust the volume of privately-sponsored construction work as the economic situation develops. Hitherto, approval has been withheld from less than 10% of the projects about which the Minister has been consulted, but it will be necessary to defer a larger proportion of privately-sponsored work in future. The lowering of the limit will give the Minister scope to concentrate the postponement control on less urgent smaller schemes instead of having to rely on deferring some of the larger projects which are more in the public interest.

This measure will be supplemented by a tighter control on office building.

My Rt. Hon. Friend, the President of the Board of Trade, has made an Order, coming into force at midnight, extending control of office building to the whole of Britain south of a line from the Wash to the borders of Hampshire and Dorset, by including within the control the whole of the East Midlands, West Midlands and Southeast region. Projects for building of more than 3,000 square feet of office space which were not the subject of an application for planning permission at the time the Order comes into operation will require an office development permit. In addition to tightening the control on building, this measure will reinforce those already taken by the Government for the prevention of undue congestion in these parts of the country and will supplement the strict policy which is being applied to the issue of industrial development certificates.

Now I turn to public investment programmes. The investment programmes in the public sector have been reviewed and the Government are introducing a number of deferment measures which will reduce demands on resources in this field by £150 millions in 1967/68, though these steps will also lead to significant reductions in demand in the current year. While they will involve forgoing for the present a number of desirable projects, they will be concentrated on those activities which are not vital to our production capacity and for the development of the economy as a whole. Housing, schools, hospitals, Government-financed factories built in development areas, including advanced factories, will not be affected.

On investment by central and local Government we are making cuts amounting to £55 million in 1967/68. This will mean cutting back projects designed to contribute to local amenities but which in present circumstances must be postponed without any setback to our major projects. This will cover such items as swimming baths and new local Government offices. The Covent Garden market project will similarly be deferred.

The programme for investment in nationalised industries has been carefully scrutinised to ensure that essential industrial investment within the public sector shall go on. Nevertheless, the Government are arranging in consultation with the Chairman of these industries for a reduction in the total demand on resources made by public industry investment to be reduced by £95 million in 1967/68. This is in addition to programmes which have fallen behind schedule owing to slippage in construction, or in the delivery by contractors of the necessary plant and machinery.

The measures I have so far announced, by reducing the level of demand within the domestic economy will make a vital contribution to our balance of payments by freeing resources, particularly *labour*, for work on exports and essential investment.

But this of itself is not enough. More direct action on the balance of payments is required.

In accordance with the policy foreshadowed in the Defence White Paper, we have been urgently reviewing how far we can make a major saving in overseas Government expenditure without altering the basic lines of external policy on which the Defense Review was founded. We have also reviewed the level of military and economic aid which we can afford next year. The Government have decided on firm programmes which will reduce our overseas Government expenditure, military and civil, by at least £100 million.

I will come in a moment to the cost of our forces in Germany. Elsewhere we are pressing ahead with measures designed to ensure a substantial and early saving compared with the present level of expenditure. Given an end to confrontation, the plans made by My Rt. Hon. Friend, the Secretary of State for Defence, during his recent visit to the area will secure a major contribution towards this saving.

As regards Germany, in the Defence White Paper published in February, we said that we thought it right to maintain our ground Forces in Germany at about their existing level until satisfactory arms control arrangements had been agreed in Europe provided, however, that some means was found for meeting the foreign exchange costs of those Forces. In my Rt. Hon. Friend's Budget Statement on May the 1st he made clear our intention to negotiate with the Federal Government a new settlement aimed at eliminating the foreign exchange cost of our troops in Germany. In a few minutes My Rt. Hon. Friend will be leaving for Bonn to continue these negotiations. In the light of these discussions, the Government will immediately consider what, if any, further action is called for including the question whether this would mean proposing forthwith through the prescribed NATO and W.E.U. procedures very substantial cuts in our Forces in Germany, sufficient to bring the foreign exchange costs down to the level covered by offset and other payments.

The figure of $100 million that I have mentioned includes, in addition to the savings on defense expenditure, reductions on military and civil aid expenditure and in the cost of our representation and information services overseas. Private overseas expenditure must also make its contribution. Expenditure on holiday travel outside the sterling area has been rising rapidly and the deficit on travel account with non-sterling countries has risen from £38 millions in 1961 to an estimated figure of £95 millions in 1966 and is expected on current trends to reach about £105 millions next year. We cannot allow this formidable deficit to go on mounting without restriction but the change requires consultation with the International Monetary Fund which we have initiated. For the twelve months starting on November 1 next, there will be a basic allowance of £50 per person for travel to countries outside the sterling area. This allowance will have to cover all the foreign exchange requirements

of the traveller, whether paid for in sterling of a foreign currency, except for fares paid for in sterling. There will be special arrangements for business and health travel and for those who, instead of paying fares abroad, take their cars abroad.

From today up to October 31, the amount of foreign exchange which may be bought for journeys to be started during that period will normally be limited to £50 per person. Special arrangements will, however, be made for people who have already made their holiday bookings to acquire a reasonable amount of foreign exchange, and sterling payments through travel agents may continue to be made under existing arrangements.

The Treasury is announcing full details this afternoon.

On the positive side of encouraging tourist expenditure in this country, the Government have decided to introduce for an experimental period of one year in the first instance, a scheme under which development loan assistance can be offered for the building, expansion or modernization of hotels which can show that this will result in a significant increase in their earnings from overseas visitors. The President of the Board of Trade will be making a full announcement before recess.

There is another field of private overseas expenditure lying between current and capital expenditure, which has imposed an increasing charge on our balance of payments—the remittance of emigrants to non-sterling area countries. In addition to the genuine transfers of capital by emigrants, there has been evidence of evasion of the control of capital movements. We have decided that while the existing allowance of up to £5,000 in official exchange for each emigrating family should stand, any balance over and above this should be transferred through the investment currency market and not through the security sterling market. Also from today, the total amount which may be sent by way of cash gifts to residents outside the sterling area will be reduced from £250 a year to £50.

The net direct saving on our overseas payments from all these measures, Government and private, amounts to £150 m. This is a direct saving on our overseas outgoings and therefore on the balance of payments deficit. To sum up the measures that I have so far outlined, I estimate that they will reduce demand on the domestic economy by more than £500 m. This is in addition to the earlier budgetary measure by this Government reducing the pressure of demand in the private sector by over £700 m. They are in addition to the monetary policy which has been in force and which was reinforced by the three further measures announced last week. They are in addition, also, to the impact of this year's finance Bill yet to have its effect on the economy and which is due to reduce demand and which will extract a further £300 m. from the economy, with all that this means in terms of imports and of redeployment of labour towards exports and other essential industries.

In addition to the measures designed to reduce the domestic pressure, the economies in overseas expenditure, public and private, will, as I have said, make a direct saving of £150 m.

But the House will recognize that the whole operation stands or falls on the extent to which we can keep our costs and prices under control.

In recent years, money incomes have been increasing at a rate far faster than could be justified by increasing production: In 1965, we paid ourselves increases in money incomes of about £1,800 m. About £1,300 m. of this represented increases in wages and salaries. Over the same period we earned only £600 m. by way of increased production. These trends are continuing. The declaration of intent of 16 December, 1964, was a great landmark when for the first time in our history, employer, trade union and Government signed a compact designed to restrain the growth of incomes to a norm within the national capacity to pay. Yet ever since that time, wage increases have outrun the figure allowed for, and pre-empted the amount available for such increases for a considerable period ahead. The time has come to call a halt.

The Government are now calling for a six-month standstill on wages, salaries and other types of income, followed by a further six months of severe restraint, and for a similar standstill on prices.

Where a definite commitment already exists to increase pay or reduce hours, its implementation should be deferred for six months. New commitments should not be implemented during the rest of 1966 and in the following six months only if the grounds for exceptional treatment are particularly compelling. In this wait, it is intended to secure virtual stability in incomes for a period of six months followed by a limited growth of incomes in accordance with national priorities during the first six months of 1967. Thereafter, it will be essential to secure that the growth of incomes is resumed in an orderly manner in step with national output. The same principles apply to other types of money income. Companies, for example, must hold down their dividends during the twelve-month period.

The Government similarly call for a twelve-month standstill on prices of all goods and services, except to the limited extent that increases are necessitated by increases in the cost of imported materials, by seasonal factors or by the action of the Government for example through increased taxation.

It is not our intention to introduce elaborate statutory controls over incomes and prices. This is a situation in which the Government look with confidence to everyone concerned with these matters to act in accordance with the public interest. Many individual salaries and other forms of remuneration are fixed outside the normal process of collective bargaining. Here too the same cannons of restraint must apply. This applies also to emoluments of direction and high executives: companies will be required to publish details of these fees and salaries with comparable figures for the previous year.

Within the main field of collective bargaining we shall rely in the first instance on voluntary action. Nevertheless, in order to ensure that the selfish do not benefit at the expense of those who co-operate it is our intention to strengthen the provisions of the Prices and Incomes Bill. To speed its passage and to redefine the role of the National Board for Prices and Incomes, which will not hesitate to act within the powers it enjoys, or may further seek, to deal with any actions involving increases outside and beyond this policy.

The Government will be consulting the T.U.C., C.B.I. and other interested organizations on the detailed application of the standstill within the next few days and a White Paper will be issued in the near future.

The House will not under-rate the deep significance of what I have just announced, its implications for industry and the degree of cooperation and restraint which will be required on the part of those affected by it. But equally the House, and I believe the country, will recognize the urgency of these measures, if we are to get our economy into balance and to keep our costs under control.

I should not feel justified in making this demand on industry, if I did not feel we had done everything in our power to secure social justice in the broader fiscal and social policies of the Government. For no Government has the right to ask for restraint, still less for an effective standstill, unless it has done everything a Government can do to create a climate of social justice, which alone can justify such a policy. Inevitably today I have dealt with measures which, taken by themselves, involve restriction and restraint. But the House will realize that their whole purpose is to provide industry with the opportunity to achieve a major increase in productivity by streamlining production and labour utilization. They must be seen against a background of policies designed to speed the application of scientific methods and techniques—already well-known to progressive managers—to increase efficiency in private industry and in the public sector. Industry by industry, the Economic Development Committees are tackling the practical problems of raising efficiency and spreading knowledge of how performance can be improved in individual companies. Industry by industry—shipbuilding, printing, the docks, rail transport—the Government are engaged in urgent discussions designed to increase productivity and eliminate over-manning and restrictive practices. We have sought to proceed by voluntary agreement. Where this is not forthcoming, other action must be taken. The Government have indicated to all concerned its determination that the freight liner train service shall go ahead on the basis of open terminals.

The problems with which I have been dealing are problems that have beset Britain's economy virtually since the end of the war. The unsung achievements of keen executives and of hard-working responsible trade unionists, of inventive scientists and creative designers are all often overshadowed by attitudes of selfishness and indifference, of indolence and indiscipline on both sides of industry.

For while the Government can and must do all in its power creating conditions to lay down the rules within which the economy must operate, the determination and resolve which today's measures demonstrate must be matched by effort and endeavour on the part of the whole British people.

---

## SUIT BY STATE OF DELAWARE TO HAVE "WINNER-TAKE-ALL" ELECTORAL VOTING SYSTEM DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Delaware's attorney general, David P. Buckson, yesterday brought suit in the Supreme Court of the United States to declare unconstitutional the present "winner-take-all" system under which all of a State's electoral votes are cast for the presidential nominee receiving most of the State's popular vote.

This is a suit of vast importance and has been appropriately covered in detail by the Nation's news media.

In the interest of inviting the attention of Senators to the substance of the suit which Attorney General Buckson has filed, I ask unanimous consent that two of today's news articles, one from the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News and one from the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, July 21, 1966]

DELAWARE HITS U.S. VOTE SYSTEM—ASKS HIGH COURT RULING

WASHINGTON.—Delaware yesterday asked the U.S. Supreme Court to knock out the

"winner take all" system of choosing the electoral college in presidential elections.

A suit filed by Delaware Atty. Gen. David P. Buckson against the other 49 states and the District of Columbia asks the court to clear the way for an alternative system that would bring the electoral vote into line with the popular percentage.

Buckson told a news conference the present system is unconstitutional, is unfair to small states and violates the one-man, one-vote rule laid down by the Supreme Court in decisions requiring state legislatures to reapportion and enlarge underpopulated congressional districts.

He said the change also would end the dominance of big states in national political conventions and might make it possible for a Delawarean such as Republican Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS to win a nomination.

Because of the bloc voting power of large states, he said, 36 states never have had a favorite son elected president, and 26, including Delaware, have not had a candidate nominated.

"We have a man of national stature in Delaware," he said in reference to WILLIAMS, who has loaned his office to Buckson for the press conference. The Senator, who was attending hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, made a brief appearance later at the meeting.

All states now use the unit-vote system, but neither the Constitution nor federal law requires it. Under the system, the candidate who wins a bare majority of the popular vote in New York, for example, wins all 43 electoral votes from that state.

The result is that at present the electoral votes of the 11 largest states, plus those of any one other state, are enough to win a presidential election.

Buckson said the suit does not request any specific alternative to the current system. He said, however, he is personally inclined toward a system of votes by district.

Under this plan, each citizen would vote for no more than three electors—one would represent his congressional district and two would run at large in each state. Buckson said the court-ordered moves toward equalizing the population of congressional districts would make the district electoral system equitable.

Another suggested alternative would divide each state's electoral votes according to the percentage division of the popular vote.

James C. Kirby Jr., a Northwestern University Law School professor, who is a special counsel in the suit, said action could come in two ways. A court decision holding the "winner take all" system invalid would clear the way for a congressional pact establishing a reasonable alternative, or the court could order one of the alternatives put into effect.

Buckson said he has been interested in electoral college reform since his law school days and has been working on the present court brief since 1964.

In that year, he said, he discovered that the National Small Business Association had been working on a similar plan for a number of years and obtained the organization's assistance in helping to prepare the lawsuit.

John A. Gosnell, a partner in the law firm which represents the association, said the organization had contributed less than $10,000 to the legal costs so far. Gosnell, who attended the press conference, said the American Farm Bureau Federation also is interested in the litigation.

The suit names the defendant states in descending order of population. Thus New York, the largest state at the time of the 1960 census, is named first and the suit is entitled Delaware vs. New York.

Buckson said he expects other small states to join Delaware as plaintiffs in the suit.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 21, 1966]

DELAWARE SUIT ASKS NEW ELECTORAL PLAN

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—Delaware asked the Supreme Court today to declare unconstitutional the "winner take all" system under which all of a state's electoral votes are cast for the Presidential nominee receiving most of the state's popular vote.

Invoking the Court's original jurisdiction to hear disputes between states, Attorney General David P. Buckson of Delaware brought suit against the 49 other states and the District of Columbia. However, he directed his legal attack specifically at New York and other states with large blocks of electoral votes.

The suit charged that a citizen of a large state exerted more political influence than a citizen of a small state because, theoretically at least, he is capable of delivering a decisive number of electoral votes. It asked the high court to extend its one-man, one vote doctrine to declare unconstitutional the winner-take-all or unit-vote system of choosing Presidential electors.

All states now use the unit-vote system, but neither the Constitution nor Federal law requires it.

According to the suit, in the early years of the Republic a majority of the states used the district system to choose electors. This method gave one electoral vote to the President nominee who carried each Congressional district, with each state's two Senatorial electoral votes going to the nominee who carried the state.

ELEVEN CRUCIAL STATES

But, the suit said, a few states were able to exert additional political influence by giving all their electoral votes to the nominee who carried the states, and this forced all the other states to adopt the same system.

The result is that now the electoral votes of the 11 largest states (based on electoral vote totals), plus those of any one other state, are enough to win an election. The 11 states, in descending order according to number of electoral votes, are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Michigan, New Jersey, Florida, Massachusetts and Indiana.

They have 268 electoral votes among them. A majority, or 270, of the 538 electoral votes is necessary to elect a President.

The defendants were listed in descending order, down to the smallest states. The suit, entitled Delaware v. New York, is in fact directed at the 11 big states.

Mr. Buckson said at a press conference that other small states were expected to realign themselves on the plaintiff side.

A New York citizen, the suit contends, has also been benefited unduly from the unit-vote system by having a greater chance to become President.

Of the 100 men nominated for President or Vice President, 24 have been New Yorkers, while no citizen of Delaware has ever been nominated for either office. And Delaware and 35 other states have never had one of their citizens elected President.

SEES WASTED VOTES

"Citizens of these states are as well qualified for national office as are New York's citizens," the suit says, but they have been overlooked because of "the premium placed upon the strategic location of potential candidates residing in New York and other large states."

The suit found fault with the present system also because, it said, those who vote for the losing nominee in a state waste their votes and because individuals' votes can be distorted in the casting of the electoral votes.

In 1960, it pointed out, John F. Kennedy received 67.5 per cent of the combined electoral votes of Illinois and Indiana when he carried Illinois by a narrow margin and got its 27 electoral votes. Richard M. Nixon received 51.6 per cent of the combined popular votes but got only Indiana's 13 electoral votes.

Citing a 1963 decision in which the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the county unit system of electing Governors in Georgia and other apportionment cases, the suit contended that a state's use of the unit-vote system in Presidential elections denied citizens of other states the equal protection of the laws and due process guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

The present system, the suit said, creates a risk that a nominee may be elected although receiving fewer popular votes than his opponents. This happened when Rutherford B. Hayes defeated Samuel J. Tilden in 1876 and when Benjamin Harrison defeated Grover Cleveland in 1888.

The suit asked the Supreme Court to bar any system "which is not designed reasonably to reflect in its electoral vote the division of the will of the people of the state as shown in its popular vote."

This would allow only the district system or a plan that divides each state's electoral votes among the nominees in proportion to their popular votes, Mr. Buckson said.

Mr. Buckson said the suit was not being supported by Delaware tax money but by the National Small Business Association. John A. Gosnell, the association's general counsel, said his group had financed the action in the amount of "less than $10,000" so far.

After the Supreme Court reconvenes on Oct. 3 it will decide whether to accept Delaware's complaint and hear the case.

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States determined in 1959 that a Captive Nations Week observed annually in the United States would be a great morale booster for the millions of people enslaved in Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Rumania, and other countries.

Some 100 million people were arbitrarily deprived of their national integrity and individual freedom by a relatively simple ploy of the Soviet Union. The Russians, our so-called allies of World War II, simply turned the nations they occupied during the war into postwar colonies.

While the rest of the post-1945 world was demilitarizing and trying to return to a semblance of normalcy, the Soviet Union was tightening its grip on the captive peoples. When Congress took official cognizance of this fact in 1959 by calling upon the President to observe annually a Captive Nations Week, it was felt that this observance would do much to encourage the people behind the Iron Curtain and renew their faith that the free world had not turned its back on them.

The first proclamation, issued by President Eisenhower, got right to the point. It accused the Soviet Government of imperialistic and aggressive policies and it took note of the very obvious fact, which should be just as obvious today, that communism and Soviet nationalism together constitutes the force which holds the captive nations captive.

Anyone reading the most recent captive nations proclamation would have a hard time identifying its purpose. It mentions neither Russia nor China, nor

does it identify the Communist ideology in which name the captive nations are held in subjugation. The Great Society apparently sees no need for a great rebirth of freedom in Eastern Europe or other captive lands.

Despite the intent of Congress, an uninitiated reader exposed for the first time to the current captive nations proclamation might well think that it is directed to apartheid in South Africa or a military-oriented government of Latin America. It mentions none of the causes, forces, or reasons for Captive Nations Week. I certainly hope that the American people, their allies in the captive nations, and the Congress of the United States will bring about a change in the strength of the language that will go into the resolution for Captive Nations Week 1967. To facilitate a comparison of the first captive nation's resolution and the current one, I ask that both be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

It has always seemed particularly tragic to me that an organization conceived, as is the United Nations, in the noble principles of peace and freedom should turn its back on the dilemma of the captive nations. That the U.N. has done so and that the United States has acquiesced in its conduct is but one more symptom of the inadequacy of both the United Nations and of American policy therein. In my judgment, the only two truly colonial powers left in the world are the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist China. And yet, the question of colonialism in the United Nations is always one which is pointed critically toward the free world. The United States could perform no better service in the United Nations than to demand that the question of the captive nations be at the top of the agenda of every session of every year.

There is a feeling in the captive nations that America's once proud national policy of peace through freedom for the captive nations has given way to neutralization through discouragement. This administration, and the one which preceded it, would rather see the captive nations captive and quiet than "rocking the boat" for their independence. It is the patency of this fact which makes a mockery of many of the splendidly intoned speeches heard annually during Captive Nations Week.

Mr. President, the people of the captive nations—and I would include in this category many mainland Chinese who are as sick of the ludicrous pronouncements of their Communist dictators as any people could be—have never lost faith. Last night at the National Press Club, the Assembly of Captive European Nations held a dinner honoring Members of Congress. The dinner should have been the other way around. It should have been the Members of Congress and the American people honoring the captive nations.

In any event, splendid speeches were delivered at that dinner—speeches by Europeans who have been exposed personally to the viciousness and total subjugation of life under communism. And there were speeches by Members of Congress who have supported the objectives and aspirations of the captive peoples.

I ask, Mr. President, that as this Captive Nations Week nears its close, several of the speeches delivered at last night's captive nations dinner be printed with my remarks.

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

[No. 3303, July 21, 1959, 24 F.R. 5773]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1959

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

Whereas the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 19, 1959, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this seventeenth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and fifty-nine, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fourth.

[SEAL] DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

DOUGLAS DILLON,
*Acting Secretary of State.*

---

[No. 3732, Presidential Documents]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all people; and

Whereas these basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty; and

Whereas, in keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples:

Now, Therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this eighth day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

[SEAL] LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

GEORGE W. BALL,
*Acting Secretary of State.*

[F.R. Doc. 66-7714; Filed, July 12, 1966; 2:44 p.m.]

---

ADDRESS BY VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS, CHAIRMAN, ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS, AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 20, 1966

Your Excellencies, Distinguished Members of Congress, Honored Guests: On behalf of the Assembly of Captive European Nations I take great honor and pleasure in welcoming you to this annual event.

Over the past years, the speeches of my predecessors at Captive Nations Week dinners focused on the key issues confronting East-Central Europe. My choice for tonight's address centers on the very word that has spurred nationwide observances of this week—the word "captive".

We all have heard it said that, as "evolution" in East-Central Europe has become a new catchword, the term "captive" has lost much of its impact. In fact, some even question whether the term is justified at all. If that be true, our dinner tonight is a misnomer, and Captive Nations Week itself has become superfluous.

But—*is* it true? What better way is there to answer this crucial question than by taking a closer look into the current situation in the captive countries and by listening to the voice of the people of East-Central Europe?

The young people in Czechoslovakia, the Communist press informs us, are "confused" and clamor for "bourgeois-type democracy". In Prague, at the Majales festival last May, young men and women greeted the harassment by the militia with shouts of "Gestapo". The Czechoslovaks, apparently, still consider themselves captive. A more detailed report on the situation in Czechoslovakia will be submitted later this evening by Jan Lukas, a recent escapee.

The same accusation—"Gestapo"—was hurled at the security forces by Polish demonstrators, who had lost patience with crude Communist interference and mounting regime restrictions in connection with this year's observance of the Polish Millennium. Demonstrators in Warsaw also demanded "freedom of the press".

When a nation with a ninety-five per cent Catholic population is facing unceasing regime obstruction in its exercise of the freedom of worship; when a nation which has given Europe many of its greatest thinkers and poets is denied the freedom of expression—then such a nation is "captive".

The question about the word, "captive", is often made in conjunction with the increasingly nationalistic overtones in the pronouncements of the Communist rulers in East-Central Europe—especially those in Rumania. We are also being told that these rulers no longer blindly accept orders from Moscow.

If that is indeed a fact, then it represents a positive development. But it seems that the prime motivation is rather the indomitable nationalistic spirit in East-Central Europe, which is too deep-rooted and too widespread to be permanently ignored by the Communists.

Moreover, one must not forget that none of these Communist regimes have come to power through free, unfettered elections. They represent a distinct minority, and their takeovers of the East-Central European countries were aided and abetted by the Soviet Union. Despite limited, but welcome, alleviations in regime rule, they continue to rely on the machinery of a police state. A citizen of a police state is, and must be considered, "captive".

It is significant that, as we observe this year's Captive Nations Week, we must note with sadness and disappointment that "liberalization" in East-Central Europe appears to be grinding to a halt. Repression is the order of the day in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Prison camps in Bulgaria and Rumania are still filled with political prisoners. Colonization, exploitation and forcible Russification continue unabated in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Stalinism and its dogmatic, regimented teachings reign supreme in Albania, although her rulers have turned from Moscow to Peking.

Therefore we must say: *Yes*, we are for "evolution", but for an evolution viewed soberly and objectively. We cannot accept the concept of an evolution which may tend to confer an aura of normalcy and legitimacy on Communist-controlled states and their rulers. Neither can we subscribe to an evolution which would draw a curtain of oblivion over the plight of the Baltic States, which are almost completely cut off from the mainstream of "liberalization."

On this solemn occasion, during Captive Nations Week 1966, we pledge to continue our work for self-determination and independence in East-Central Europe. For only when this goal has been achieved will we be justified in removing the poignant term, "captive" from any reference to our countries.

I wish to conclude my remarks by asking Admiral Harold B. Miller to take over from here. Admiral Miller, a staunch champion of our cause, has devoted his life to public service. After a distinguished career in the United States armed forces, Admiral Miller served briefly as President of the then Committee for a Free Europe—now Free Europe, Inc.—and as President of Crusade for Freedom. Admiral Miller is at present Director of Special Affairs at Pan American Airways.

Admiral Miller.

---

TIGHT REGIME CONTROLS ON ARTISTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(Speech by Jan Lukas at the Captive Nations Week Dinner on July 20, 1966, at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.)

(Jan Lukas, 50, is generally considered Czechoslovakia's top creative photographer. His photographs, ranging from the Nazi occupation of Austria in 1938 to current subjects, have provided the material for some 20 picture books—some of which are considered masterpieces of creative photography. His distinguished record also includes an exhibition in the Czechoslovak Pavilion at the 1958 Brussels World Fair. In 1964, Mr. Lukas came to the U.S. for a one-month visit, but his family had been forced to stay behind in Czechoslovakia. In August 1965, he made his way, via Hungary, to Yugoslavia—where his wife and two daughters had gone on vacation. Once together, the Lukas family escaped to Italy. They arrived in the United States only a month ago. Mr. Lukas hopes to continue working in his field and make full use of his talent and experience.)

It has been said that a picture is worth a thousand words. This not only holds true in a free society, but even more so when one lives under a totalitarian regime.

I know. During the years I worked in Czechoslovakia I saw many of my pictures suppressed before they could reach the public. One of my picture books—on Moscow—was even taken out of the bookstores, because the Czechoslovak regime considered some of the pictures in the book too frank and therefore embarrassing to the Soviets. Pictures have a strange way of pressing home the climate of apathy, despair and resentment that is in strong evidence throughout the Communist "paradise". Text may sometimes be dismissed as propaganda, but a photograph of a woman—looking yearningly at the stilled belltowers of the churches inside the Kremlin—can only have one explanation and is not easily forgotten.

As a member of the Czechoslovak Association of Creative Artists, which groups the country's top-flight men and women in the field, I was practically a member of the "New Class". But, although the bars were gilded, it was still a prison.

True, I did not live in material want. My daily life was quite comfortable. I was even permitted to go abroad, from time to time. These trips, however, were hardly pleasure trips. The regime had a distinct ulterior motive in letting me out . . . foreign currency. Whenever I would go abroad on an assignment, the fee I would earn from foreign publishers or other sources would be paid directly and in foreign currency to the Czechoslovak regime. I would then be compensated by the regime in local, Czechoslovak, koruny. Moreover, I was never allowed to take my family along on these trips. To the Communists, my family's presence in Czechoslovakia while I was abroad was a guarantee that I would return.

Yet, the experience gained on these trips to foreign countries was invaluable. They offered a breath of fresh air after the sickening, polluted atmosphere at home. To work, to create, or even just plain "live" in a Communist-ruled country is oppressive, drab and monotonously predictable. People go through the motions day after day, only to wake up to another day of a dreary existence that offers little challenge or joy of living. Deprived of their individuality, the people feel like automatons and are tired of the same commands.

In the arts, as well as in other fields, the regime seeks to maintain a rigid monopoly on ideas. So-called deviations are occasionally overlooked or even sanctioned, since they help provide a safety valve for pent-up frustrations and resentments. But whenever the regime feels the danger point has been reached, the door is promptly and unreservedly slammed shut in the artist's face. The artist, therefore, often feels akin to a yo-yo—manipulated openly or covertly, depending on his stature.

In coping with "deviationists" and "rebels", the Czechoslovak regime employs various tactics. A classic case is that of the Beatles. It is well known that the younger generation throughout the Communist orbit copies Western fads and is most enthusiastic about Western music. To ban the Beatles, the regime figured, would only encourage clandestine Beatles clubs and elevate the English quartet to the status of an anti-Communist symbol. So the regime adopted a more subtle and more effective way to cope with the Beatles—overexposure. They began to literally ram the Beatles and their music down young people's throats until the Beatles had become a "routine" experience rather than a tantalizing, regime-forbidden hobby.

There is little doubt that this type of regime approach is more dangerous than the former blanket suppression of all that comes from the West. First of all, it may lead some people at home to believe that there is a gradual "thaw" in the regime's attitude to the people over whom the Communists rule. Secondly, such regime tactics may be mistaken for genuine attempts toward "liberalization" and be talked and written about as such in the West.

Although the terror of the Stalin era is no longer in strong evidence, fear remains. At the same time, the average citizen has had to date very little personal benefit from the so-called liberalization.

Freedom, as you know it in the West, is still a mirage. An apt illustration of this point is a story, still very much in vogue in Prague and throughout Czechoslovakia. It goes like this: "Every man and woman in Czechoslovakia has the right to criticize the President . . . . . of the United States.

Thank you.

---

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ED REINECKE, REPUBLICAN OF CALIFORNIA, AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 20, 1966

Thank you very much for this opportunity to join with you tonight for the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week at this dinner honoring members of the United States Congress. Perhaps, however, the honor and tribute of this particular occasion should be reversed. We Congressmen owe you a debt of gratitude—for your sincere concern in the affairs of this nation and the world, and for your willingness to give of your time and resources to serve the cause of freedom. Your dedication sets a valuable and excellent example.

As we gather here in this notable place we cannot help but wonder what effect these annual observances have on the Communist governments of eastern Europe. Apparently we bother them a little. And I'm glad about that, aren't you?

After last year's Captive Nations observances a few reports of reaction filtered through the iron curtain. One editor of a newspaper in the Ukraine said, "They are beating the drums again across the sea, filling the columns in newspaper and delivering hypocritical speeches. For the umpteenth time the ruling circles of the United States are holding the so-called 'Captive Nations Week.' And the propaganda machine is deafening the citizens with atrocious inventions about the fate of nations which are suffering under the yoke of the Kremlin regime."

Another Russian writer said, "Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize a so-called captive nations week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke . . ."

It seems that these observances have been effective in developing a psychological and political weapon against the tyranny of Eastern Europe. These reactions sound like another way of saying "ouch."

We must also ask ourselves the question: "Why should we be concerned, as Americans, for the plight of people in such far away places? We have many problems of our own to solve. We are engaged in a major military action in Southeast Asia. And besides, what can we do about the people of Eastern Europe short of a major war with the Communist world?"

I think that the answers to these questions come from the deepest roots of our

own country's history. For the work that was begun just one hundred and ninety years ago is still going on today. It is spreading around the world.

I am reminded of the words of Emerson in his "Concord Hymn" when he said,

"By the rude bridge that arches the flood,
"Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
"Here once the embattled farmers stood,
"And fired the shot heard 'round the world."

The sound of that 'shot' still rings throughout the world. For in the goals of our revolution we crystalized the deep aspirations of every man in every nation and in every age. Our revolution is still going on. And so is theirs. And that is why we cannot turn our backs on them. They are following in our battle paths. And we dare not let them down. Our revolution, and their struggles to throw off the yoke of tyranny are part of the same universal battle of mankind for freedom, for spiritual fulfillment, for peace, for prosperity and for progress.

And if we be true to our own principles of democracy and of individual liberty and responsibility, and to our own system of free enterprise, we must believe that every people should have the opportunity to choose for themselves a system of government. They must be allowed to adopt to their own cultures the universal concepts of free self-government.

We have often said in this country that if even one man lives in fear or in tyranny or does not enjoy the full opportunities afforded by our Constitution then we all live in fear and tyranny. In our free society if one man is robbed of his inalienable rights or of his dignity, then all men become victims of the same crime.

And this principle ought to be applied to the world as a whole. For if the freedom of one nation is destroyed then the freedom of all nations is in jeopardy. And if any people anywhere suffer from the burdens of captivity, then all people everywhere are in some measure held equally captive.

Therefore, we see that the plight of the captive peoples of eastern Europe, and even of southeast Asia, becomes the plight of free men everywhere. Their struggle becomes our struggle. Our stewardship of democracy becomes their hope for freedom. That is why we cannot neglect the over 100 million people held captive by Communist colonialism. That is why we are here tonight.

Well, then, what are we going to do about it? What hope do we hold out to these people? What is our responsibility?

The United States, whether we like it or not, has been thrust into history at this time as the leader of the free world. The cause of freedom and the development of its ideals has become the great work of our generation. How have we done so far?

We have not done all that we could. In current times we have seen the steady decline of the great alliance of NATO. Time and time again the initiative to take positive action in foreign affairs has been stolen from us by our enemies. Our foreign policy has become simply a series of stop-gap emergency reactions.

Because of the inaction and lack of forethought of those who carry the responsibility our diplomats have been made to appear like a comic water brigade running back and forth around the world putting out brush fires.

It is time that the United States reassert its leadership in the free world rather than to follow the whims of those who do not care, or who are playing power politics with the fate of their nations.

Leadership means ideas. New ideas; and we had better start thinking. I propose that we mount an effective freedom offensive. A campaign using psychological, political and economic weapons against the regimes of captive nations everywhere. We have already seen what this simple observance here will do to unnerve and irritate those on the other side of the iron curtain. And we ought to do more of it.

In our freedom offensive we ought to draw more broadly on the resources of leadership of the responsible private sector of this country.

I propose that we gather together, under private sponsorship, or under the authority of the Congress or the President, the great technicians of mass communication, advertising, and public relations for a brief time to design a creative program of propaganda to be used against the regimes of iron and bamboo curtain countries. The technology of propaganda, and I use that word in the best sense, has been developed by private industry to an amazing degree. But not enough of this new knowledge has been put to work by our government's foreign public relations directors.

We need fewer foreign policy philosophers, and more communications experts in the United States Information Agency. The Voice of America should be strengthened and its programming drastically improved.

We need to draw more upon the experience and resourcefulness of our motion picture industry, our radio and television industry, and our universities with their vast new communications research centers. We ought to bring to government the fresh ideas that these people have. Then we could mount a psychological campaign that would beam the weapons of ideology and the hope of freedom to the captive peoples of the world. It has never really been done before. Why not try it!

In the matter of the economic and political offensives, we must seek to drive a wedge into every tiny crack that appears in the iron curtain. We must avoid every pitfall that might lend comfort or support to the Communist regimes of these countries. We must not provide the means for propping up their failing economies and thereby perpetuate their dictatorial governments.

I would propose that we bring before the United Nations General Assembly the whole question of the captive nations, and request that the Soviet Union be made to answer to the charges of history.

Or, as an alternative, that we embark on a diplomatic freedom offensive, similar to the recent peace offensive for Vietnam, to seek the cooperation and ideas of every free nation in a united effort to liberate the captive peoples.

Real progress demands revision of thought, policy, and action. We need to do a lot more thinking about extending the frontiers of freedom. We have grown accustomed to living in a world half-free and half-slave.

There can be no peace in the world; no peace among nations; no peace in the hearts of captive peoples until all the world—every nation—and each person is free. "Freedom isn't free," in the words of the popular song:

"Freedom isn't free.
You've got to pay the price,
You're got to sacrifice,
For your liberty."

The easiest thing for a rich nation to do is to give of its wealth. But the noblest thing for any nation to do is to give of its heart.

Let the price we pay for our freedom be to lift even higher the torch of liberty—and by its light to expose the still darkened corners of captive nations—in Asia, as well as in Eastern Europe. Let the price we pay be to extend our heart and hand in encouragement and moral support to those whose struggle for freedom is not yet accomplished. And let our word of courage be to them that "there is a universal, eternal law which is man's will to be free. And though the struggle may be long and hard, you have allies in every nation on earth, and in every age of history. You will not be defeated."

Thank you.

---

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE LESTER L. WOLFF, DEMOCRAT, OF NEW YORK, AT THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK DINNER, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 20, 1966

Good evening. It is a privilege to speak tonight before this most respected organization—whose members know better than anyone else the true meaning of Freedom.

We are gathered here tonight at a crossroads. The past has been tragic for us all since the tyranny of communism enveloped some of the proudest nations on the face of the earth. The future must inevitably be brighter. A day will come when the freedoms we all have in the Free World will be shared by all.

This banquet is being held on a fateful anniversary.

The Potsdam Conference, at which the Free World began to realize how serious Russia's goal of world conquest really was, first convened twenty-one years ago last Saturday.

Within a few years of that fateful conference, nearly one billion men, women, and children lost their most precious possession, their freedom, because of the ambitions of totalitarian Russia. Untold millions have suffered for many years under the yoke of Communist servitude.

We are in a time when much of American attention is concentrated on the fight for freedom in Viet Nam.

Important as that struggle may be, it is just as important that Americans remember that the Captive Nations of Eastern Europe are still captive.

The inhuman practices of communism have in no way diminished in Eastern Europe.

Men are still shot as they attempt to pierce the Iron Curtain to freedom.

Men are still coerced by the State in all aspects of their daily existence.

There is no freedom of speech in the Captive Nations.

Every word uttered in a Captive Nation can condemn a man on the spot.

There is no freedom of the press in the captive nations. The only information disseminated to the people is the propaganda churned out by the puppet regime and the Communist Party.

The only way those in the captive nations can learn the truth about their world is by listening clandestinely to such radio stations as the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe.

There is no freedom of religion—despite the claims to the contrary by the local parties.

Communist ideology is Godless.

The outcry around the world raised against Red anti-Semitism is only one example of the true intention of the Communists: to erase religion and God as a competing force in the Captive Nations.

This campaign has been a miserable failure.

In captive Poland, the Catholic Church has survived under the brave leadership of Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski, even as the Communists continue to show their enmity to the Church by refusing to allow the Pope to visit Poland to celebrate the Millennium of Christianity.

In Hungary, Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty remains a symbol of defiance and courage.

All through the captive nations, the spirit of religion has been crushed.

But religious freedom is not the only victim of the Communists.

Within the Captive Nations, there are no free elections. The puppet regimes would

never dare to test their popularity by allowing the people a choice.

History has taught us that whenever men have had free elections, they always vote for an increase in freedom for the people. Free election in the Captive Nations would bring an immediate end to every single puppet regime imposed by Russian imperialism.

There has never been a single nation where a free election has resulted in victory for Communist candidates.

Men are by nature free: they will never consciously choose serfdom.

Tonight, we are proud to entrust Mr. Wells of Freedoms Foundation with temporary custody of the beautiful plaque which was presented to Congressman HORTON and me last year.

We hope it will not long remain at Valley Forge, the home of Freedoms Foundation.

We hope it will soon find its permanent shrine in the capital of the first captive nation to be liberated from the yoke of communism.

My friends, the past has taught us many lessons. If we remember them, that day of liberation will not be far off.

We must remember that even today when men talk of detente the Communists continue to see the world as a struggle between two forces—with only one essential question: "Who will survive?"

And let us not forget, my friends, what bitter experience has taught us about dealing with the Communists: we must never let our guard down.

My friends, there is growing evidence that the Red Tide, unleashed across the world by the Russian Revolution has passed its crest.

I believe that I have good cause for my optimism about the future.

The Communists will not win in Viet Nam.

The Communists admitted the failure of their economic system to provide for the needs of their people when they built the Wall across Berlin.

The Communists have failed notoriously in Asia—especially in Indonesia and India—in Africa where they have not even managed to gain a toehold, and in Latin America where Fidel Castro, who perverted the ideals of his nation's revolution for freedom, has been trying unsuccessfully for over seven years to export his poison.

And I believe it is only a matter of time before communism begins to crumble in the ancient states of Eastern Europe now held captive.

In fact, the process may have already begun.

For communism is none other than a modern day version of traditional Russian imperialism. And such a force, relying on violence and hypocrisy, has never been able to permanently prevail.

It has been almost ten years since the brave freedom fighters of Poland and Hungary fought to the death against overwhelming odds.

Although these men did not succeed the first time, their cause lives on.

There are and there will be, I can assure you, other men just as dedicated to the cause of freedom.

For God did not will that men should live in slavery.

Just as Abraham Lincoln said that the United States could not exist half slave and half free, history will bear out my prediction that our world will not continue half in submission and half in freedom.

Because all men are brothers, as long as one single man is a captive of communism, a part of all of us is captive.

## CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, during June 1966, a total of 3,097 part I offenses were reported in the District of Columbia. This was an increase of 14.4 percent over June 1965. I ask unanimous consent that a report, entitled "Crime in the District of Columbia—June 1966," issued by the District of Columbia Police Department, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—JUNE 1966

During June 1966, a total of 3,097 Part I Offenses were reported in the District, an increase of 390 offenses or 14.4% from June 1965.

During this month increases occurred in the classifications of Criminal Homicide, up 3 offenses or 27.3%; Robbery, up 16 offenses or 5.8%; Aggravated Assault, up 68 offenses or 27.6%; Housebreaking, up 29 offenses or 4.5%; Grand Larceny, up 18 offenses or 12.2%; Petit Larceny, up 239 offenses, or 27.4%; Auto Theft, up 21 offenses or 4.2%. A decrease occurred in the classification of Rape, down 4 offenses or 26.7%.

The increase for this month brought the trend of serious offenses (total offenses for the past 12 months) to 35,222, an increase of 2,677 offenses or 8.2% from the trend of June 1965, and an increase of 19,429 offenses or 123.0% from the low point of June 1957.

Clearance of Part I Offenses for the twelve month period ending with June 1966 were down to 27.9% as compared with 36.7% for June 1965.

This month brought to a close fiscal year 1966 with the preliminary crime count (subject to final changes because of unfounded offenses) 8.2% above the preliminary count of fiscal year 1965. The following table compares data for fiscal year 1957 (the low point under the present reporting system), fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1966:

*Part I offenses reported, preliminary data*

| Classification | Fiscal year | | | Percent change | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1957 | 1965 | 1966 | 1965–66 | 1957–66 |
| Criminal homicide | 88 | 179 | 170 | −5.0 | +93.2 |
| Rape | 199 | 155 | 196 | +26.5 | −1.5 |
| Robbery | 944 | 3,969 | 3,825 | −3.6 | +305.2 |
| Aggravated assault | 2,555 | 2,498 | 2,845 | +13.9 | +11.4 |
| Housebreaking | 3,023 | 9,361 | 9,276 | −.9 | +206.8 |
| Grand larceny | 798 | 1,610 | 1,910 | +18.6 | +139.3 |
| Petit larceny | 6,343 | 8,716 | 11,466 | +31.6 | +80.8 |
| Auto theft | 1,843 | 6,057 | 5,534 | −8.6 | +200.3 |
| Total | 15,793 | 32,545 | 35,222 | +8.2 | +123.0 |

The crime data for 1966 is especially encouraging with respect to the decreases in the classification of Robbery, Housebreaking, Auto Theft. Since the current upward trend began in 1957 these categories have shown sharper increases than the other Part I Offenses. During the five year period from fiscal year 1960 through fiscal year 1965 the annual rate of Robbery moved from 1315 to 3969, an increase of 201.8%; the annual rate of Housebreaking moved from 4446 to 9361, an increase of 110.5%; and the annual rate of Auto Theft moved from 2074 to 6057, an increase of 192.0%.

These comparisons of fiscal years 1965 and 1966 clearly indicate that the combined special anti-crime programs provided last year (Tactical Force, one-man cars, added school crossing guards, added footman radios) have had a very positive effect in reducing crime trends in this city, especially in those categories of crime most affected by police preventive patrol.

The above data is particularly striking in view of the fact that these three offenses which show reductions for the year were the primary targets of the Tactical Force.

## REPORT ON REORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress today announced approval of its final report. The report recommends major changes in congressional organization and machinery. The recommendations include uniform rules of procedure for the standing committees, changes in committee jurisdiction, improved staffing and use of modern management techniques in evaluating the Federal budget. Approval of the report was announced at a news conference held by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY and Representatives RAY J. MADDEN, co-chairmen, and Senator KARL MUNDT and Representatives THOMAS B. CURTIS, ranking Republican members of the bipartisan joint committee.

The report is the product of a year and a half of study. The committee was formed in March 1965. It conducted several months of hearings where 200 witnesses testified, including Members of Congress, high Government officials, political scientists and representatives of national organizations. The committee has begun preparation of an omnibus reorganization bill—to be entitled the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966—based on the recommendations contained in the report. It will ask for permission to report the bill directly to the floor of each House during this session. This procedure was followed in 1946 when the last comprehensive review of congressional organization took place.

The report proposes major revisions in the standing committee system—the basic working unit of Congress. It recommends a committee "bill of rights" to give a majority of the committee membership the right to call meetings and report legislation in the event a chairman refuses to do so. It recommends more frequent use of open hearings and that committee deliberations may be televised or broadcast at the option of the committee. Safeguards are prescribed

to insure that all committee members can participate in the preparation of committee reports and that committee reports are available to all Members prior to floor action. The use of proxy voting in committees would be eliminated.

Major changes in committee jurisdiction are recommended. New Committees on Education would be created in each House. These committees would assume the educational jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor, as well as educational programs under the jurisdiction of other committees. The jurisdiction of committees dealing with scientific matters in each House would be expanded and redefined. The committee recommends redesignation of the Banking and Currency Committees as the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs to give recognition to growing urban problems. It also recommends creation of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs with jurisdiction comparable to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The committee attempts to achieve a better distribution of workload in the Senate by placing a limitation on committee assignments and chairmanships. It also recommends that no Senator can serve on more than one of the Appropriations, Finance, Foreign Relations, and Armed Services Committees because of the jurisdiction of those committees.

Committee staff resources would be expanded and improved. The right to employ outside consultants is authorized and encouraged. Three positions—two professional and one clerical—are to be assigned to the minority on request. An additional staff member designated as a "review specialist" would be assigned to each standing committee to review the administration of existing laws.

The report makes a number of important recommendations in the field of fiscal controls and congressional review of the budget. It urges the use of automatic data processing to expand the budget information available to Members. Specific improvements in the presentation of the budget are recommended. Budget officials are to appear before the full Appropriations Committees of each House within 30 days after submission of the budget to discuss overall budget guidelines. The Appropriations Committees are urged to expand their study of multiagency programs and to hold more open hearings. It recommends new operating units within the General Accounting Office to assist the committees in program evaluation.

Each Member is to have a personal legislative assistant. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is to be redesignated as the Legislative Research Service to emphasize the scope of its responsibilities. A new reference division to handle routine requests in order to free expert personnel for more important inquires will be created. It recommends better liaison between the Service and the congressional committees.

The report also deals with Capitol housekeeping functions. Patronage appointments are to be eliminated on the Capitol Police Force and an Office of Personnel and Office Management shall be created.

The report recommends the creation of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations to conduct a continuing study of the organization and operations of the Congress. The proposed joint committee would supervise a number of housekeeping functions and in some respects would become a permanent successor to this committee.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provided for the registration of individuals and organizations who solicit or receive funds for the purpose of influencing legislation. The committee proposes to strengthen the act by requiring registration of those having influencing legislation as a "substantial purpose" rather than the present "principal purpose" requirement. It would also transfer responsibility for the maintenance and publication of lobby registration records to the General Accounting Office. Stringent arrangements for contingent fees for lobbying purposes would be required.

The committee urges that congressional business be scheduled on a 5-day workweek. In the event a session extends beyond July 31, a recess would be held in August and the business of the session completed in the fall.

Finally, the committee recommends that Members divest themselves of patronage responsibilities on the appointment and confirmation of postmasters and the recommendation of rural mail carriers.

The report was unanimously approved by the committee. A number of Republican members also filed supplemental views. They made additional recommendations beyond those of the full committee. Among these were proposals for minority party control of an investigatory committee when the same party controls both Houses of Congress and the Presidency, curbs on administrative lobbying by the executive branch, disclosure of assets and income by Members and proposals relating to financing of political campaigns.

Congressman KEN HECHLER, Democrat, of West Virginia, expressed strong support of the recommendations in the report, and also added supplemental views designed to give the public a more informative view of the Congress, to provide for electric voting on an optional basis, and several other suggestions for future consideration by the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations proposed in the report.

The complete report of the committee will be available to Members and the public next week.

Other members of the committee are Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, Senator J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware, Representative JACK B. BROOKS, Democrat, of Texas, Representative DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, and Representative JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of recommendations of the Joint Committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Joint Committee has made a number of recommendations for the improvement of the organization of Congress. It is our intention to request authority to report legislation based on these recommendations. The specific recommendations are contained in the body of the report.

They may be summarized as follows:

*Committee procedures should be strengthened to provide—*

1. For a committee "bill of rights" to give a majority of the committee the right to call meetings, to eliminate proxy voting, and to give a majority the right to require a chairman to report legislation.

8. That committee *hearings* should be public to the maximum extent possible and may be broadcast or televised at the option of the committee.

3. That committee *meetings* should also be open except for necessary executive sessions, and results of all committee action should be made public.

4. That the Legislative Reference Service prepare concise legislative histories of bills scheduled for hearings.

5. That committee hearings should be announced publicly at least 2 weeks in advance and witnesses should submit written statements at least 2 days in advance of their appearance.

6. That the minority be given at least 1 day to call witnesses of its choice.

7. That daily summaries of hearing testimony should be prepared by staff.

8. That committee reports should be circulated among all Members at least 2 days prior to filing with the opportunity for submission of supplementary and minority views Floor votes should not be taken until committee reports and hearings have been available for at least 3 days.

9. That committees should be permitted to conduct hearings during floor sessions by consent of the majority and minority leadership and should schedule their business on a 5-day workweek.

10. That subcommittees should follow the rules of their parent committees and should be funded by a single annual resolution of the full committe.

*Committee jurisdictions should be realigned by—*

1. Division of the House Committee on Education and Labor into a Committee on Education and a Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and creation of a Senate Committee on Education with redefinition of the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

2. Redesignation of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee as the Committee on Science and Astronautics and expansion and redefinition of the jurisdictions of the Science and Astronautics Committees of both Houses.

3. Redesignation of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees as the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

4. Creation of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*Committee assignments of Senators should be limited to:*

1. Membership on two major committees and one minor, joint, select, or special committee.

2. Membership on not more than one of the following committees: Appropriations, Finance, Foreign Relations, and Armed Services.

3. One committee chairmanship and the chairmanship of not more than one subcommittee of any major standing committee.

*Committee staff resources should be augmented by—*

1. An increase of professional staff positions under the 1946 act from four to six.

2. Assignment of two professional staff positions and one clerical position to the minority on their request, and equitable treatment to the minority in the staffing of subcommittees.

3. Authorization to employ outside consultants to supplement permanent staff.

4. Authorization to provide supplemental training or education for professional staff.

*Review of the administration of existing laws should be strengthened by—*

1. Redesignation of the term "oversight" to "review" for better public understanding.

2. A full-time review specialist for each standing committee in addition to other authorized professional staff.

3. An annual report on review activities by each standing committee.

4. Provision for committee hearings on major reports required of the Executive.

*Conference committee procedures should be modified to provide that—*

1. Senate conferees should prepare an explanatory statement in connection with the conference report.

2. The minority should have the right to half the allotted time in floor debate on the conference report.

*Fiscal controls should be strengthened by—*

1. The use of automatic data processing of budget information.

2. Reorganization of the General Accounting Office of participate in the establishment of a standard classification code of activities and expenditures, to assist in locating budget information, to provide expert assistance in the analysis of cost-effectiveness studies, and to prepare tabulations of budget data.

3. Improvement of the budget document to include multiple-year financial projections for ongoing programs, better descriptions of carryover balances, updating of budget summaries on June 1, and more detail on financial assumptions underlying the budget totals.

4. Requiring an appearance before the full Appropriations Committee of each House of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers within 30 days after the submission of the budget.

5. Modifying the appropriations process to include examination of multiagency programs, open hearings (except in national security matters), yea and nay votes on all appropriations bills, and more comprehensive reports on supplemental and deficiency bills.

6. Requiring more uniform distribution of GAO audits and reports, and reference to those reports in agency budget justifications.

7. Greater participation by the legislative committees through a projection of costs on new legislation in committee reports, review of fixed obligation and grant-in-aid programs, and authorization of programs in such a manner that they will be subject to annual appropriations review.

*Office staff and allowances should be improved by—*

1. Creating the position of legislative assistant for each Member.

2. Increasing the maximum allowable salary for one position on the House Member's office staff without increase in the total clerk-hire allowance.

3. Increasing the transportation allowances available to Members and Members' staffs.

4. Studying the feasibility of a Capitol-wide leased-line telephone service and consolidation of present telephone and telegraph allowances under the unit system.

*The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress should be strengthened by—*

1. Redesignation of the Service as the Legislative Research Service.

2. Creation of a new reference division to handle routine reference inquiries.

3. Authorization to employ outside consultants and research organizations on a temporary basis.

4. Better liaison between the Service and committees of Congress.

5. Provisions for closer supervision of the Service by the Joint Committee on the Library through approval of the Director of the Service by the Joint Committee, an annual report by the Service to the Joint Committee and provision for a review specialist on the Joint Committee to oversee the Service.

6. Abolition of the Office of Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives and the transfer of its functions to the Service.

*The* CONGRESSIONAL RECORD *should be improved by recommendations to the Joint Committee on Printing to—*

1. Limit the body of the RECORD to germane insertions and verbatim remarks actually delivered, with provision for special time periods during which insertions will be permitted.

2. Print nongermane debate separately in the body of the RECORD.

3. Utilize modern printing techniques for greater readability and more frequent indexing.

*A Joint Committee on Congressional Operations should be established to—*

1. Conduct a continuing study of the organization and operations of the Congress.

2. Study and recommend the use of automatic data processing for congressional purposes.

3. Absorb the functions of the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers.

4. Identify court proceedings and actions affecting Congress as an institution and provide for appropriate legal representation.

5. Consolidate functions lending themselves to central supervision.

*To deal with the problem of ethics, the House of Representatives shall—*

Create a Committee on Standards and Conduct similar to the Senate Committee on Standards and Conduct.

*Capitol housekeeping functions should be improved by—*

1. Providing greater authority for the elected officers of each House to supervise the activities of Capitol employees under their jurisdiction.

2. Creating a professional Capitol Police force operating as a division of the Metropolitan Police Department.

3. Creating an Office of Personnel and Office Management to assist Members and committees in filling job vacancies and to render assistance on office management practices.

4. Limiting the appointment of pages to persons who have completed high school.

5. Placing the Capitol Guide Service under the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

6. Repealing the House Classification Act.

*The Lobbying Regulation Act should be strengthened by—*

1. Broadening its scope to require registration by individuals and organizations who solicit or receive funds and have influencing of legislation as a "substantial purpose."

2. A requirement for a more complete disclosure of expenditures for influencing legislation.

3. Transfer of the responsibility for the maintenance and publication of lobby registration records to the General Accounting Office.

4. Stringent requirements for disclosure of arrangements for contingent fees for purposes of influencing legislation.

*Scheduling of the business of Congress should be improved by—*

1. Scheduling committee and floor business on a 5-day workweek.

2. Requiring a majority rollcall vote in each House to extend the session beyond July 31.

3. Providing for no session in August except in time of war.

*Appointment and confirmation of postmasters and recommendation of rural carriers should be by the Post Office Department with no congressional participation.*

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a statement I issued today in connection with the release of the report disclosing the recommendations made by our Joint House-Senate Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress.

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

There are numerous recommendations in the Joint Committee's report which, if adopted by the Congress, will lead to substantial improvement in Congressional procedures.

I invite special attention to the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. From the long-range point of view, this new departure may well prove to be the most fundamental item in the report. It will assure continuous scrutiny of Congressional procedures and it will initiate the use of electronic data processing for use of the Congress. Even more basic, it creates, for the first time in history, a central agency in the Congress to identify vital issues affecting the Congress and strengthen it as an institution.

I do feel, however, that the report does not delve very deeply into the vital question of preserving the traditional check and balance system of our government. Everyone knows that the Executive Branch increasingly has encroached upon the powers of the Congress. We might well have created a mechanism which would help assure a better check and balance system. I believe we should have looked more closely at proposals which would have provided a sort of watchdog committee on procedures and policies of the Executive Department which would be chaired in each House by Members of the minority party. This would give greater assurance that partisanship would not prevent or modify complete scrutiny by the Congress of the executive branch, especially when both Houses of the Congress, as well as the Executive, are controlled by the majority party. Surely it would give far greater assurance that the public would be given the full truth in matters such as the Bobby Baker scandal. This is a parliamentary tool which the British have found to be very effective through the operation of what they call "The Committee of Public Accounts" which is controlled by the minority.

I hasten to add I believe a number of recommendations in the report do represent good progress toward improving the position of the minority. Although much reliance still reposes in the chairman of the committee, we did provide a completely new position for each committee which we call a "Review Specialist." This position will be filled by the chairman with the approval of the ranking minority member of each committee. The Review Specialist must make

an Annual Written Report to both the majority and the minority. His activities will be jointly supervised by the chairman and ranking minority member of each committee of Congress. This is a new concept which should greatly strengthen all the committees in overseeing administration by the executive branch of the laws under jurisdiction of the respective committees. Also specific provision has been made, where the minority Members so request, for two professional staff positions on each committee. While many of the committees already have provided minority staff personnel, this measure would at least assure, as a matter of right, that the minority is entitled to professional staff assistance.

When the full printed report is available, I commend its careful study not only to members of the news media, but to all students of government. It is an important document and merits careful study by everyone. It contains many recommendations for strengthening Congress as an institution and for improving its procedures.

I am especially pleased the Joint Committee unanimously approved my motion to set up a new and separate Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs.

The Members of Congress making this eighteen month study and approving unanimously its recommendations are as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

*Senate*

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Oklahoma, *Cochairman.*
JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama.
LEE METCALF, Montana.
KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota
CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey.
J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware.

*House*

RAY J. MADDEN, Indiana, *Cochairman.*
JACK BROOKS, Texas.
KEN HECHLER, West Virginia.
THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri.
DURWARD G. HALL, Missouri.
JAMES C. CLEVELAND, New Hampshire.[1]
W. DeVier Pierson, *Chief Counsel.*
George Meader, *Associate Counsel.*
Melvin W. Sneed, *Staff Assistant.*
Nicholas A. Masters, *Research Consultant.*[2]

## X-RAYS AND NUCLEAR MEDICINE: BENEFITS AND RISKS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on June 23 I spoke to the Senate on the subject of the radioactive contamination of some American rivers by uranium mill tailings.

The purpose of my talk was a simple one. It was to draw attention to the ever increasing hazards to man and his surroundings caused by the ever increasing amounts of radiation man is releasing into his environment.

I want every Senator, and every American, to be aware of these hazards.

I want every Senator and every American to be aware of the inadequacies in the efforts our Government is making to meet the challenge presented by these hazards. I believe it is important these efforts be improved.

As a first step, I look for the full implementation of the recommendations contained in the report to the Surgeon General prepared by the National Advisory Committee on Radiation in April of this year. This respected, professional Advisory Committee recommends that the number of radiologists, radiological scientists and radiological technicians be substantially increased; that Federal regulation and control over radioactive materials and X-ray equipment—now almost nonexistent—be strengthened and that the Public Health Service play a greater role in the appraisals of health risks associated with nuclear facilities and laboratories. These recommendations are sober and modest. They are the result of a quiet appraisal of a serious problem. If the recommendations have not received the public attention they deserve it is because the committee has been determined to avoid sensationalism and irrational reactions of fear or panic from the public.

I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations of the committee may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

RESTATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In this report the National Advisory Committee on Radiation has made a number of recommendations which it hopes may be helpful to the Surgeon General in meeting the responsibilities of the Public Health Service in the radiological sciences. For convenience, these recommendations are summarized as follows:

1. The Public Health Service should take immediate steps to strengthen its programs in the radiological sciences by unifying their administrative direction. Such action is needed to assure an orderly development of the broad spectrum of radiological activities for which the Service is responsible and to give continuous attention to the balance of benefit and risk in all matters pertaining to the human application of ionizing radiation.

2. The Service should undertake the following training and research and development programs to upgrade the quality of the radiological services which have become such a critical part of medical and dental care and to improve radiation protection practices in the health professions:

(a) a series of training programs: (i) to strengthen radiological instruction of medical students; (ii) to increase the number of academic radiologists in American medical schools; and (iii) to increase the number of practicing radiologists in the United States.

(b) a series of training programs to provide increasing numbers of radiochemists, radiological engineers, radiobiologists, radiological physicists and radiological health specialists.

(c) a series of training programs to provide increasing numbers of technologists in the several disciplines of the radiological sciences.

(d) a series of applied research and revelopment programs to increase the effectiveness and safety with which radiological procedures are employed in the health professions.

(e) a series of programs to provide training and research facilities for academic departments of radiology in American medical schools.

3. The Service should take the initiative in the formulation and promulgation of (a) standards dealing with the qualifications of personnel who operate X-ray equipment or who use radioactive materials not regulated by the Atomic Energy Commission; (b) design standards for sources containing radium and other radioactive materials that are not reactor byproducts; and (c) standards for the premarketing clearance of X-ray equipment used in the health professions and in industry.

4. The Service should take appropriate action to assure that official health agencies play an increasingly prominent role in the appraisal of the health risks associated with the construction and operation of major nuclear facilities.

5. The Service should take immediate steps to strengthen its laboratory and statistical resources in the radiological sciences. These resources are essential components of the PHS effort to meet the Surgeon General's responsibilities to the nation.

6. If needed, appropriate legislative authority should be sought at the earliest possible time to carry out the foregoing recommendations.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, if these recommendations are to be adopted, if this report is to be approved the Congress must be made aware of the extent of the problems. That was my purpose on June 23 when I spoke on river contamination, that is my purpose today when I speak on X-rays. That will be my purpose in the days ahead when I speak on fallout. Only by drawing public attention to the hazards will it be possible to obtain the preventative measures necessary to safeguard the public from unnecessary or excessive exposure to radiation.

I do not want to be an alarmist. I do not want to arouse fears or panic. I do not want to deal in sensationalism or exaggeration. But I do want the public to be aware of the extent of the problem and the rising need for Federal solutions.

Today I speak of X-ray machines and fluoroscopes. The benefits of diagnostic and therapeutic X-ray treatment are many and well known. A great many lives have been saved because of X-rays. A great many lives have been prolonged. Needless operations have been averted. Advanced cases of carcinoma have been stayed. Without doubt, mankind is much better off as a result of the discovery of the X-ray.

The discovery of the X-ray dates back but 70 years. So widely recognized have been the benefits of X-rays that now, today, more than half our population each year is X-rayed or administered radioactive materials during the treatment of disease. The new and promising field of nuclear medicine is expanding rapidly and the number of patients examined by these procedures doubles every 3 to 5 years.

Although the use of X-rays and nuclear medicines continues to grow, there has been no commensurate expansion of registration of machines and surveillance of equipment. Some States maintain careful registration and licensing procedures for X-ray equipment. Some States provide for a systematic and regular inspection of this equipment. More than half the States, however, have little or no supervision.

[1] Appointed on May 18, 1966, to succeed Robert P. Griffin, of Michigan, who resigned to accept appointment to the U.S. Senate.

[2] Walter Kravitz of the Legislative Reference Service assisted the Joint Committee staff.

Regulations, licensing, and supervision take a technical competence that some State departments of health do not have. Licensing and adequate inspections take time and money with which many States are loathe to part.

The Federal Government which has subsidized the development of many of these nuclear medical techniques has not—to any real, responsible, or adequate degree—assisted the States in shouldering these burdens.

Why is it important to have Federal control over the use of X-rays, fluoroscopes, and over the construction of X-ray equipment for medicine and dentistry?

Let the Senate think about the following facts. They are taken from reputable articles in reputable professional publications. I will not burden the RECORD with the full bibliographic citations. I have them on file and I will make them available to any who seek them.

In the first years of the development of X-ray machines over 100 radiologists died of skin cancer brought on as a result of exposure to X-rays.

It has been estimated that in past years radiologists have experienced incidences of leukemia 10 times greater than the general population. It is believed this leukemia was the result of exposure to X-rays.

A study made in 1963 indicated that as a result of exposure—often unnecessarily large exposure—to X-rays the life expectancy of U.S. radiologists has been statistically shortened.

In a study, conducted in 1962, of the case histories of 700,000 children born in hospitals in the U.S. Northeast results indicated that the incidence of cancer was about 40 percent higher in children who had received X-ray exposure in utero than in non-X-rayed children.

In a similar English study conducted during the years 1953 to 1965 information was collected on 677 children under 10 years of age who had died of malignancies. The mothers of these children reported receiving diagnostic X-rays during their pregnancies twice as frequently as mothers of normal children. Children exposed in utero to X-rays, according to this report, are about twice as likely to die of cancer before the age of 10 as are other children.

It is thought that a direct relation between exposure to radiation and leukemia can be detected in doses as low as 2 to 10 roentgens. The usual exposure received from a chest X-ray is not much more than 15 milliroentgens. This implies, however, that the X-ray machine is in good shape. If it is not, exposures can easily increase substantially, by multiples of tens and even hundreds, without the operator being aware. The average exposure during fluoroscopy exceeds 10 roentgens per minute.

The calculation of the total genetic and somatic damage from X-ray exposure of large populations is largely a matter of informed guesswork.

It is incontrovertible that some damage is caused by X-ray exposure. It is incontrovertible that this damage includes shortening of life, cell damage and genetic mutation. The difficulty comes in estimating how much harm is caused. An article in the American Journal of Public Health in January of 1964 by Hermann J. Muller, Ph. D., a study financed by the AEC, makes some ballpark estimates.

It is thought that the average American receives approximately 3 roentgens from medical sources over a 30-year period. This constitutes about half the total exposure received from all radiation sources—natural and manmade—and about 90 percent of all manmade radiation exposure. A conservative estimate holds that a man's life is reduced by 2¼ days for every roentgen received after his postnatal life. There are 80 million people in the reproductive portion of the U.S. population. By straight mathematical calculation using a 70-year lifetime, 21,180 lifetimes are lost by an average 3-roentgen exposure to our population.

The above figure by no means indicates that 20,000 people have been killed by X-rays. It indicates that the equivalent of 20,000 lives have been lost this generation. It indicates also the great power of this important medical tool which, like all tools, is dangerous if improperly used.

It is more difficult to calculate hereditary damage to large populations. The extent of the damage depends upon many variable factors. These include not only the amount of radiation but the length of radiation exposure as well as the time period over which it is applied.

Dr. Muller has estimated that the present level of exposure being received by Americans of reproductive age would result in one mutated gene for every 400 babies born. This works out to 200,000 babies with a newly mutated gene for every 80 million babies born. This is, says Dr. Muller, "a modest estimate." However, he adds, "of course only a small fraction of these 200,000 or more lethal equivalents cause genetic death in the first generation of offspring that receive them. The losses are spread out over centuries."

It is clear that X-ray machines are dangerous when improperly handled. Fluoroscope machines are even more dangerous. The average fluoroscopic examination exposes the patient to approximately 200 times more radiation than he would receive from an X-ray machine. This is if the machine is properly used. If it is improperly used the radiation exposure is even greater. Studies seem to indicate that the improper use of these machines is a common occurrence. Some doctors are careless about the length of time they leave a patient under the rays of the beam. Often as not the beam is turned on before the doctor's eyes are accustomed to the dark and the patient must wait under radiation until the doctor's eyes are adjusted to the darkness. In the dark the doctor may find it difficult to judge the passage of time. Further, the machine is often improperly shielded.

There is no reason why fluoroscopes should emit more than 10 roentgens per minute. The National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurement has specified that exposure should be as low as possible and shall not exceed 10 roentgens per minute. And, yet for example several years ago a survey in a southern county showed that of 189 fluoroscope machines tested 113 were found to emit more than 10 roentgens per minute. Twenty-five were delivering 20 roentgens per minute. In a survey taken in a western State, one fantastic machine was found to emit 65 roentgens per minute.

Fluoroscope machines are important to modern medicine. There is no reason why they cannot be used properly and there is every reason why in certain medical procedures they must be used.

On the other hand, there is no excuse for the unnecessary use of fluoroscopes. To guard against this the American Academy of Pediatrics has advised "against the installation of fluoroscopes in doctors' offices." And has stated flatly that "routine fluoroscopy of children, or fluoroscopy for demonstration to parents, is strongly condemned." Most reputable medical authorities have urged the use of fluoroscopes "only when there is a specific medical need not met by other diagnostic means, and taking very special care with infant children, pregnant women, and young adults."

Research into the effect of X-rays on large populations has been meager and inadequate but even what facts and figures are available indicate strongly that special care should be taken to see that machines are properly equipped and handled and that those handling them are properly trained in their use.

Is this special care being taken?

The answer is "No." The director of the office of radiation control for the health department of the city of New York in an article published in the December 1964, New England Journal of Medicine makes this clear. Professor Blatz states that "examinations are often done with insufficient clinical reason, and that many exposures are unnecessarily repeated." Professor Blatz says that the average dose to patients could be reduced by 50 percent overnight, by 75 percent or more within a month. But these reductions have not been made.

The persons conducting the survey in the southern county study left 118 written recommendations for eliminating the hazards which they found in their investigations of physician-owned X-ray and fluoroscope machines. A check made a year after the original survey was taken indicated that only 41 of these recommendations had been complied with.

Professor Blatz estimates that New York City physicians' compliance with written requests to improve their X-ray equipment as required by law in that State is only about 60 percent.

Persons continue to receive radiation from unproperly shielded machines, often unnecessarily. It is well known that shoe-fitting fluoroscopes are a source of

severe gonadal dosage of a totally unnecessary sort. And, yet only 32 States have banned their use. These machines are still in use in stores across the Nation.

Professor Blatz points out that 85 percent of all X-ray equipment is owned by physicians without formal training in radiology. The simple fact of the matter is that these physicians are "quite ignorant" says the professor, "of the many factors that contribute to patient dose and means for controlling it." He goes on, "many years of attempted professional education have been quite unsuccessful."

One of the most horrifying examples of this sort of thing is found in an article published in the June 16, 1966, issue of the New England Journal of Medicine. This article concerning medical ethics tells of a research project undertaken on newly born babies who were subjected to extensive and continuing X-ray exposure of the bladder and gonads. Such practices in the name of medicine are unspeakable. The author of the article, Dr. Henry K. Beecher, pointed out, in remarkable understatement:

> What the results of the extensive X-ray exposure may be, no one can yet say.

Obviously X-rays and fluoroscopic equipment are not now being properly regulated. This regulation has been left to the States. They are capable of providing proper protection but many are apparently unwilling to do so.

Only 37 States have any regulations governing X-ray protection. If a State program is to be effective it must have registration and licensing and active inspection programs to see that its regulations are enforced. The Public Health Service estimates there are over 113,000 X-ray machines in the United States and yet there are only 116 full-time people working on the X-ray licensing, regulating, and inspecting activities of the States. The States spend only $1,800,000 a year on their X-ray programs and this sum includes formula grants from the Public Health Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statistics on State efforts on X-ray protection prepared for me by the Public Health Service may be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Senators who have heard me out will understand why the eminent and respected National Advisory Committee on Radiation has recommended that the Federal Government take the lead in determining the qualifications of persons who use X-ray equipment or radioactive materials and in developing standards for X-ray equipment manufacturers and use. The Committee recommends the upgrading of all radiological services. We need better radiological instruction of medical students. We need to increase the number of academic radiologists. We need to increase the number of practicing radiologists.

The continued careless use of these machines must come to an end. This is an age of increasing radiological hazards. The number of nuclear power plants increases yearly. The amount of atomic waste products continues to grow. The French and Chinese continue their atmospheric testing. And, atomic fallout continues to fall. In the years ahead, it is as certain as certain can be that the radiation exposure burdens received by all men will grow.

I do not mean that we should be afraid. There is no cause to fear. There is cause to be alert. I pray the Senate, the Congress, the administration and the President will hear me in this call.

EXHIBIT 1

*Number of States having X-ray protection legislation and regulations[1] as of Dec. 31, 1965*

| | Total number of States[1] |
|---|---|
| Legislation: | |
| Total, enabling act | 38 |
| Therapeutic and industrial uses only | 1 |
| Total statutes | 25 |
| Registration only | 10 |
| General authority | 4 |
| Total regulations | 37 |
| Registration only | 5 |
| Therapeutic and industrial uses only | 1 |
| Both legislation and regulations | 36 |
| Nothing | 8 |

[1] Includes 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

*Expenditures for State X-ray programs*[1]

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

| Fiscal year | Amount | Percent of total | Percent over previous fiscal year |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1962 | $682.8 | 26.1 | |
| 1963 | 946.1 | 21.9 | 38.6 |
| 1964 | 1,381.5 | 25.9 | 46.0 |
| 1965 | 1,839.4 | 29.7 | 33.1 |

[1] Includes PHS formula grants.

*Number of people working in State X-ray programs*

| Fiscal year | Full time | Part time | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1962 | 54.0 | 20.1 | 74.1 |
| 1963 | 79.5 | 12.8 | 92.3 |
| 1964 | 100.2 | 18.4 | 118.6 |
| 1965 | 116.4 | 26.7 | [1] 143.1 |

[1] Fiscal year 1965 shows 93.1 per cent increase over fiscal year 1962.

*Medical X-ray program activities*[1]

| | Estimated number of units | Number registered (cumulative) | Fiscal year 1965 activities | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Number of units inspected | Number of units defective | Number corrected |
| Total | 113,806 | 88,635 | 25,174 | 11,001 | 7,713 |
| Number of States showing nothing | | 13 | 7 | 7 | 10 |

[1] Includes 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

*Laws and regulations governing use of shoe fitting fluoroscopes (Dec. 31, 1964)*

| | Registration required only | Banned | Nothing |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total number of States | 17 | 32 | 3 |

## FELIX GREENE: RED CHINA'S MAN IN AMERICA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, America plays host to a variety of citizens from many nations. We have within our shores nationals of more than 100 countries living here in various stages of permanency and engaged in a wide range of pursuits.

They are a unique element in our citizenry and most are assets to the United States. None, however, is more unique or less of an asset than an impeccably manicured British gentleman who lives in Palo Alto, Calif.

Not only is this Britisher, who has lived off our country for more than a quarter century, able to champion the causes of the People's Republic of China without registering as a foreign agent, he is able to travel between the United States and China in violation of our laws, slap the face of our Government in his travels, and have reentry permission handed him on a silver platter. And that is not the limit of his wiliness.

When he is through gathering his notes and remembrances from mainland China, he is able to regain his resident status; and he can get his American citizen wife into China without a properly validated American passport.

He is able to draw immense crowds of bright-eyed, eager students because he

represents himself as an objective lecturer and journalist.

This most clever man is Felix Greene, whose current claim to fame is as the producer-distributor of a film entitled "Felix Greene's China."

Greene was one of the first 86 persons to register in 1938 under the newly authenticated Foreign Agents Registration Act. He registered at that time as a BBC employee and hence an agent of Great Britain. Today, unregistered, he is a most articulate and persuasive advocate of the People's Republic of China.

The reason I am given for this by the Justice Department is that Mr. Greene has either avoided, or cleverly concealed, a contractual relationship between himself and the government he serves. It may be true that his ties to Peiping are more emotional than pecuniary, but the fact remains that his actions are in enthusiastic support of Communist China and her government.

Mr. Greene represents a new kind of China lobby quite unlike the small anti-Communist lobby of the 1940's which endeavored to tell Americans that Mao Tse-tung and company were not agrarian reformers. This new China lobby of the left works on Mao's side of the ideological fence. Mr. Greene, as an articulate, sincere-sounding, and persuasive advocate of the People's Republic of China, is the new China lobby's blue-chip asset.

In making these remarks, Mr. President, it is not my purpose to silence the clever Mr. Greene, only to label him.

Mr. Greene may say whatever he wishes to whomever will listen so long as he is properly identified and within the law. I wish Mr. Greene to be prohibited from speaking from the false platform of an objective, nonpartisan China watcher, because he is anything but nonpartisan. He is an advocate, and a most persuasive and articulate one, for the rapacious regime which governs mainland China.

It is not surprising that in his role Mr. Greene has sought to avoid compliance with the Foreign Agents Registration Act. His lectures draw substantial audiences, his manuscripts appeal to major publishers, and his propaganda is freely distributed in this country, all because he has escaped the onus of registration.

Eager for what they think are objective reports from mainland China, the American people accept Mr. Greene at face value because after all, the Government, which has been his host and which he has abused so egregiously for the past decade, has not suggested to the people that Mr. Greene is anything other than what he purports to be.

Before I go more fully into Mr. Greene's activities, I should point out that he has been a resident of the United States since about 1940. He travels on a British passport and has been granted permanent resident status—several times—by the Department of State. So that he will be properly backgrounded, I ask that at this juncture of my remarks a brief résumé, prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
*Washington, D.C., April 20, 1966.*

To: Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON.
Attention: Mr. Baldwin.
From: Foreign Affairs Division.
Subject: Background Data on Mr. Felix Greene.

Mr. Greene was born May 21, 1909 in Berkhamsted, England of Edward and Eva (Stutzer) Greene. He is the cousin of the celebrated author, Graham Greene (Brighton Rock, End of the Affair, The Quiet American, etc.). He married Elena Lindeman and the marriage produced a daughter, Anne. Mr. Greene graduated from the Sidcot School but terminated his university level studies at Cambridge after two years.

Between 1931 and 1933, Mr. Greene was employed as a political worker with the Prime Minister's office in London; from 1932 to 1940 he served as a "senior official" with the British Broadcasting Corporation in London and New York. Since that time has been variously employed in the United States: he has been an importer, a free-lance radio and television commentator, a photographer for McGraw-Hill Book Company, and a traveling lecturer on international affairs. Mr. Greene travels extensively on a British passport, having toured South America as a representative of B.B.C., gone round the world twice in the employ of British Commonwealth radio organizations, visited mainland China thrice (1957, 1960–61 and 1963). Mr. Greene obtained the first television interview ever given in Communist China by Chou En-lai (1961) and conducted a controversial interview with Ho Chi Minh in Hanoi in late 1965 (text in Washington Post, Dec. 14, 1965).

On his last trip to Communist China, Mr. Greene made a movie, predictably entitled "China"; during the past two years, Mr. Greene has travelled broadly in the United States showing his movie and lecturing on U.S. policy toward China. The film has been shown in most of the cities of this nation and has, without fail, caused controversy due to what might be termed "a somewhat left-of-center interpretation" of the occurrences on the mainland since 1949. Understandably, Mr. Greene has been associated with the recent "peace movement."

Mr. Greene's publications include: "Awakened China; The Country Americans Don't Know" (Doubleday, 1961, 425 p.): "A Curtain of Ignorance: How the American Public Has Been Misinformed About China" (Doubleday, 1964, 340 p.); "Let there be a World" (Fulton Publishing Co., Palo Alto, 1963, 63 p.) (a tract on nuclear arms).

Mr. Greene also edited "Time to Spare; What Unemployment Means by Eleven Unemployed" (1935).

He is a member of: The Press and Union League Club (San Francisco), Royal Societies Club, Royal Institute of International Affairs and P.E.N. (all headquartered in London).

Mr. Greene's home and office is at 1765 Fulton St., Palo Alto, California. His literary agent is Brandt and Brandt, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.; the agent handling his lecture program is W. Colston Leigh, 521 5th Avenue, New York. N.Y.

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask also, Mr. President, that other related editorials, to which I shall allude, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks—including the translation of an article by French journalist, Jules Roy, which paints a starkly vivid picture of the so-called new China.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. As noted in Mr. Greene's biography—which, incidentally, contains an omission of one in the number of trips he has made to China—he has written two full-length books on China, both of which were published by Doubleday. His books and other writings are their own testimony to the author's purpose and allegiances as is the motion picture "China," which tells graphically of the producer's affinity to Communist China.

Let's look at the reviews of Mr. Greene's books. With hardly any exceptions, they are ecstatic in leftwing publications and sharply critical in all others.

GREENE'S PROPAGANDA

The Saturday Review of August 22, 1964, writing of "A Curtain of Ignorance," calls it "the second book—Greene—has written in an effort to achieve" the purpose of convincing Americans "that they are completely wrong in their view of Communist China." Further on in the same review, writer John N. Ellison notes:

> The book is so one sided and the author commits so many of the crimes of omission, partial quotation, and complete dependence on official statements and government statistics that he charges others with, that one is tempted to dismiss everything he says as arrant propaganda.

In a more recent review of "A Curtain of Ignorance," Mr. George E. Taylor notes in "Problems of Communism" for May–June 1966 that—

> Mr. Greene also tells us—not surprisingly—that it was the Communist armies which took the initiative against the Japanese invaders, while Chiang Kai-shek was more concerned with protecting himself against the Communists. This is actually nothing but a Communist-inspired myth which even Mao has corrected.

Mr. Greene would also have us believe, according to reviewer Taylor, that "the Soviet standard of living will be the highest in the world within the lifetime of our children," and that "the historical role of communism is to provide the most effective way for backward countries to become industrialized, and if this means the establishment of a self-perpetuating party and a bureaucratic state, we have only to wait for the healing influence of time to turn it into a democracy."

Reviewer Taylor notes in addition that—

> It is strange to have an Englishman writing a book on American policy and meaning Americans when he says "we." It is even stranger to have him claim that the United States of America is ignorant about China when it publishes more news, more translations of Chinese Communist materials, more scholarly books and articles on that country than all of western Europe.

I might add that Mr. Taylor gave his review of "A Curtain of Ignorance" a title which mirrored his opinion of Mr. Greene's book. He called it "A Curtain of Distortion."

The Los Angeles Herald-Express, in a review December 18, 1961, calls Greene's "Awakened China.":

> A piece of propaganda which in no manner reflects facts of strife and hunger and failing industrialization which are known to the western world. No intelligent reader would

swallow Greene's assertion that he was "unbiased" in his report. One needs only look at the book itself which denounces Nationalist China and goes page after page into what he calls "the Chinese case—an apology for Communist China."

But a far rosier review came from the left. The Worker of July 31, 1962, calls the book:

The most authoritative and heart-warming account of a great nation's emergence into the new world of socialism.

Says the Worker of Mr. Greene's literary output:

A rare combination of excellent reporting—objective yet human—a thoroughly enjoyable style of writing, and a full appreciation of the human miracle being wrought in the building of socialism in China . . .

Lucid and graphic accounts of what he wants audiences to believe about Red China constitute the lecture feature of the Felix Greene propaganda potpourri. Those to whom he has spoken attest to the effectiveness and drama of the Greene oratory. That oratory varies little from the naked propaganda of his books and motion picture.

Mr. Greene's most recent and spectacular contribution to the interests of the People's Republic of China is his motion picture "China." This 65-minute color film, which, I am informed, is being promoted for showing in our public schools in the not-too-distant future, is an unqualified success, technically and in the propaganda field. It has drawn substantial audiences in Washington, New York, and a score of other cities.

Mr. Greene has told critics of his film and his conduct that he went to China in 1963 under contract with the Associated Television Co. of London to produce a television film on China. This may be true as far as it goes because he did provide documentaries for the British firm. But the full story is that he was not on contract to produce a specific film entitled "China." This he did on his own, with Peiping's help, and British Television has no share in or of the production. The film "China" is a creature of Felix Greene and Peiping, and the producer was not underwritten by British Television.

The Department of State has acknowledged that Mr. Greene took his raw, unedited film to them in an attempt to reap a gigantic profit by peddling it as intelligence material. After screening some of it, the Department and intelligence sources agreed that it was so lacking in objectivity that it had no intelligence value. Mr. Greene was simply trying to make a profit off the Government that he had slapped down in making his trip to the Orient—a "double whammy" for the People's Republic.

But Felix Greene still made money—good old American greenbacks—from his propaganda activities, as evidenced by this press release from his New York City publicist:

"China," the documentary film report on Communist China, has grossed $13,500 from the second week of its premier engagement at the Carnegie Hall Cinema, it was announced today by Felix Greene, the producer of the film.

I should add that Mr. Greene gives credit in his film to the official China Film Corp. of Peiping for its cooperation. There is also reference to the Chinese photographer, Hsu Chih-Chiang, who shot many of the scenes and, of course, whose cooperation was approved by Peiping.

As to the 15,000 miles Mr. Greene professes to have traveled in photographing the Chinese people and landscape, Variety, in a review of "China," points out:

Although he says that he has traveled over most of China, most of the film deals with two cities, Shanghai and Peking, both with heavy political overtones. The few rural and village shots could have been immediately outside either city.

Felix Greene's "China," like Felix Greene's books, drew reviews along typically predictable lines. A column in the San Francisco Examiner notes that the movie is "good professional propaganda fare," while the Worker of June 8, 1965, points out:

Old China is shown in black and white, its people starving, ravaged by the western powers * * * the momentum of advance permeates the entire film.

Felix Greene wrote a short piece for a recent issue of Ramparts in which he said that when traveling through China "you will be amazed how much communication is possible. And above all—listen. Listen to what China and her people are telling you."

That would be a good trick for Mr. Greene because he would have to overcome his own private, cut-to-order "Curtain of Ignorance." Anyone, including Felix Greene, can "listen" to Chinese, but few westerners, including Mr. Greene, can understand it. By his own admission, he does not speak Chinese in any of its dialects, nor does he read or write it. Official interpreters provided for the Britisher by the People's Republic of China related in their own phraseology "what China and her people" were telling him.

Mr. Greene has written also that he knows something of the bloodshed that preceded the Communist takeover of China. It would be extremely unlikely that he would know much of this subject, however, because his first trip to China was in 1957. He returned there again in 1960 and 1963, and we now know that without fanfare he slipped back into China last year in the course of a propaganda sojourn to North Vietnam. There is no record of Mr. Greene ever having been in China for a firsthand perusal of that country prior to its takeover by today's Communist dictators.

THE LAW AND MR. GREENE

The Justice Department, while admitting that it deplores Mr. Greene's conduct while a guest of the United States, asserts that it cannot prosecute him as a foreign agent because there is no proof of contractual relationship.

In my judgment, the "contractual relationship" misses the entire point of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. A man with an emotional commitment to a cause will wax no less eloquently on its behalf than will a mercenary.

Few of history's luminaries have committed themselves to a crusade because of its attractive dollar value. I doubt both that Mr. Greene carries about in his breast pocket a contract from Peiping, or that such a contract would materially affect the quality or quantity of his propaganda.

It is worth recalling that Mr. Greene has ridden the tail of the dragon to considerable affluence simply by the commercial aspects of his campaign. He admits that his Peiping popularity film grossed $13,500 in the second week of its showing; and at a minimum of $500 per lecture, the globetrotting Britisher has certainly been able to keep the wolf from his door.

Felix Greene can write on behalf of the People's Republic of China, he can produce films on behalf of the People's Republic of China, he can deliver speeches on behalf of the People's Republic, and he can exploit the public airways for radio broadcasts on behalf of the People's Republic. But because the Justice Department cannot produce a contract between Mr. Greene and Peiping, the Britisher is apparently beyond the scope of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, which has been just recently amended.

It is perhaps to the credit of the Department of Justice that Mr. Greene has been investigated at some length and that the Department at least finds his activities worthy of "dislike."

In addition to the visible evidence of his unstinting devotion to Peiping, Mr. Greene is an unusual man in other ways. He is fast on his feet. His is a fast man with a nationality change. He is a fast man with his wife's passport. And apparently he has some pretty fast allies in the American bureaucracy.

I call the Senate's attention to this most amazing sequence of events:

In August of 1963, Mr. Greene applied to the Department of State for permission to travel to Communist China. Permission was denied. And yet, 6 weeks later he was en route to China. How? By the simple expedient of informing the Immigration and Naturalization Service that "he" no longer considered himself a permanent resident of the United States.

He wrote the Service, turned in his alien registration card, and, with an unfettered British passport, embarked for mainland China by way of London.

After 4½ months of trekking through the People's Republic, Mr. Greene applied for reentry to the United States as a new immigrant. He was given a visa at the American Embassy in London on January 29, 1964, and reentered the United States at New York on February 6, 1964. Our Embassy in London could have refused him a visa but obviously chose not to do so.

Initial action to have kept Mr. Greene out of his sometimes country should have come from the State Department.

This was Mr. Greene's third trip to China, but not his last. Reports reaching Washington late in 1965 told startled officials that their jolly Greene traveler

was again in Communist China and again by way of England. This time he had a fellow traveler—his wife—who is an American citizen and who did not have a passport validated for travel in Red China. Greene had also been in North Vietnam.

This time, Greene did not even go to the trouble of abandoning his permanent resident status in the United States. He summarily and without fanfare went to Communist China, and despite the fact that he was in patent violation of American law, which makes such conduct a felony, he was again allowed back into the United States.

For reasons known only to the Department of State, Mr. Greene was given a visa by our Embassy in London on December 30, 1965. He reentered the United States at New York as a permanent resident on January 3, 1966. To assuage his trepidation in this moment of consternation, his wife dutifully filed a petition declaring him an immediate relative.

The State Department clamped down on the distaff side of the Greene team. Mrs. Greene's passport was withdrawn on March 17, 1966, and she will have a much more difficult time getting back into China. But even though Felix Greene is just as obviously in violation of law, no action has been taken against him.

I should point out in this regard, Mr. President, that for her illegal entry into a restricted country, Greene's wife could have been prosecuted under regulations which make a felony of her conduct. The State Department simply lifted her passport.

Mr. Greene is truly a most clever or fortunate man because the same agency of the Department of State which had denied him permission to travel to Communist China in August of 1963 turned around and approved his reentry into the United States only 4 months later and again 2 years later.

In fairness to the State Department, it should be noted that the agency which at first refused Greene's travel request and then on two occasions helped him get back into the United States was the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs headed at that time by Abba Schwartz. Mr. Schwartz is no longer with the State Department.

Now, Mr. President, a number of questions come immediately to mind in the matter of the clever Mr. Greene. The first is that our immigration laws, so recently amended, need to be further amended so that the privilege of living in the United States and enjoying the pecuniary and subsidiary benefits thereof cannot be prostituted to benefit a foreigner who is running a one-man political campaign for our country's enemies.

If the law allows Mr. Greene to arbitrarily renounce his permanent status, travel to China in violation of American regulations, and then come back and demand the same status that he had just surrendered, then that law ought to be changed.

Further, I would suggest that if the Foreign Agents Registration Act is so ambiguously drafted as to ignore a man whose attachments to a hostile foreign power might be more emotional than pecuniary, that law ought to be changed.

It can perhaps be argued that Mr. Greene is not under contract to Communist China, that he has enjoyed no direct financial gain from his representation of Peiping in the United States, but there is no doubt that he has a strong emotional tie to the Asian government.

Mr. Greene's feet may be in Palo Alto, but his heart is in Peiping, and this makes him no less effective as a foreign agent.

I would suggest also that responsible public officials ought not to be so circumspect in discharging their responsibilities. There is sufficient legal and discretionary authority vested in the Department of State for officials to have twice denied Greene reentry into the United States.

If the State Department functionaries were afraid of having the free speech argument thrown at them, then they ought not to have been so timid. No one familiar with Felix Greene's utterances or writings could honestly assert that they represent journalism or literature in any form.

But the most important point of all this is the fact that Greene is presently in violation of American law in that his 1965 trip to China was made without the required withdrawal of his permanent resident status and without clearance from our Government. The law clearly provides that it is a felony for an unauthorized alien with permanent resident status to travel to a restricted area.

The Departments of State and Immigration acknowledge that Felix Greene was in two restricted areas—North Vietnam and China—in 1965; that he had not informed the country which had been his host for two and a half decades that he was going on such a trip; and that, in fact, he had not renounced his permanent resident status. This is a clear violation of Federal law—8 U.S.C. 1185—and Federal regulations—22 C.F.R. 46.2 and 46.3. It is a serious violation for which the Departments of State and Justice could and should initiate criminal proceedings against the jolly Greene traveler.

The State Department has claimed helplessness in stopping Mr. Greene's reentry into the United States because, as they see it, he does not fit any of 31 definitions of aliens "excluded from admission." These 31 points are spelled out in 8 U.S.C. 1128(a).

The language of subsection 27 of the above-mentioned citation is, in my judgment, both general enough and specific enough to have applied to a man who has violated American law in traveling to a restricted area and who is known to have a propensity for championing causes diametrically opposed to American interests. This subsection reads, and I quote:

> Aliens who the consular officer or the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe seek to enter the United States solely principally, or incidentally, to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest, or endanger the welfare, safety, or security of the United States shall be ineligible to receive visas and shall be excluded from admission into the United States

Certainly an analysis of Felix Greene's activities would indicate that they fit this language.

In addition, there is another matter involving the Treasury Department. Title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides that persons under the jurisdiction of the United States—and this includes Greene's resident status—shall have certain licenses before traveling to a restricted area. Neither Greene nor his wife had such licenses in 1965, although Treasury claims it would have issued them had they been requested. The fact is that they were neither requested nor issued and there is a violation of law in this regard. Greene did get an import license for film after his 1963 trip to Communist China.

The Departments with which Greene's travels were discussed warned that the arguments against Greene might be "rebuttable" because the Government could be called upon to establish that Greene's "primary purpose" in his trip was to go to China rather than England. As a lawyer, I find this logic to be ridiculous.

It is to say that if John X stops off at a drugstore en route to robbing a bank, he could not be prosecuted because the "primary purpose" of his trip was to visit the drugstore. The facts of the matter are that Greene went to China; that he had not surrendered his permanent resident status before traveling; and that this is a clear violation of Federal law.

In summation then, Mr. President, I make these points:

Felix Greene for the past decade has acted in the capacity of a foreign agent representing the People's Republic of China. That he is effective in that capacity, despite the lack of a "contractual relationship" between himself and Communist China, cannot be disputed.

Felix Greene willfully violated the intent of our laws in failing to secure in advance of his 1963 trip to China the necessary Treasury Department licenses to bring Communist Chinese film—a commodity—into the United States. He got such permission "after the fact."

Felix Greene has egregiously abused the Government that has allowed him to be a guest of the United States for more than 25 years. He has used his unique status and his British passport to confuse and confound American laws and policy.

And finally, Felix Greene is in patent violation of Federal laws and regulations which prohibit travel to a restricted country by an alien with permanent resident status in the United States. The law is clear in this matter, and the Departments of State and Justice ought to cooperate in initiating criminal prosecution proceedings.

Felix Greene has been a guest of the United States. That he has misused the courtesies extended to him by his sometimes country, there can be no doubt. That he has no inherent right to residency in the United States, there can be no doubt.

He has made no attempt to secure citizenship. He has been an alien leech in this country's jugular, proselytizing on behalf of our enemy, deprecating our policies, and inveighing against our objectives.

He has made countless statements advocating the supremacy of a Communist Chinese hegemony; apologizing for the rapacious excesses of the Peiping regime.

While our guest, he has been actively engaged in pursuits which has been detrimental to the interests of the United States. He has advocated and continues to advocate through lectures, motion pictures, books, radio broadcasts, and other means, the affirmative cause of a nation with which we have extremely hostile relations.

He is slapping down the Government and the country which has extended itself in residency to him. Were he to display comparable conduct as a private house guest, I am sure he would be booted into the street, and I think it is time this country took action to boot him back to Peiping.

EXHIBIT 1

A FRENCHMAN'S PERSONAL REACTION ON VISITING RED CHINA: LIES, DYNASTS, AND LOCKED ROOMS

(By Jules Roy)

(NOTE.—*"Having come to China in an ecstasy of love and admiration, I left bitter and frightened." The speaker is Jules Roy, the strongly opinionated French soldier-author whose latest book "The Battle for Dien Bien Phu" eclipses even his earlier fine work on Algeria. Roy's approach to China was, to say the least, open-minded. A former regular Army officer who resigned his colonelcy rather than continue to fight what he felt was an unjust war in Indochina, Roy went to China recently without any preconceived hostility to Mao's regime, prepared to praise Mao's accomplishments. His conclusions turned out differently, as this excerpt from his forthcoming book on China indicates. Although other political experts may differ with Roy's impressions of Mao's China, no one has thus far written about that state more brilliantly or intuitively.*)

There is no place to drop anchor off the continent that is majestically drawing near. Everywhere the cliffs drop straight down into the sea, forests cover the mountains. "Beyond the hundred rivers, beyond the thousand mountains . . ." But then another hundred rivers and thousand mountains succeed them in endless procession. In his feverish haste to set foot on the empire and pierce its mystery, the traveler fears he will never be able to get inside it. The plains are boundless, the villages all built of the same daub, the rice fields all turn green at the same time, the swine all devour the same roots, the people all carry the same heavy load.

The visitor senses that in the short time available to him he cannot hope to learn anything about this huge phenomenon wrought by the centuries out of almost unscalable peaks, deserts and a sea roiled by typhoons—as if nature wanted to crush the wretched creates that dared inhabit that part of the globe.

Nothing in China assumes the human proportions that enables us to separate truth from lies and sanity from insanity. To gain the upper hand, man has to hoist himself up to the level of cosmic revolutions and victories and win not only over men but over sun and waters, famine and injustice, by trading his own life for his children's.

The Chinese revolution is the refusal to continue serving former masters—a refusal kindled like fire in countless hearts, a refusal that was crushed, rekindled, crushed again and again rekindled into triumph. Oceans, rivers, daring deeds, revolts and plagues—all the words usually applied to China—take on the weight of century-old legend. In that land where nothing is small, disorder and the restoration of order, asceticism and cruelty assume the magnitude of their environment. It is impossible to keep from viewing everything in the same terms. Rivers carry hundreds of billions of tons of silt. Walls cut across a whole continent. The toll of any uprising reaches millions. A march counts only if it exceeds 10,000 kilometers. And when an emperor builds a garden, it is as large as an entire department in France. One million men is the unit of employment, two centuries the unit of time.

At the age of eighty, a learned man still prepares for examinations so he can learn a few thousand more words whose meaning changes with intonation, and every morning he practices his scales. A Westerner who has spent his whole life in China is barely able to get along without making too many mistakes. There is a temptation to abandon China to the swollen-headed scholars who watch over the temples of the Celestial Empire in Europe and devote their whole lives to deciphering poems and studying the customs, society and history. It is embarrrassing to disturb them by asking questions. . . .

Is it sinful to try translating their knowledge into plain language, in an attempt to understand how and why the prophets of Chinese Marxism-Leninism have merely followed in the imperial tradition of a state that oversees all things and all persons from birth to death? "Without the people's trust, government cannot exist," Confucius said twenty-five centuries ago to all who sought to harmonize relations between man and nature. After posthumous self-criticism, Chinese Marxism-Leninism will end up by building Confucius a mausoleum and taking him over.

Old China, the land of pleasant scepticism and tolerance, has already become the land of a faith which can no longer feed upon itself. Religious wars are impending. There is not a man in China who, in the name of Marxism-Leninism, whose banner is flying aloft, will hesitate to fling himself into the just war that Mao Tse-tung has been dreaming about for years, since the end of the Long March. Marshall Chen Yi tried to frighten me with this prospect.

No one is afraid—small children are being prepared for it and tens of millions of young militiamen and women are being trained. It has never been easy to make a soldier out of a Chinese, but now all of them are ready to die or to endure the worst hardships for the fatherland. No longer do they fear leaving their bones thousands of miles from their villages, for Marxism-Leninism has annihilated the ancestor cult and the tradition that sons must not die before their fathers.

The twenty pounds of written notes I accumulated in six months have not allayed my utter ignorance of China. I know hardly more today than when I arrived. . . . A plethora of novels, essays, statistics and philosophy has flooded my library. Professors, poets, diplomats, sailors, geographers, ethnologists and military men have been poring over the customs, language and origins of China, listening to her chest rise and fall in rhythm with history's tides: order and disorder alternating every two hundred years doom her to the heights of greatness or abysmal wretchedness. Certain death was their diagnosis. To read but a fraction of the material was enough to make one dizzy, but all those books were not worth one single look at China.

THE VIEW FROM CAR WINDOWS

Escorted by my mandarins, I wandered from hotel to hotel, city to city. We always had a private bathroom and each of our stops was highlighted by a banquet. We had heat when others were cold; I slept, ate and drank at the expense of the people who were pushing carts under our windows—somewhat hidden away, as was fitting, so that our eyes would not be hurt by their suffering or theirs by our ease. Above us, at unfathomable heights, U-2s and artificial satellites that we could not see were spying upon the Sinkiang deserts. We saw only avenues, squares, streets and the countryside framed by the sleeping car or plane windows; people bent under their load or waving branches of peach trees in bloom; columns of happy children who were being taught to hate imperialism.

A few witnesses of past social struggles and wars of liberation were brought to recite their lesson to me. A once-humiliated people, at last standing erect, had just shaken the atmosphere with its first nuclear explosion. These grains of sand that can slip through one's fingers had turned into concrete; the steel of the Party had reinforced them. It had taken 10 million men as proud and resolute as these to defeat the West at Dien Bien Phu.

Was there anything that the Chinese could not achieve with their valor and sheer mass? The figure of 750 million Chinese was already being mentioned; Chen Yi had spoken to me of 700 million, while a few days later Mao placed it at only 650. Anyway, within that range there is not much difference between 650 and 750 and they may be used interchangeably, depending on the impact sought by the speaker. It is estimated that the Chinese will reach the billion mark in 1980, 2 billion in 2000 and 5 billion in one hundred years if the frenzy of reproduction is not stemmed. My escort of mandarins kept telling me that plowing new lands would suffice to feed these multitudes, provided one took the long view in terms of space and time to be conquered. One century or two in the history of China, 100 or 200 million men more or less, who will notice the difference and who in China would be afraid of losing them? The time has now come when the blanket of men that covers China is threatening to engulf Siberia or Tibet, crushing any obstacle in its path.

I can already hear the snickering brought on by my clumsy image of the yellow peril. Which trap had I fallen into now, this imperialist wolf in a shepherd's cloak? I could not possibly have seen anything of China. This I shall not deny: I have seen almost nothing through the eyes of faith; the truth is that my erstwhile faith has forsaken me. I only know that, having come to China in a trance of love and admiration, I left bitter and frightened.

Is it my fault that the only pictures we were able to bring back were taken on the sly in the street or from car windows? Is it my fault that I was shown only museums, parks in bloom, lake shores and villages swept as clean as a barracks yard just before the colonel's inspection? I can still see that gloomy Sunday in Chungking when the head of the people's commune who was driving at the front of our motorcade on a muddy road roughly pushed an old peasant off the road and into a hut—a ragged old man on his way home with a bag of vegetables hung on a pole.

I would have been happy to glorify the crossing of the Tatu River and the flight in a military plane over the snowy foothills climbed by the remnants of Mao Tse-tung's and Chu Teh's legion. Is it my fault that I was asked to avoid questioning any official I might meet about the past? Is it my fault

that most of the conversation consisted of platitudes? That they tried to bring tears to my eyes over the prospect of future friendship between our two nations? That they were happy only when they knew we were locked in our rooms or on night trains, our cameras safely tucked away?

In point of fact, they treated us as if they feared we would discover something. I would have understood some initial distrust. Yet my reputation—an assumed one, in all likelihood—as a man of the Left had helped with the Chinese Embassy in Paris. To reach Peking, however, a reputation has to travel not only 15,000 kilometers but also 10,000 light-years through empty skies. China has not kept up with the evolution of ideas in the West since Montesquieu and Anatole France, and for the past fifteen years Mr. Karl Marx has been studied in the universities instead of literature. If they hurry a little, they may get to Gide, Shaw and Thomas Mann by the year 2000, but to Faulkner the imperialist—never.

In the Middle Empire they sneer at the West's opinion, and it took a few painful failures before any thought was given to copying its production methods. Mao Tse-tung's works stretch around the library shelves of a new Great Wall, while one of the most intelligent peoples on earth is becoming the stupidest. It is a Socialist brand of stupidity, pleased with itself, its statistics and its self-criticism that merely humiliates the individual the better to extol the system. As for me, I was only a writer—in other words, to the Chinese who recognize only those who adhere to their regime, no better than a valet. That I should have the conceit or the naïveté to undertake to write the epic of the Chinese revolution was only the quirk of a barbarian from the distant seas. The emperors used to rewrite history as they saw fit with the help of their court of archivists and scholars. Mao Tse-tung, Chiang Kai-shek and their cliques are no different. Little do they care about books published in London or Berlin: they will never be read in China. If need be, they can write books themselves. China is enough for them. Not for us.

MUSEUMS AND ARMOR

My request for documents different from those preserved in museum cases was not the least cause of the storm I aroused. Had I been honest, I would have been content with what I was offered. What was in the museums was being offered to the people, and the people is the repository of the highest thought in the nation. I happen to distrust museums, just as I distrust institutions, the powers that be, the establishment, the apparatus of justice and of the State, and everything that rests on the power structure or depends on its good will. In the West we know that truth is not told when it displeases governments; it must be dug out of closed stacks in libraries and attics of witnesses. As to the rule that prescribes fifty years of seclusion for files on contemporary history, the good thing about democracy is that it allows writers to flaunt it. But in China, no one would dream of divulging state secrets unless the policy makers themselves did it for reasons of their own.

What was I to do? I knew that nobody would dare express a thought that did not fit in with the official truth, without being prepared to spend the rest of his life in a people's commune; in any case, there would be neither publisher to publish nor readers to buy any opinions not approved by the regime. It was tempting to say: "What does it matter? I shall make do with the museums." Was I going then to rehash the state doctrines, extol the state truths, write about the Long March and Mao's life solely on the basis of books published by the State?

In their naïveté, the Chinese expected us to recognize that China is the land of the heroes and the melting pot where junk, legend, epic and blood turn into gold. They could not understand my need to poke my nose into their brew to find out how the gold was being made. I was expected to settle down, to echo the ladies and gentlemen who had come from France in recent years and were saying that the wind from China was about to turn the world upside down and nothing counted any longer in the face of this cosmic mutation; we were becoming its servants, whether we wanted to or not, our minds were to be readied for the ways of the Chinese people's imperialism and our little European provinces for the Chinese armored divisions. In order, allegedly, to help the peoples free themselves from the West, I should have avoided incurring the displeasure of the Chinese lords who were preparing to pour their propagandists and military instructors all over the earth. I should have let myself be swindled to the accompaniment of the giant drumbeat of their atomic explosions. Well, I was not going to do it!

I admire the courage of the Chinese people. My heart overflows with love for the 700 million men and women who have taken up the challenge and are showing that they, as well as we, are capable of making steel, transistors and tractors, people who have conquered rivers, drought and famine. But I refuse to swallow their mandarins' lies. I was not going to participate in the cult of their emperor, for theirs is not my religion. The sight of so many busts, statues, portraits made me smile, as did the sound of the ecstatic speeches; but in the end I found them pitiable. Was I expected to take my hat off, speak in a whisper, walk on tiptoe, stiffen with awe as in a cathedral every time I entered a railroad station or a factory auditorium and came upon the colossus, his face glowing with health, power and serenity? Was joking allowed? Were people supposed to raise their teapots and drink to the emperor's health? We were somewhat stiff, while our escort of mandarins appeared neither less at ease nor craftier than usual, since by nature they do not behave naturally—save for my friend Tsai, who is unable to fake.

THE FORBIDDEN RIVERBOATS

Had the Chinese still been persecuted, invaded, scorned, had the Chinese people still been treated as dirt, thrashed by landlords, spat upon by foreigners or piled into the holds of slave ships, I would have risen to defend them and explain the causes of their rebellion. But it was no longer so; the Chinese people had won! They wanted to become the first power in the world. They no longer wasted their time baking china or carving jewelry. Instead, they were on the way to producing long-range rockets capable of destroying the United States. Every time the leaders asked for an extra hour of work for the building of the country, they were given 500 million hours and a new project came into being. China now inspired fear instead of pity.

Why should I have refrained from saying so? Because I was going to disappoint those who expected me to follow in the footsteps of the Long March fighters? Because I was going to displease the Chinese people? The Chinese people did not care one iota about me and were not going to read anything I wrote anyway. I was bored and politely said so. Moreover, I was stifling and also said so. Then they bared their teeth at me: I was no longer acting as a friend, I was peddling gossip; I was heeding the Soviet enemies who claimed that the opium trade was still going on in Yunan, and the imperialists who resented President Mao's Messiahship. I replied that they were free to expel me if they wanted to—I should be glad to go to Hong Kong; but since I cannot tell a lie, I do not like to be told lies either.

That was a mistake on my part. In China people do not "lie"—they "express their thoughts." They abhor the straight line. Truth is observed through a telescope, a goal is reached by way of a series of detours. All the Chinese are diplomats at birth. A friend is sounded out without ever being asked any of the brutal straightforward questions that betray low birth. If he seems in a bad mood, attempts are made to discover the reason.

Likewise, no person may ever be offended by being told that foreigners are not welcome on river boats because they might see too much of China's poverty or military might. Why shock or upset the honored guests? So a roundabout way is taken; the waters are rising, the boats are not comfortable enough or too slow, the travel arrangements were forgotten or the boat schedules no longer fit in with the program. If the barbarians are awkard enough to refuse to understand that they are not wanted on the boats, if they insist, or else agree to all the discomforts, the Chinese are thrown into confusion: a thousand tricks are devised to prove to the friends the depth of the concern felt about their health and happiness. Then, at wit's end, the Chinese avoid them, leaving them in the throes of bitter bewilderment. There is a word for loyalty—chung-chilh—but it is no more than the reflection of a shadow.

Is there a Chinese who does not believe he he owns and is serving truth? Yet his truth is sinuous and has nothing in common with ours. How could I claim that I meant to write the history of the revolution—I who trod elephant-like through museum cases? What could my views of the future be when I seemed so ill-informed about the past?

Confucius, who is still quoted on occasion, forecast the acts of future dynasties by studying those of defunct dynasties. What nefarious schemes were secreted under my frantic search for accurate dates? What use are details about persons when history belongs to the past and the aim is not to set it straight but to dam it up, like all of China's rivers so they may never again overflow their beds? If need be, texts were consulted or amended as many times as necessary in order to align the past with the present, as is being done for Mao Tse-tung, because the prophet may not be second to the theoretician.

I was the only one who was disturbed by this tampering with documents. It mattered very little to the Chinese that truth be adjusted when reality flows into it like a river into the sea. After all, the waters have blended. Who cares if their course has been altered by man? But I could see the heavy load of filth—of slime and silt that muddied the estuaries: I was still too near the shore.

"The Chinese know nothing about freedom," said Doctor Sun Yat-sen, father of the revolution, who remarked that the very word freedom was a recent import; he thought that the Chinese had too much of it at the time. His spirits may rejoice: freedom lives there no longer. Is an eel free to leave its companions when they gather in European waters before swimming to the Sargasso Sea? The concept of freedom has no more meaning for the Chinese than for the eel.

A Chinese gives his life, not in order to become a free man, but to do away with tyrants. A slave by calling, he wants to choose his master; after the coronation no one complains about the master's harshness, especially if he provides food and a dignity that the slaves never enjoyed before. The fact that no Chinese may invite his mother to stay at his house without informing the block chief is part of the rules which everyone willingly obeys for the sake of state security. No one dreams of protesting if a

neighbor suspected of being politically lukewarm is sent to a people's commune—to have his revolutionary spirit rekindled.

On what grounds would people demand greater rights when all they know of the West are Stalinist Russia and the specter of American imperialism? Who could set the Chinese right? They know only what they are told by the radio and the press. They do not ask questions of traveling foreigners, and when I happened to ask them some, what could they answer me in front of my escort of mandarins? At Peking University I tried to find out from students of French what they know about America and Europe: it was only the nonsense that is being drummed into them. They had but boundless pity for our obscurantism and despotism.

The Chinese believe that our working class is cowering under the landlord's lash. In China, where nobody has friends but only acquaintances always ready to denounce one another, I wondered whether a student ever dared confide any trace of a doubt. In private, most certainly not; in public, self-criticism is one of the rites of education. After the period of grace has elapsed, any recurrence entails the charge of revisionism. In this immense barracks where everybody lives in dormitories, it is impossible to see a person alone. There are no confessionals in China, only tribunals; and if penance is called for, it must be conducted in public.

In bygone days, anyone with a complaint was entitled to beat the large cymbal that hung in the inner courtyard of the tribunal, and the mandarin had to come out, day or night, to hear the plaintiff. In that old empire of injustice, there was a certain respect for justice. But the Manchus took over the judicial system to destroy the authority of the Chinese mandarins, and ordered whipping for all plaintiffs. The people's regime has reinstated that ancient imperial custom. Now no one, not even a minister, is safe from an indictment which inspires more fear than an indictment would here in France. The institution smacks of terror rather than of freedom.

---

[From the Worker, June 8, 1965]

CHINA COLORFULLY, VIVIDLY CAPTURED IN DOCUMENTARY BY FELIX GREENE

(NOTE.—"China!" A documentary film by Felix Greene. Written and produced by Felix Greene. Photographed in color by Felix Greene and Hsu Chi-chiang. Editor, Jim Jeremy, sound editor, Walter Storey, and narrator, Alexander Scourby.)

(By Doug Archer)

"China!"—the documentary now playing at the Carnegie Hall Cinema, was written, filmed and produced by the British photo journalist, Felix Greene. With Hsu Chi-chiang, a Chinese cameraman, Greene has photographed, in color and black and white, a fine film which focuses on China's great humanity, and leaves its politics alone. The result is, as Greene discloses in an introduction to the film, the discovery of a country quite different from the one we might expect.

With few restrictions, Greene traveled four months and 15,000 miles through the vast region of China, where snow swirls in Mongolia while spring is blooming in Canton. Greene spoke to workers, professionals, students, peasants, religious leaders of Buddhist, Moslem and Catholic faiths.

In splendid color, his camera catches the fervor of marching thousands celebrating the October revolution.

His camera cuts to the awesome natural beauty of the land, its blue mist covered mountains, jagged and craggy, exactly as artists of China's brilliant past depicted them. We see factories, farmers, students playing basketball, their favorite sport, and children singing, "We Shall Not Be Moved," in almost flawless English. We watch the Peking Opera. We see Yin Chen Tsang perform a Liszt piano concerto before an audience of 10,000. And we watch the ancient art of storytelling still packing theaters.

Old China is shown in black and white, its people starving, ravaged by the Western powers, invaded by the Japanese army and rent by civil war. Shanghai, a former colonialist playground, whose streets once sagged with death, pimps and beggars is now a flourishing industrialized port. Vice, opium and hunger have been eliminated, we learn from the narrator, Alexander Scourby. There is only one port, in Japan, where boats are loaded faster than they are in Shanghai.

This doesn't deter the Chinese intent, however, to leap into the modern world. We watch as full advantage is taken of its greatest asset, a man power pool of 700 million people. One fourth of the world's population.

We are awed by China's use of human power and organization, as we watch the citizens of the island town of Amoy build a causeway to connect them with the mainland.

Tons of rocks are dumped into the sea by the men and women of the town. For weeks and months young and old join in the effort. It is arduous work against the changing tides. With water rushing at 40 knots, the little boats are swept away before the rocks can be dumped.

An engineer solves the problem by wrapping the rocks into huge bales that are easily rolled from the boats in the seconds the current allows.

It is a breathtaking scene, characteristic of the Chinese people's effort for any improved life. The Chinese don't compare their conditions with conditions in the West but with what existed in China before, we are told. There are three large tractor plants in China now. They do not meet the needs of the entire country. But none were ever in existence before the revolution. China has more spindles than Britain but they too are not enough.

But machines tools are exported and there is a fast growing industry. Cameras, bicycles, violins, rifles and televisions are being produced. The hydraulic plants are Chinese made and supervised by youth.

Much of the old is still in evidence, however. The ancient arts of jade carving, wood block making and caligraphy are still being taught. There are still few roads. Canals and rivers take their place. And in many rural communities the peasants have never seen a car.

Another memorable scene presents a loudspeaker announcing that pests are ruining the crops.

"Everyone, to the field," the loudspeaker blares.

We see fleets of bikes flying from neighboring areas and even the army joins in the fight.

"Where other countries depend on machines, China depends on human power and organization," says the narrator.

"They have learned the necessity of communal effort."

But nevertheless the momentum of advance permeates the entire film. In an epilogue the commentator declares, "Despite problems and mistakes, the Chinese are united by a common purpose and great national pride. When China takes her place among the powers, will she contribute knowledge to enrich us all?"

He then suggests that the opposite is also possible. Quite so. But I think the answer is provided by the ordinary people in the film. Go and see for yourself.

[From the Worker, July 31, 1962]

NEW CHINA PORTRAYED WITH ELOQUENT REALISM

A rare combination of excellent reporting—objective yet human—a thoroughly enjoyable style of writing and a full appreciation of the human miracle being wrought in the building of socialism in China is the remarkable service rendered by Felix Greene to readers of his Awakened China.

Greene, a British citizen but longtime resident of the U.S. is one of the three reporters who has visited the Peoples Republic of China with the approval of the U.S. government in the last twelve years. He is the only one of the three who has been there twice.

Acknowledging that he took with him all the prevailing assumptions and apprehensions, Greene—in his preface—candidly states:

"The discrepancy between what I had been led to expect and what I actually saw was at first bewildering and disturbing. No one can be in China for more than a few hours without sensing an almost tangible vitality and an enormous optimism. I saw in the people a buoyancy and confidence which was utterly unlike my expectations."

For 392 pages after that, Greene took this enthralled reader through communes, rich and poor, beset with problems which in "great measure came from unexpectedly high production, from enthusiasm, in short from success, rather than from conflict or failure."

"Once again," Greene stated, "the Chinese government has shown extraordinary flexibility when confronted with problems or actual mistakes, and responsiveness to the actual needs of the farmers themselves. There is apparently, to be less administrative control of the communes by the party cadre, for—in the words of the government—the 'masses must be daringly trusted.'"

This daring trust was reflected in countless ways as the author scrutinized, probed and interviewed in factories, schools, prisons, government bureaus and wherever else his unrestrained travels took him.

Never content with first impressions or seemingly pat answers to his questions, Greene has dug deep into the richness of his Chinese people to produce what in all likelihood will stand for a long time as the most authoritative and heartwarming account of a great nation's emergence into the new world of socialism.

Meticulously avoiding even a vague appearance of either personal or political bias, Greene has nonetheless emerged as the most eloquent spokesman for the exciting realities of that new world.

Whether in his coverage of a rural divorce case—which is exquisite tenderness and compassion on the part of the judge and the people's assessors who have an active part to play in helping people eradicate old values—or his interviews with ballet, teachers, steel workers, peasants, professionals or trainmen, Greene found constant reaffirmation of the liberation of the creative talent of an entire people eagerly working, building—and occasionally blundering—under the slogan. "Don't be frightened of the experts—compete with them!"

The author has devoted one entire and compelling section of his book to "The Chinese Case" against those—and this is applied especially against the United States—who pose a threat against her peaceful building of socialism.

The "case" goes deep to the roots of imperialism that tore apart and ruthlessly exploited China's people and resources and which—up to today, through the cold war—continues to harass Chinese efforts to lift themselves "from a state of poverty and

feudalism into a modern nation with equal opportunities for all."

Awakened China is a powerful, factual, calmly reasoned—yet impassioned—argument for a change in the United States "China Policy." Its message should be known and told far and wide.

If ever a book merited a place on a reader's "must" list—this is it!

—D.P.

---

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Dec. 18, 1961]

"AWAKENED CHINA" NAILED AS PIECE OF PROPAGANDA

(By Arthur Hewitt)

The book, "Awakened China," is promoted as a "report in depth" from behind the Iron Curtain of Communist China. But it should be nailed for what it is—a piece of propaganda which in no manner reflects facts of strife and hunger and failing industrialization which are known to the Western world.

It is written by Felix Greene, an American resident but British citizen traveling under a British passport. It is published by Doubleday & Co. at $5.95.

Greene talks of a "people's revolution" which has produced a happy, clean (to excess), contented, hard working people. Under communism they have an enlightened approach to everything from ballet and music instruction to hydroelectric plants and prisoner rehabilitation programs.

Greene visited Red China in 1957. He was a visitor at the invitation of the Communist government for four months in 1960. It would appear that, rather than reporting "in depth," he is touching on highlights of a quick trip—seeing only what he was allowed to see.

There is nothing to indicate in his book that he traveled with anyone but an "official" interpreter and guide. It would appear to an experienced newspaperman that this was a "Communist-guided tour."

No intelligent reader would swallow Greene's assertion that he was "unbiased" in his report. One need only look at the book itself which denounces Nationalist China and goes page after page into what he calls "The Chinese Case"—an apology for Communist China.

Fortunately, important reports on the political and social facts of Chinese Communist life are available to brand Greene's report for what it is.

*(Editor's note—By a strange co-incidence, the contents of this book parallels very closely to the Communistic propaganda which is contained in the film "The Face of Red China," which was protested by many groups of parents as unfit to be shown to high school students. The L.A. School District "Committee of Nine," however, rated this film as proper and it still is scheduled by the L.A. School Board to be shown to L.A. students, with the provision a teacher's guide be used with the showing of the film.)*

---

A CURTAIN OF DISTORTION

(Felix Greene: A Curtain of Ignorance, New York, Doubleday, 1964, reviewed by George E. Taylor)

The thesis of this book is that the American people today are more misinformed about China than the people of any other Western nation. According to Mr. Greene, the information exists but is being either distorted or deliberately withheld from the American public by news correspondents, editorial writers, and government officials. The author thinks that this cumulative misinformation has led most Americans to the conclusion "that China's backwardness, her shortage of food, and what is thought of as the prevailing misery of her people, are due to the Communists; that during the civil war in China evil men threw out the good men; and that though the good men were defeated and are now in exile, it is America's moral obligation to support them against the ruthless and aggressive tyrants who have reduced the Chinese masses to unspeakable indignities and suffering" (p. xiii). This, Mr. Greene maintains, is also the picture that governs US national policy, which is therefore based on an unrealistic conception of the condition of China today.

What is the reason for this state of affairs? The author's argument is that emotion gets in the way of objective reporting. He suggests that the exaggerated American hostility to China today has resulted directly from the excessive hopes which the United States pinned on China in the past; and he further claims that an American's views of Communist China have, since 1949, come to be taken as a test of his loyalty. This latter is a peculiar charge in view of the number of Americans who have called for a review of US policy towards China—for example, in the Conlon report,[1] the resolutions of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce regarding trade with Communist China,[2] and the recent hearings of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by Senator FULBRIGHT.

Part one of Mr. Greene's book deals with the background of the American mythology about China. In his view, it seems, Americans have never actually had a correct view of China. During the 19th century, they allegedly looked down upon the Chinese as inferior, crafty, dangerous, and inscrutable. (No doubt some did, but the generalization is far too sweeping.) After the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, the triumphant Western powers patronized the defeated Chinese, and a sympathetic image grew up which carried over for almost half a century. This, runs Mr. Greene's argument, was based upon self-delusion: Americans looked upon themselves as animated by a feeling of kindly benevolence toward a backward people but actually were motivated by crass materialism. (The truth is that many Americans were sincerely pro-Chinese, motivated by genuine sympathy for Chinese culture and the Chinese people.) Then came Chiang Kai-shek, and the Americans—says Mr. Greene—fell into another delusion: hero worship of the Generalissimo and his wife. Chiang, who in the author's words had risen to power by making "his deal with the big Chinese and Western commercial interests," who had "turned on his Communist allies" and taken "savage reprisals" against them, became for Americans the embodiment of all that was "heroic, selfless, fearless" (p. 14).

But then came World War II, during which thousands of Americans came into personal contact with China, and, instead of finding a heroic ally, found themselves—to quote Mr. Greene—"involved with greedy civil and military officials, brutalized policemen, and cynical bureaucrats living off a pauperized population" (p. 17). Some Americans even wrote about these facts, but according to the author the truth never reached the public until the war was almost over. Mr. Greene also tells us—not surprisingly—that it was the Communist armies which took the initiative against the Japanese invaders, while Chiang Kai-shek was more concerned with protecting himself against the Communists. This is actually nothing but a Communist-inspired myth which even Mao has corrected.[3]

The author acknowledges that, for a short period after the war, the curtain was lifted and Americans were told about the horrible realities of Chiang's China. But even this, he says, did not keep President Kennedy from identifying Chiang with freedom and humanity as against the ruthless dictatorship of the present Communist regime (p. 30). It would appear that no one—except, of course, Mr. Greene—recalls the conditions in China under Chiang Kai-shek; yet all he seems to recall is the misery and chaos brought about by eight long years of war with Japan. He does not recall the tremendous progress made between 1928 and 1937—the military and political unification of the country, the establishment of a national currency, the building up of a modern army, the expansion and improvement of education, and the rapid growth of commerce. These achievements of the Nationalist regime deserve to be mentioned no less than its shortcomings.

The author spends thirty pages on the so-called "China lobby," described as a partnership between agents of the Chiang government and Americans who favored full United States support of Chiang. Mr. Greene admits that the US government, as late as May 1950, was ready to accept the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and even to recognize the new regime. This is quite true. Then came the Korean War, Chinese Communist intervention, and the American people's shock at finding themselves at war with China. Was it the casualties, the brainwashing of captured Americans, the acrimonious negotiations, and the frustrations of a war not fought to a decisive conclusion that turned American opinion against Communist China? No, we are told, it was the China lobby. This is patently ridiculous and grossly exaggerates the influence of the lobby on American policy.

Turning to internal conditions in Communist China, Mr. Greene claims that starvation has ceased and heaps scorn on the American press for its reports in 1960–61 of food shortages, mass discontent and apathy, and mounting deaths. He should therefore learn a great deal from reading the captured Chinese military documents which have been available for quite some time to those who can read Chinese and are currently being published in English translation.[4] These documents are secret orders issued to high-ranking Chinese army commanders in 1961 explaining how to handle existing discontent in the ranks caused by malnutrition and by reports of famine deaths in the home villages of the peasant soldiers. While Mr. Greene was actually in China, whole districts in the west and southwest were completely out of control, and estimates of the death toll from starvation run as high as 10 million people.

At this stage in his argument, the author embarks upon a discussion of alternative paths of national economic development. The British and American path, he holds, is no longer acceptable: "The inequitable class exploitation that enabled Britain to industrialize and advance would not be tolerated today by any country in the world" (p. 114). The only way for a backward country to advance, in Mr. Greene's view,

---

[1] *United States Foreign policy (Asia)*, studies prepared by the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations, US Senate, by Conlon Associates Ltd. No. 5, Nov. 1, 1959. Washington, DC, US Government Printing Office, 1959.

[2] *Report of the Committee to Explore Trade with the People's Republic of China*, prepared for the San Francisco Area World Trade Association of the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, 1964.

[3] *Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, Ltd., 1954. Vol. III, p. 184 ff.

[4] "Work Bulletins" of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, Issues 1, 6, etc. Released by the US Government in 1963. To be published in English translation by the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, in March 1966 under the title, *The Politics of the Chinese Red Army*, edited by J. Chester Cheng.

is to do what the Russians did—submit to a system of austerity, economic discipline, and forced marches to higher production goals—and we should not criticize the high cost in lives and human suffering that goes with the Communist style of industrialization. This is the old argument that you can't make an omelet without breaking eggs. But the point is what kind of omelet you are trying to make. Is the objective a higher standard of living for the people or a power economy for the elite? Mr. Greene apparently has no qualms at all on this score. Unless we do better than we are doing now, he predicts, the Soviet standard of living will be the highest in the world within the lifetime of our children. This would seem a rather rash forecast considering that at the present moment it does not yet match that of Japan.

In his discussion of development, Mr. Greene has a lot to say about India and much of it is disparaging. If India is lagging, however, it is not in an attempt to build a military-totalitarian society as the Chinese are trying to do; instead, she is engaged in a much more ambitious and commendable effort to construct a parliamentary democracy. The author would have us believe that the historical role of communism is to provide the most effective way for backward countries to become industrialized, and if this means the establishment of a self-perpetuating party and a bureaucratic state, we have only to wait for the healing influence of time to turn it into a democracy. The fact that there is no empirical evidence to back up this claim, and the fact that this amounts to condoning the suffering of millions of people does not seem to bother our author in the least.

Mr. Greene is particularly anxious to defend the communes against descriptions that have pictured them as slave camps, but the weight of evidence is against him. The trick, of course, is to compare what the Communist Chinese say about the communes with either the chaos of the early post-war period, to which the Chinese Communists contributed, or with earlier periods in Chinese history, but never with the enormous progress of the years from 1928 to 1937.

In part three of the book, the author advances the view that Americans wrongly look upon China as the most belligerent, expansionist nation in the world today. One can agree that some sections of the press have exaggerated the Napoleonic designs of Communist China, without, however, accepting Mr. Greene's contention that the Peking regime has no desire for expansion. It is impossible to repeat the whole tortuous argument here; nor is it necessary, because the facts are only too obvious.

It was to be expected that Mr. Greene would spend some time lauding the benefits to be derived from trading with Communist China and making fun of statements that China has very little cash with which to buy from the Western world. Much is made of China's ability to pay cash for wheat. There is, however, no mystery about this: the cash she pays for wheat amounts almost exactly to the profits that Communist China gets from trading with Hong Kong. If the United States were to trade with China and even to become her leading trade partner, the volume of exchange would probably still amount to less than one percent of U.S. trade.

It is strange to have an Englishman writing a book on American policy and meaning Americans when he says "we." It is even stranger to have him claim that the United States of America is ignorant about China when it publishes more news, more translations of Chinese Communist materials, more scholarly books and articles on that country than all of Western Europe. And an American, Edgar Snow, has written the most authoritative book on Communist China of any journalist who has been there. Mr. Greene apparently does not read the available material. No one would deny that there is need for greater and more reliable information about China. But if there is "a curtain of ignorance," it exists largely because China's Communist rulers prefer it that way, hoping to keep the rest of the world in the dark about real conditions in their country.

THE MOST OF MAO'S CHINA

*A Curtain of Ignorance, by Felix Greene (Doubleday, 360 pp. $5.50), sets out to prove that the American public has been kept in ignorance about both Nationalist China and the Mao regime. John M. Allison, who is now with the University of Hawaii, has served as United States Ambassador to Japan, Indonesia, and Czechoslovakia.*

(By John M. Allison)

Felix Greene is a man with a purpose. It is to convince Americans that they are completely wrong in their view of Communist China. This is the second book he has written in an effort to achieve this purpose. The first, *Awakened China*, was a description of what the Communists had made out of the old China. While much of what Mr. Greene reported was undoubtedly correct, it was obvious that while traveling in Communist China he had worn rose-colored glasses, and the over-all effect of his book was unconvincing.

This new volume is an attempt to prove that the American press, American experts, and American officials have kept from the American public the truth about Nationalist China as well as about Communist China. In telling of the conditions on mainland China under the regime of Chiang Kai-shek, Mr. Greene paints a picture in unrelieved black. The corruption, the inefficiency, and the horror of life under Chiang are detailed unmercifully. The interesting thing is that much of the evidence for these charges is quoted from statements in the same American press that Mr. Greene claims has failed to report the truth about China.

Anyone who ever lived in pre-Communist China and who had eyes to see and ears to hear, to say nothing of a nose to smell, will have to admit that many of the charges made by Mr. Greene are true. But a fair-minded person who had lived in China in those days would also have to report that Mr. Greene tells only part of the story. From 1936 to 1938 I lived in central and northern China and saw the effort that Chiang's government in Nanking was making to do something for the people and to create a sense of unity throughout the country. A small but significant illustration is the fact that the manager of the Bank of China (the government bank) in the capital of Shantung Province was a graduate of Cornell Agricultural College who had spent much time in the southern United States studying American agricultural methods in the cotton and tobacco areas. He had been specially picked by the central government with a view to having the Bank of China in Shantung take the lead in sponsoring the development of cotton and tobacco cooperatives among the people.

That the Chiang government was beginning to make a success of its efforts was undoubtedly one of the motives that prompted the Japanese military to come into North China in 1938. The Japanese wanted to control this area, and if the people began to develop a loyalty to Nanking their plans would be foiled. This Japanese invasion completely disrupted all plans the Nationalist Government had, and the full-scale war that eventually grew out of it must take the blame for much, though certainly not all, of the Nationalist failures listed by Greene.

Greene continually delights in pointing out the mote in Chiang's eye but never mentions the beam in Mao's. For example, in speaking of Chiang he says, "It is difficult to recall that under this man's rule millions were killed and a whole social system went to pieces." Nothing is said of the twenty million landlords and rich peasants estimated by outside observers to have been liquidated under the Communists. Even if this figure is exaggerated by as much as 50 per cent, as it may be, it is still a substantial figure. The Communist Government itself admits to three million killed.

Mr. Greene serves a useful purpose in his review of the activities of the China lobby and its support of McCarthy and his henchmen. This is not a pretty picture, and it is good for the American public to be reminded of the danger of allowing a foreign-government-sponsored group to gain influence in our press and legislative halls.

Much of the argument in this book seems like beating a dead horse. We are told at gruesome length that the charge that millions have starved in Communist China is false. It is true that in the past many American commentators of the more emotional type, some government officials, and a large number of members of the China lobby have tried to create the impression that a starving mainland is ripe for invasion. But it would be hard to find any responsible persons, private or official, making such statements today. And the lengthy account of how Communist China is outstripping India tells little that has not already been pointed out by American writers. The June 29th issue of *Newsweek*, for example, says explicitly: "In its unavowed economic race with Red China India currently seems to be lagging."

This is an irritating book. Mr. Greene is ostensibly trying to inject realism into the emotionally charged China problem. Certainly realism is needed. He rightly points out the strength of the Communist Chinese and the danger in loose talk of invasion that assumes the Chinese people will rise up and welcome Chiang's return with open arms. But the book is so one-sided, and the author commits so many of the crimes of omission, partial quotation, and complete dependence upon official statements and government statistics that he charges others with, that one is tempted to dismiss everything he says as arrant propaganda. This is unfortunate, for there are lessons to be learned from his book. Perhaps the greatest is that the curtain of ignorance has two sides, and Mr. Greene has shown us only one.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agree to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, until tomorrow, Friday, July 22, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 21, 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on January 28, 1966, of Michael Kuzma to be postmaster at Columbus, in the State of Pennsylvania.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 21, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Frank C. Di Luzio, of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*God is able to provide you in abundance for every good work.*—2 Corinthians 9: 8.

O God, our Father, whom we seek to serve and to whom we look for guidance, we bow before the altar of prayer offering unto Thee the gratitude and the loyalty of our hearts. We thank Thee for this new day fresh from Thy hand with its possibilities for great and good living. By Thy spirit may we always be honest and kind and forgiving: may we be generous in our criticism of others, patient with those who criticize us and considerate with those who differ from us. As we follow Him who went about doing good, may we also stop merely going about and begin, like Him, to go about doing good to all.

Through these trying times, bless Thou our President, our beloved Speaker, Members of Congress and all who work with them. May the benediction of Thy presence rest upon us all this day and every day. Together lead us in the paths of unity and peace for Thy name's sake. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2948. An act to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3523. An act to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to undertake a comprehensive study of high-speed ground transportation to Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes.

## GLOBE-DEMOCRAT REPORTED SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY ANHEUSER-BUSCH OFFICIALS TO DEMOCRATS IN 1964

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see so much concern on the Republican side over the fact that people who should have been contributing to the Democratic Party for many years perhaps had not been contributing as much or as often as they should.

However, when this insinuation of ingratitude for past favors—such as the repeal of prohibition—is directed at Mr. August A. Busch, Jr., and other members of his family or executives of his firm, I might say that we on the Democratic side in St. Louis, and in Missouri, are quite pleased with the support this man has given our party ever since 1933.

I do not know what contributions, if any, he has made in previous years to the Democratic National Committee, but according to the St. Louis Globe-Democrat following the 1964 elections, a statement filed in accordance with the laws of Missouri in the office of the recorder of deeds in St. Louis reported that Mr. Busch contributed $5,000 and Mr. Fleishman $1,000 to the Johnson-Humphrey Missouri Citizens Committee, of which Mr. Busch was chairman and Mr. Fleishman was secretary. If the opposition wants to check back over the years, it will find many reports in Missouri of contributions to the Democrats by the Busch family.

Although the name in the paper's masthead indicates it is a Democratic paper, the Globe-Democrat is actually on the other side in most elections, and vigorously supported Senator Goldwater's candidacy in 1964. It commented editorially last Friday that the Republican charge that Anheuser-Busch in some way bought off an antitrust suit with $10,000 in contributions to the President's Club was "baseless."

If there were any substance whatsoever to these insinuations and allegations, then of course the Attorney General of the United States would deserve to be impeached, and everyone in the antitrust division who recommended dismissal of this old lawsuit be summarily fired. I resent political slurs on decent people.

## THE AIRLINE STRIKE DRAGS ON AND DAMAGE TO INNOCENT VICTIMS ACCUMULATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the airline strike drags on and the damage to innocent victims accumulates.

Mr. Speaker, many nonstrikers have been thrown out of work and many businessmen are being inconvenienced and are suffering financial losses, because of the breakdown in transportation.

Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I sent President Johnson a telegram calling attention to these facts and urged swift and aggressive action on his part in an effort to get the planes flying again, and I pledge full support of his efforts.

The distinguished Governor of the State of North Carolina has written the President along the same lines, urging him to take personal action.

I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, to read the negative approach of the President to this problem in his press conference yesterday. The President stated that he was encouraging the parties to continue bargaining. He did not announce any intention of calling the bargainers to the White House to impress upon them that the national interest has become affected.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand the lack of action on the part of the President of the United States, since in his state of the Union message he promised to deal effectively with "strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest."

Legislation to deal effectively with such strikes has been introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE], and if the President will use his influence, and if he will send the Postmaster General and others up here to urge affirmative action, as has happened frequently this year on other bills, I think we could move that legislation through the Congress but not in time to stop the damage from accumulating.

Mr. Speaker, I believe only determined action by the President in the use of his well-known persuasive powers can accomplish this, and I most respectfully urge him to take that action.

## FORTHCOMING ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, many of us are concerned that the forthcoming elections in Vietnam be credible, and that once they have taken place, charges of corruption, bias, or rigging will be without standing in the international community, as well as in Vietnam and in the United States.

Ambassador Bunker and the interim Government of the Dominican Republic have achieved a miracle by holding free and fair elections, which have been accepted both by the people of that nation and by the community of nations as an accurate expression of the popular will.

The same credibility must attach to the elections in Vietnam, or they will reduce and not increase the possibility of an early settlement of the conflict.

I am sorry that the United Nations has not been able to accept Premier Ky's request that observers be sent. So we must encourage other alternatives: The use of the International Control Commission, or a group from independent and preferably Asian nations as ob-

servers. These observers should not only report on the voting, but they should report on the ground rules before the elections are held. And time is running out. I hope that prompt action can be taken.

Unless we know both that the rules by which candidates are placed on the ballot and are allowed to campaign permit full expression of differing positions and points of view, and that the ballots will be counted accurately, we will have failed to achieve a most important objective on the road toward peace.

## THE AIRLINES STRIKE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of words condemning the airlines strike have sounded through these Halls of Congress the past 2 weeks and have filled up page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The time for words of protest are gone. I call for legislation.

The President has done everything within his power to settle the airlines strike. He appointed an Emergency Board composed of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Dick Neustadt, of Harvard, and David Ginsburg, a Washington attorney.

The parties to the dispute had full opportunity to present their cases. The Board considered all the evidence presented, a record of 2,000 pages, and came up with a generous recommendation.

The President then publicly urged the parties to come to agreement on the basis of the Board's report, which he said formed the framework for a just and prompt settlement.

He directed Secretary Wirtz and Assistant Secretary Reynolds to work around the clock to obtain a settlement within the 30-day cooling off period by law.

The airlines, acting perhaps without enthusiasm but nevertheless with complete sincerity, accepted the Board's recommendations. The union continues to refuse to do so. The Board's recommendations represent a tidy little $76 million package for the union. The union leadership remains immovable from its original position, leaning its full weight on its original $117 million package.

The President took every action available to him, through all departments of the Federal Government, to reduce the inconvenience to the public, to assure the national security, and to minimize the delay in delivering the mail.

Today, the President of the mightiest Nation in the world stands powerless in a situation that can best be described as a creeping economic paralysis. He has no tools left to deal with this situation. He has no further power available except the power of persuasion, and it should be apparent to all of us that he is faced with men who are listening to other voices.

It is up to us, now, to provide the President with additional tools, tools with a diamond cutting edge, designed to operate swiftly and effectively in this one specific situation. The matter now rests with us.

## INJUSTICES IN VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that is needed to remove the serious injustices that have become apparent since the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1966 became effective last June 1. At that time, I explained to the House that a number of flaws in that act would have to be eliminated in fairness to those who served in the uniform of our country.

My bill, the Veterans' Fair Treatment Amendments Act of 1966, provides an increase in allowances for veterans in college or participating in job, farm, or flight training programs to levels now available to war orphans in similar programs. Under present law, the war orphan receives $30 per month more than the veteran, a discrepancy that obviously cannot be justified. It is illogical to expect living expenses of older veterans to be less than those of high school graduates receiving war orphans' allowances.

My proposal is also designed to broaden educational assistance to include children of veterans having service-connected disabilities of 50 percent or more. Surviving children of veterans so rated at time of death would also be eligible.

In addition, this legislation will compensate veterans who obtained their education before the current program became effective. Many veterans, rather than wait for Congress to act, went to college on their own initiative and often on borrowed money. To exclude them from the benefits of the GI bill penalizes them unfairly, and corrective action on the part of Congress is mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that my bill be given the highest priority at this session. Congress must keep faith with our veterans. It is on this premise that I have introduced the Veterans Fair Treatment Amendments of 1966.

## COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## STRIKING OF MEDALS TO COMMEMORATE THE 1,000TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF POLAND

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 139) to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of the founding of Poland, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "1966" and insert "1967".

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that the bill calls for no expenditure of money?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No, that is perfectly correct. These medals will be struck at no cost whatsoever to the Treasury.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FACILITIES FOR VISITORS TO THE NATION'S CAPITOL

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14604) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to remodel the existing structure of the U.S. Botanic Garden for use as a visitors' center, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the President's statements of recent date, his alleged concern about expenditures of the Government, and in view of the potential cost, I am of the opinion that this proposal ought to have more discussion than can reasonably be given it under unanimous consent on the House floor today.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to consideration of the bill under unanimous-consent procedure.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

## CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE TUALATIN RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 254, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon,

and for other purposes, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees; Messrs. ASPINALL, ROGERS of Texas, and SAYLOR.

## SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 602 to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1627)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1044), as amended (43 U.S.C. 422a et seq.) is hereby further amended as follows:

"(1) In section 1, by striking out 'in the seventeen western reclamation States' and inserting in lieu thereof 'throughout the United States';

"(2) In section 2, by striking out the second sentence of subsection (d) and the first two provisos thereto and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The term "project" shall not include any such undertaking, unit, or program the cost of which exceeds $10,000,000, and no loan, grant, or combination thereof for any project shall be in excess of $6,500,000:' and by striking out *"And provided further,"* and inserting in lieu thereof *'Provided,';*

"(3) In section 4, by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following: 'The costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among project functions.';

"(4) In section 4, subsection (b), by striking out the word 'construction' from the phrase which now reads 'and willing to finance otherwise than by loan and grant under this Act such portion of the cost of construction' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the project'; by inserting at the end of the parenthetical phrase which follows thereafter ', except as provided in subsection 5(b)(2) hereof,'; and by changing the colon (:) to a period (.) and striking out the remainder of said subsection;

"(5) In section 5, by striking out the present text of items (a), (b) and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) the maximum amount of any loan to be made to the organization and the time and method of making the same available to the organization. Said loan shall not exceed the lesser of (1) $6,500,000 or (2) the estimated total cost of the project minus the contribution of the local organization as provided in section 4(b) and the amount of the grant approved;

"'(b) the maximum amount of any grant to be accorded the organization. Said grant shall not exceed the sum of the following: (1) the costs of investigations, surveys, and engineering and other services necessary to the preparation of proposals and plans for the project allocable to fish and wildlife enhancement or public recreation; (2) one-half the costs of acquiring lands or interests therein for a reservoir or other area to be operated for fish and wildlife enhancement or public recreation purposes; (3) one-half the costs of basic public outdoor recreation facilities or facilities serving fish and wildlife enhancement purposes exclusively; (4) one-half the costs of construction of joint use facilities properly allocable to fish and wildlife enhancement or public recreation; and (5) that portion of the estimated cost of constructing the project which, if it were constructed as a Federal reclamation project, would be properly allocable to functions, other than recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, which are nonreimbursable under general provisions of law applicable to such projects;

"'(c) a plan of repayment by the organization of (1) the sums lent to it in not more than fifty years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available; (2) interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the contract is executed, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such average rate to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, on that portion of the loan which is attributable to furnishing irrigation benefits in each particular year to land held in private ownership by any one owner in excess of one hundred and sixty irrigable acres; and (3) in the case of any project involving an allocation to domestic, industrial, or municipal water supply, or commercial power, interest on the unamortized balance of an appropriate portion of the loan at a rate as determined in (2) above;';

"(6) In section 8, by striking out 'Act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401), as amended (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.)';

"(7) In section 10, by striking out '$100,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$200,000,000'.

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be applicable to or affect in any way the terms on which any loan or grant has been made prior to the effective date of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
ED REINECKE,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HENRY M. JACKSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
FRANK E. MOSS,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
GORDON ALLOTT.
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill, S. 602, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, submit this statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language agreed upon is essentially the language of the House amendment with two significant changes as herein noted.

CEILING ON THE AMOUNT OF THE LOAN AND GRANT

The Senate-passed bill included language to amend the basic Act by increasing the maximum amount of any loan or combination loan and grant for a single project from $5,000,000 to $7,500,000.

The House amendment retained the $5 million limitation but with qualifying language to permit adjustment of the amount to reflect changes in costs of construction of the types involved in the particular project which may have occurred between January 1, 1957 and January 1 of the year in which the loan is made. At the present time, the language of the House amendment would provide a ceiling of between $6 million and $6.5 million depending upon the particular project involved.

The conference committee adopted language which places a ceiling of $6,500,000 on the amount of any loan or combination loan and grant for any single project. A specific amount seemed preferable in view of the problems that would be inherent in administering the House language. The $6,500,000 figure is considered an equitable amount on the basis of increases in construction costs since the enactment of the basic Act 10 years ago. In other words, at today's prices, $6,500,000 will purchase about the same in the way of project works and facilities as $5,000,000 would have paid for 10 years ago.

INTEREST RATE

The formula included in the Senate-passed bill for determining the interest rate to be used in repaying those portions of any loan allocable to the irrigation of excess lands, to municipal and industrial water supply, and to commercial power is the formula based on coupon rates which has been adopted by Congress in recent years for various Federal water project programs.

The House amendment made no change in the interest formula in the basic Act which is based on yield rather than coupon rates.

The conference committee adopted the interest formula embodied in the Senate-passed bill in the interest of maintaining consistency among all Federal programs. It seemed particularly important that there be consistency between the interest rate used for this Small Reclamation Projects program and the program of the Department of Agriculture under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT

The language of the conference report makes the following important changes in the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956:

(1) The Small Reclamation Projects Program is extended to the entire United States as in the House amendment to S. 602.

(2) The ceiling on the amount of a loan or combination loan and grant for any one project is increased from $5 million to $6.5 million.

(3) The formula used for determining the interest rate for the interest-bearing portions of loans under this Act is changed from a formula based on yield to a formula based on coupon rates.

(4) New language is added updating the basic Act by incorporating recently adopted cost-sharing policies applicable to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. This is substantially the same as in the House amendment to S. 602.

(5) An additional $100 million is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Small Reclamation Projects

Program. This is the same as in the House amendment to S. 602.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WALTER ROGERS,
HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
ED REINECKE,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 172]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson, Ill. | Farnsley | Murray |
| Andrews, N. Dak. | Flynt | Nedzi |
| Arends | Fraser | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Ashbrook | Frelinghuysen | Pepper |
| Baring | Gathings | Pike |
| Beckworth | Goodell | Powell |
| Boggs | Green, Oreg. | Race |
| Burton, Calif. | Griffiths | Redlin |
| Cabell | Grover | Reid, N.Y. |
| Cahill | Hagan, Ga. | Rivers, Alaska |
| Celler | Hansen, Wash. | Roberts |
| Chelf | Hébert | Roncalio |
| Clark | Henderson | St Germain |
| Conyers | Hungate | St. Onge |
| Corbett | Irwin | Scott |
| Craley | Keith | Senner |
| Dague | King, N.Y. | Stephens |
| Dawson | King, Utah | Sweeney |
| Delaney | Leggett | Toll |
| Diggs | Long, La. | Tuten |
| Dwyer | Mackie | Udall |
| Edwards, La. | Martin, Ala. | Watkins |
| Ellsworth | Miller | White, Idaho |
| Evans, Colo. | Mills | Willis |
| Everett | Mink | Wilson, Charles H. |
| Evins, Tenn. | Moeller | |
| Farbstein | Monagan | |
| | Morrison | |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 602 provides for continuing a very successful small water projects program which was initiated 10 years ago. The purpose of this program is to encourage State and local participation in the development and rehabilitation of small water projects primarily for irrigation. The Federal Government assists such undertakings by providing loans to the States or to local public agencies. The local agencies retain full responsibility for the planning, construction, and operation of these small projects.

Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1955, Representative Engle introduced H.R. 5881 which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide Federal assistance in the development of reclamation projects by non-Federal organizations in all 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

As reported out of committee on May 4, 1955, H.R. 5881 would have retained the authorization of the Secretary of the Interior to furnish such assistance in all 48 States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

H.R. 5881 was considered on the floor of the House on May 26, 1955, and amended to provide that the Secretary of the Interior would furnish assistance under the bill in the 17 western reclamation States, and that the Secretary of Agriculture would furnish the assistance authorized by the bill in the 31 Eastern States and Hawaii and Alaska—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, page 7134. The bill passed the House as so amended—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, page 7159.

The Senate version of this bill, S. 2442, introduced by Senator ANDERSON on July 11, 1955, contained two titles. Title I pertained to the 17 western reclamation States and authorized assistance to be furnished thereunder by the Secretary of the Interior. Title II pertained to the 31 Eastern States and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska and authorized assistance to be furnished thereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In the Senate, S. 2442 was substituted for the bill passed by the House, and in this form it was passed by the Senate on July 28, 1955.

The conference committee eliminated title II and both Houses subsequently passed the conference bill which was limited to the 17 western reclamation States with assistance thereunder to be furnished by the Secretary of the Interior. The conference report was filed in the House on May 23, 1956, agreed to by the House on June 13, 1956, by the Senate on July 20, 1956, and approved on August 6, 1956.

The statement of managers on the part of the House indicates that the agreement in conference to limit the program to the 17 western reclamation States was based on an amendment, pending before the Congress at that time, to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act which might provide for the Eastern States the purposes sought by enactment of the Small Reclamation Projects Act. The amendment to the Watershed Act was subsequently passed and both programs have been in operation since 1956.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act was amended in the 85th Congress by the act of June 5, 1957—71 Stat. 48. However, this amendment did not involve the matter of extending the act to the Eastern States.

H.R. 4851, the companion bill to S. 602, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act was introduced on February 11, 1965. As introduced it was applicable only to the western reclamation States and to Hawaii. Hearings were held on June 25, 1965, and subcommittee markup sessions were held on August 2 and August 19. The bill was reported to the House on August 25 with an amendment extending the coverage of the act to the entire United States.

On September 7, 1965, under suspension of rules procedure, H.R. 4851 passed the House without any floor amendments. This action was subsequently vacated and S. 602 was passed with the House language. The matter of extending the program to the entire United States was discussed during floor consideration of September 7.

On September 16, 1965, the Senate objected to the House amendments and asked for a conference on S. 602. On May 2, 1966, House conferees were appointed and the conference committee meeting was held on June 2, 1966, in which agreement was reached on the legislation including extension of the program to the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, the major differences between House and Senate versions of S. 602 are as follows:

First, coverage: Language in the House-passed bill made the small reclamation projects program applicable throughout the United States. There was no comparable provision in the Senate-passed bill. In the conference committee meeting, the Senate receded and the House provision was agreed to;

Second, size of project: The size of project permitted in the House-passed bill was $5 million on the basis of 1956 costs, adjusted to reflect changes in the costs of construction. It is estimated that the House language would have permitted assistance to projects costing about $6.5 million at the present time. The Senate-passed bill would have permitted assistance to projects costing $7.5 million. The conference committee adopted a project cost figure of $6.5 million without any provision for adjustment;

Third, interest rate: The interest rate formula in the House-passed bill was based upon yield while the formula in the Senate-passed bill was based on coupon rates. The House receded and the conference committee agreed to the formula in the Senate-passed bill. This is the same formula which has been adopted by the Congress in recent years for most Federal water project programs;

Fourth, fund advances to conduct studies and prepare reports: The Senate-passed bill included a provision to permit the advance of up to half the cost of making the necessary engineering studies and preparing reports to accompany loan applications. There was no comparable provision in the House-passed bill. The Senate receded and the conference committee deleted this provision; and

Fifth, authorization of appropriations: The House-passed bill authorized the appropriation of an additional $100 million to carry out the purposes of the small reclamation projects program. The Senate-passed bill authorized the appropriation of not only an additional $100 million, but included language increasing that amount by amounts repaid on previous loans and the amounts of nonreimbursable allocations. In other words, the Senate provision would have established a revolving fund for this program. The Senate conceded and the conference committee agreed to the House provision.

Mr. Speaker, from the foregoing, it is clear that the conference committee report differs from the House-passed bill only in one major respect—the interest

rate to be used in repaying interest-bearing allocations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I find myself very discomfited by the fact that I must oppose this conference report, but I do so in the light of the history of the fact that we have undertaken during the last 11 years a fine and useful program of implementing watershed development.

Mr. Speaker, in 1955 this same proposition was presented to the House of Representatives.

The Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at that time was the beloved gentleman from California, Mr. Engle.

Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to strike out or to delete the 31 Eastern States from the application of the small projects interior operation bill. That amendment succeeded.

Subsequently, in the following year, we passed Public Law 566, designed to complement and to embrace the furtherance of water resource development, taking into account land use and the ultimate basic needs that we could devise from these stream developments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that program has succeeded. It has succeeded because it took into consideration the total water utilization.

Now, this proposal comes along designed to extend irrigation in the 31 Eastern States. They already have that authority under Public Law 566.

Now, we have heard—at least I have heard since being in the Congress for a period of 20 years—that we did not want duplication of effort and that we did not want a multiplicity of agencies dealing and dialing in directing these water resource projects. But, here is one seeking today to set up another bureaucracy with which to deal with these problems that are reconciled to local use and understanding, that will be destroyed or at least disturbed through the application of this arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I see no sense in our having expended millions and millions and millions of dollars to complete the survey requirements of local conditions that have been extended since the adoption of Public Law 566 to a community situation today and throw them out and make no use of them.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we are going to deal with this enormously expensive problem of water resource development, we should take into account what has been accomplished and what we seek to do in the future.

Now, if we want to commence another agency, operating in all of the other 31 States, here is the commencement of it.

Mr. Speaker, how in the world are we going to vote for an authorization to give sanction to an operation when the Federal Government is not going to have this close scrutiny over the expenditures of Federal funds and how the projects are going to be made compatible to the general use of a basin operation, for instance, and how the withdrawal of water is going to be determined and how its use is to be determined.

Mr. Speaker, the question as to how we are going to make these unified approaches to water problems is of paramount importance.

Here we are called upon to fragment the operation and to set aside one little useful part—and that is irrigation—and close our eyes to the general use of a stream in its relationship to land management.

We have some 19 accredited practices that are employed by the farmers in their soil use and water use programs on their farms.

Are we going to strip them of the opportunity to use the land in conformance to good water policies? I do not think so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe what we need to do, if we are really anxious about the problem, is to accelerate the program of watershed development in cooperation with local people and in cooperation with their local desires.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the conference report is not agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are again confronted with the question of whether we can wisely extend a good program to areas in which it has not operated and in which other good programs have been and are operating.

To me, the answer seems to be no. To do so, we must either add materially to the appropriations which we are now making as is provided in this conference report or we must spread the benefits of the program very thin indeed. This conference report, if you adopt it, authorizes an extra $100 million for this purpose. If you do not make the additional appropriations—and frankly I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations and I cannot speak for that great committee—but I do not believe that committee is going to appropriate $100 million of additional money—if it does not and we extend this program which is now applicable to only 17 Western States to all the States of the Union, we will have so diluted the program, so thinned it out, that neither the Western nor the Eastern States are going to have any program of which they can be proud. They are not going to have an effective program if you spread it over the Nation unless you are willing to put up the additional funds, which I just do not think the Committee on Appropriations is going to put up.

We have two programs working now all over the United States and a third one working over 17 States. We have a program that is working very successfully in small watersheds. Something like 700 of them have been approved and are now either in operation or are being constructed. The present small watershed program requires that you do more than merely impound water. You cannot establish one of the existing programs without getting at least half of all the land above the reservoir into soil-conserving contracts so that you protect the reservoir and the land. This is, as I see it, sound conservation.

I see no such provision in this system.

Nor is this a "reclamation program." I was deeply interested to hear the great chairman of the committee say that this is not a reclamation program but if I understood right, that it is indeed a small watershed program. If this is true it is indeed a complete duplication of existing programs.

I remember when our late lamented colleague, later Senator Engle, came here and suggested that he would establish a program all over the United States of reclamation because we might need reclamation sometime down the line in Connecticut or we might need it in Mississippi or somewhere such as that. He said it would be reclamation. But as I now understand the chairman he points out, and I think fairly, that this is not reclamation but a small watershed program.

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

Mr. POAGE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the committee, did not say this is a small watershed program. He said it was an irrigation program.

Mr. POAGE. I sat here on the front row and I thought I heard the gentleman say that it was not a reclamation program.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will yield again, I said it was not a reclamation program. It was directed by the Bureau of Reclamation, that was what I said. I said it was an irrigation program rather than a Bureau of Reclamation program. But it is financed largely from the revenues that are taken from the public lands of the United States.

I tried to differentiate between the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation over the 17 Western States and what its jurisdiction would be in taking care of this irrigation program.

May I say to my friend, what we have involved here is not building watershed programs but making available those facilities that would make irrigation available to the East as it is to the West.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for yielding me the time.

This conference report on S. 602 is of tremendous importance. It is imperative, as the two preceding speakers have indicated, that the Members of the House should understand exactly what the issues are.

As I see it, the issues are quite simple. If the Members of the House wish to follow the admonition of the President of the United States to curtail expenditures, stated by him only the day before yesterday in very explicit and commanding terms, then it is not time to expand programs which will ultimately require greater expenditures of Federal funds over the continued existence of this act. Although the Department of the Interior now favors an additional $100 million,

that amount for expansion was not included in the President's budget request in January of this year. I assume that if we vote down this conference report and maintain the 17 Western States concept that this extra $100 million will not be needed or will be spent over a much longer period of time than now envisioned. The administration, might I add, did not recommend the additional $100 million. The administration did not request the bill, S. 602, and it surely did not request in any departmental report an expansion of authority beyond the 17 western reclamation States.

Let me quote the Department of Agriculture, so that there will be no question about what the position of that Department is on this matter. I say to those who want to support the President of the United States, those who want to practice fiscal responsibility, and those who want to heed the President's admonition that this is the first and one of the major instances in which you can demonstrate that support, practice that fiscal responsibility, and heed that admonition by voting down this conference report, thus, in effect, voting against the $100 million, which means the doubling of the program presently in existence, as well as voting against any expanded authority.

On May 5, 1966, the Department of Agriculture had this to say, through its Secretary, and I think it is important to point out what the Department said:

This Department was not advised of this section until the bill was reported out and so had no opportunity to submit its views by report or testimony.

* * * this Department recommends deletion of the House amendment which would extend the authority of the Act to all 50 States.

This Department feels that the issue of whether or not the Small Reclamation Projects Act should apply to all the States or just to the western reclamation States was considered and settled at the time the original Act was passed in 1956. * * * It was objected to in debate by the Chairman of the Agricultural Committee and amended on the floor of the House to apply only to the 17 western reclamation States.

This extension of the Federal Reclamation Laws to all 50 States would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide Federal assistance in the 31 eastern States on small water resource development projects that would be largely duplicative of that being provided by the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. (P.L. 83-566).

This is the Department of Agriculture speaking, and I presume they know what they are talking about.

That has been discussed previously. I continue from the letter:

Moreover, the Small Reclamation Projects Act does not contain the fundamentally sound requirement of Public Law 566 that needed land treatment measures to protect reservoirs and insure proper water use in the benefited area shall be an integral part of the project.

* * * The Bureau of Reclamation would be required to set up new offices and new personnel to serve the 31 eastern States to carry out this duplication of authority irrespective of the need for increased agricultural production.

Small Reclamation Projects must have irrigation as their primary purpose. The Federal Government should not be promoting new irrigation development in the 31 eastern States because of the effect it would have on increased crop production.

That is the Secretary of Agriculture speaking, and this is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] just stressed and rightly so.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. CRAMER. The date of that letter is May 5, 1966.

Mr. COOLEY. Notwithstanding this opposition, the measure that is now submitted to the House relates to a program which was rejected years ago by a vote of the House?

Mr. CRAMER. It was rejected some 10 years ago by a vote of the House. This issue was decided once before, and it should now be decided on the same basis, particularly under the circumstances of the President of the United States saying to the Congress of the United States that the Members of Congress are the ones who are responsible for increased spending at this time, causing tremendous inflation, and at a time when the war in Vietnam requires billions of dollars of expenditures.

The President says the Members of Congress are the ones responsible for adding to the budget request of his administration. The President says they are the ones responsible for increased budget expenditures, and they are the ones causing increased inflation. This is the time when we have $100 million on this one vote which we can save from the expenditures of this session.

Mr. Speaker, I have risen in opposition to the conference report on S. 602, for I have serious reservations about it in the form agreed upon by the conferees. I agree with my many distinguished colleagues that its provisions to extend the small reclamation projects activities of the Department of the Interior to the entire United States and its authorizations for an additional $100 million for appropriations for such an expanded program appear to me to be a dangerous attempt to expand the authority and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior over small water resource development programs under the jurisdiction of other Federal departments. The jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and its established and successful small watershed development program under the Soil Conservation Service will be challenged substantially, if S. 602 is enacted.

During the past 6 years, we have seen the authority of the Secretary of the Interior expanded time after time, each time encompassing greater jurisdiction for the Department of the Interior.

The small watershed development program of the Department of Agriculture should in no way be jeopardized by the actions of those seeking to expand the Secretary of the Interior's control over the resources of this Nation, particularly its water resources.

I have had the privilege of serving since 1955 on the Committee on Public Works which has jurisdiction over approving workplans for small watershed development projects within the Department of Agriculture of over 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity for any one single watershed structure. As the ranking minority member of that committee, I feel that the small watershed development program, authorized under Public Law 566 of the 83d Congress, would be undermined if we enact S. 602 today. S. 602 does not, per se, transfer the authority for the small watershed program authorized by Public Law 566 from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior. But the expansion of the small reclamation projects activities of Interior would surely constitute unwise competition and duplication of responsibility and effort between the programs of the two departments in many areas of the Nation.

When the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was before this body over a decade ago, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], one of the most knowledgeable men on water resources in the free world, offered a successful amendment to that original bill which maintained the proper role of the various Federal departments over water resource projects by limiting the program to its legitimate domain, the 17 Western reclamation States. That farsighted amendment to require the continuation of orderly growth and development in the then 48 States and 2 territories should not now be repealed. The principle of that amendment should be reaffirmed.

There are many other reasons for opposing the enactment of S. 602 as agreed upon by the conferees.

The expansion of the Department of the Interior's activities in the area of small water resources development in the Eastern States of the Nation is unwise because the water problems of those Eastern States are wholly different from those over which the Department of the Interior has jurisdiction and over which it has expertise. S. 602 would also establish another Federal agency in the small watershed development field which is more adequately handled by the Soil Conservation Service and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has stated, the provisions of S. 602 would not only duplicate the small water resources programs now in effect but would also cause irreparable harm to those programs by setting up competing policies and conflicting practices in an area of natural resource management where efforts should be focused rather than diffused. It would require additional offices and additional personnel. It would result in inefficiency and waste in the administration of the small water resource development programs of the Federal Government.

I am glad to see that the Department of Agriculture has objected strongly to those portions of S. 602 which I am discussing, and I am also pleased to see the

distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on Conservation and Credit of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] making such a fine presentation on behalf of his Committee and the Department of Agriculture. As it has been pointed out by other Members, the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended the deletion of the amendment which was added by the House to extend the authority of the Small Reclamation Projects Act to all 50 States. In my opinion, the matter of whether the act was to apply to the 17 Western States or to the entire Nation was settled by the act's passage a decade ago.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of Public Law 566, which has been functioning commendably for 12 years, require, in addition to other things, land treatment measures and agreements with owners of lands benefited and local soil conservation districts. No such provisions are contained in the small reclamation projects statutes. At a time when our Nation is suffering great natural resource losses from extensive soil erosion, it is unwise indeed not to require land treatment measures designed to retard such costly erosion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that a single Member here could dispute the excellent work which the Soil Conservation Service has done under Public Law 566. During the 12 years since its enactment, and it was enacted and was operating when the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was considered, 729 projects have been approved by the Department of Agriculture. These 729 projects constitute 4,336 single purpose floodwater retarding structures, 280 multiple purpose structures, and 29 other single purpose structures. The total drainage area encompassed by these 729 projects covers 41,486,600 acres of America's valuable land. Through fiscal year 1965, the floodwater storage capacity of these 729 projects was an astounding 3,675,174 acre-feet; sediment storage was 633,771 acre-feet; and water supply storage for municipal, recreation, and irrigation purposes was an additional 431,151 acre-feet.

In addition to projects approved by the Department of Agriculture, another 1,211 projects have been approved for planning which would encompass a drainage area of an additional 84,124,800 acres. Furthermore, some 2,502 applications have been filed for even more watershed projects which would encompass a drainage area of an astounding 181,617,600 acres.

Mr. Speaker, if these proposed projects and this fantastic program are allowed to suffer because of the administrative disruption and jurisdictional conflicts which will result if we enact this unwise bill, S. 602, today, then we have permitted a great injustice to the development of this Nation's resources to have come about. I just cannot imagine us permitting those projects for which our local people have worked so hard to be jeopardized by the provisions of this bill today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this conference report before us should be voted down overwhelmingly. By its enactment, the Bureau of Reclamation would be undertaking an expanded program which would presumably require new offices and new personnel to serve the additional 31 Eastern States in carrying out this unnecessary duplication of authority. Furthermore, the expansion of the small reclamation projects program into an additional 31 States of the Union would include them in a program of new irrigation development. Such a new program might have far-reaching effects, and I suggest, as others have today, that such an expansion should be considered much more carefully by the Congress before the adoption of such a far-reaching policy change.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will demonstrate the same judgment that it did 10 years ago and prohibit the extension of the small reclamation projects program to all the States of the Union. I urge the Members to vote down this conference report, and I am confident that we will, giving notice to the conferees to strike any provisions to expand the act beyond the original 17 Western States.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

I do not believe any of us here feel more deeply than I do that we need to look after our own country, and all the obligations we have and all the expenditures with which we are faced should not at any time cause us to give less attention to our own country. However, in the present case, there is a great deal more involved than might appear on the surface.

In my opinion, from the start, there has been a desire by the Department of Interior to become the Department for the eastern part of the United States. There has been a constant drive in that direction. If we were to pass this bill and if it becomes law, the Department of Interior as it now stands is not fitted, nor does it have offices, nor does it have any other capacity to know what it is doing in this area. So we would be faced immediately with having to set up an expansion of that Department over the eastern part of the United States and therefore duplicate what we have now in the Corps of Engineers and in the Department of Agriculture.

We just had a little taste of what it means when we get people into an area where they are not experienced. The Congress passed a bill last year—and when I say that, I say it with admiration for my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for whom I have the highest regard, as high as I have for any man in the Congress, and no man has higher standards—but that bill was passed with the best intention approximately a year ago. It permitted charging for the use of certain reservoir facilities, though those in my area would or should have been excluded, for they do not qualify.

Approximately a month or so ago, fees were charged for the right to go down a road on one's own farm, which had been flooded by the Government against the desire of the owner. They started to charge the owner fees—the same type of thing was started elsewhere.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I just want to be sure we understand each other. It was not the Department of Interior that issued those regulations. It was the Corps of Engineers. What the Corps of Engineers proposed was not the intent in the legislation which later became law.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Following the direction of the act as they interpreted it, and they did after it became law, charge the fees.

My friend from Colorado said this was not intended by the act. Relying on his statement, we got a great deal of change in the regulations, and I appreciate his help on it.

But the point is, in carrying out that law, at the instance of the Federal Government, they were doing something they did not know about.

I go back a long way. I was around, and I was before the Democratic Platform Committee in 1952, and I got them to include watershed and flood prevention. The Republicans won that year, and our subcommittee provided $5 million to set up these pilot projects throughout the country, which led to Public Law 566.

Now, I come back to this. If there is a need and a desire for this type program in the eastern part of the United States or other States, other than the 17, it should be put under those departments where personnel and offices and experience are available, and not under an organization that has 17 States, that would like to be national in its scope. It would just be a beginning of the expansion of the Department of the Interior, as a duplicate for other departments.

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

May I ask the gentleman from Colorado, Chairman ASPINALL one question: Can the gentleman in this House give us the names of three persons on the eastern seaboard who have asked for this—just three out of the whole eastern seaboard?

Mr. ASPINALL. I believe we have had requests from individuals of the east. They were not formally before the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. They were not before the committee? What does the gentleman mean by that? Did somebody just whisper that to the gentleman?

Mr. ASPINALL. Just a minute, if the gentleman will yield? When my friend is pointing the finger of neglect, where was he when this legislation was approved without opposition under suspension of the rules procedure in this House?

Mr. COOLEY. That was because we did not have any notice. In fact, the Department of Agriculture had no opportunity to submit its views upon the amendment, expanding the Reclamation

Act throughout the United States, before it was written into the Senate bill by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Under the procedures by which this bill was considered in the House, very few Members were aware that it had been amended in committee to provide for a major territorial extension of authority.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

The point I am making is this: Let us continue to help our friend WAYNE ASPINALL and his committee and the 17 States, but let us not turn the rest of the country over to this department which does not understand it. If we need these programs, let us give them to those areas where we have experienced people, with officers, who know what they are doing.

We do not have the money, the time or the personnel to put the Interior Department all along the eastern part of the United States.

I believe you will help us by voting down this conference report. Thereby we will have more money and more time to help WAYNE with his own section.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I state, as chairman of the committee, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], presents his position here this afternoon, there is no man who is more careful in his presentations before our committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is not a sectional committee but happens to be a national committee and in many respects an international committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is also very careful about the interests of the rest of the United States as he serves upon the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I wish to pay this tribute to him.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank my chairman.

Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it has been a long time since it has been my privilege in the House to listen to as much misinformation as has been given to the Members of the House on a conference report today, though this has been given with all good intention by the people who have spoken against the conference report.

What is involved?

The Small Reclamation Projects Act was passed and has become the law of the land and applies to the 17 Western States. It is forced on nobody. The Interior Department does not set itself up for the handling of water affairs.

By the way, it should be amusing to the Members to hear that the Bureau of Reclamation, which has been handling the water affairs of this country since its establishment in 1902, does not know anything about it, but a bureau which was established in the Department of Agriculture only a few years ago knows all about it. That is rather strange.

The projects which will be authorized under this bill can be anywhere in the United States. How does one go about getting them? No Government agency forces anything upon anyone. If a local community decides it would like to take advantage of this act, known as the Small Reclamation Projects Act, the people get together, and they draft their own engineering, or they may use their own money to ask the Bureau of Reclamation to examine the area and to determine whether or not a project can be built. If their own engineer or the Bureau, through the use of their private financing, agrees that a project can be built for the purposes of the act—the principal one must be reclamation, but it could be for water use or it could be for municipal and industrial water, or it could be for fish and wildlife and recreation and the other things in the act—then they come to the Congress or to the Bureau of Reclamation and ask whether there is sufficient money for them to make an application to be given a grant, to be repaid in accordance with a contract they would enter into with the U.S. Government.

Now, the Secretary of the Interior, on the 12th day of July 1966, just announced the signing of departmentwide agreements with 54 soil and water conservation districts authorized by the Small Watershed Act referred to by the opponents of this bill, bringing the total of such agreements to 386 in the 41 States of the Union.

The other States of the Union outside of the Western States are entitled to this. It is not going to be an economy vote. There is going to be $100 million in this project whether or not it applies to the western States alone or whether it applies to all of the United States.

How would you like to go back home and have somebody campaign against you, you who come from part of the drought-stricken East and drought-stricken South at the present time, and have them look at you and say, "Look, we would like to have some of that money going to the 17 Western States, but you voted against giving us the privilege as American citizens of having that same right that you would have if you lived west of the 98th parallel."

Now, the important thing in the difference between the regular reclamation fund and this fund is that the basic reclamation fund is contributed to by the 17 Western States. That is why it does not apply to all of the United States. But where does the money come from in the small reclamation projects fund? It is a draft on the General Treasury. Now, this bill is going to go through. If this conference report is defeated, the same amount of money will be in it. We will go back to conference and the Senate will say, "We agree there should be $100 million in the project. The House agrees there should be $100 million in the project. However, only those citizens who are fortunate enough to live west of the 98th parallel get any benefit from it, while those who live in the metropolitan East, where most of the people of the United States live, are going to have to use their tax dollars to pay for it, but you citizens are not going to be able to get any benefit out of it."

There is not a Member who represents the East on either side of the aisle who does not have an area at the present time where you have a need for municipal and industrial water, particularly you men who live outside of the large concentrations of people where you have your farmers supplying that area and where they supply not the surplus crops which are worrying the Department of Agriculture but the other crops.

By the way, I wish that the Department of Agriculture would at least be consistent. The Secretary of Agriculture just got through telling everybody that he is getting rid of his surplus food crops which may be in short supply. I never knew that the Department of Agriculture ever came along and supported the so-called row crops since we have gotten rid of supporting potatoes. That is what is involved in supporting this act. The people down in West Virginia, in Virginia, and in the eastern part of the United States, in Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana, need this bill. If they want it, that is. Nobody forces it on them. It will not create any new bureau. It will not create any new group of people that are going to have to be put on the payroll.

The fact of the matter is I can recall when the Small Projects Act was passed. Those who supported it got up and said it would not increase the number of people in the Department of Agriculture. You should see the number of people they have working down there now on this same project.

This will not happen in this area.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I shall be happy to yield to my distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], for whom I have a very high regard, to answer two questions.

Allegations or statements have been made by other speakers. One such allegation or statement which has been made is to the effect that if we approve this conference report, then the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation will expand their personnel and their offices to 31 other States.

Is that an accurate fact or statement or is it not?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is not an accurate statement, because the Bureau of Reclamation only exercises supervisory capacity.

The local people must pay for their own engineering. They can either hire their own engineers and submit their plans, or they can use their own money and give it to the Bureau of Reclamation and ask them to do it.

This has been done in a number of the Western States. It has been done in both ways. However, the only thing that will affect it after a project is built is the supervision of the project; that is all.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield further, well, let me localize it, if I may.

To my knowledge the Bureau of Reclamation does not have any offices in the State of Michigan. I presume we have

a need and probably a desire to have a watershed project of this sort in the State of Michigan. Such office might be obtained under the existing law, Public Law 566.

But if this legislation passes they might exercise their prerogative under this legislation.

Would this mean that the Bureau of Reclamation would then move in with an office in the State of Michigan?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. It does not. We have been assured by the Department of the Interior that the present personnel they have in their district offices are sufficient to take care of all of the needs of this program.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the second question is this: Is this extra $100 million a budgeted item contained in the President's budget submitted in January of this year?

Mr. SAYLOR. This is not a budgeted item.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this is a total authorization for just $100 million. This is not an annual appropriation. No part of this is budgeted in the year 1967 and it is not likely that any will be necessary for fiscal year 1968, although the Department is getting close to the final use of the total funds authorized originally, the $100 million, 10 years ago.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I happen to sit on the Subcommittee on Appropriations which deals with the Bureau of Reclamation.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I say that those in the Bureau of Reclamation do supervise, inspect, and travel to look at all the projects that are presently in operation in the 17 States. They have that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that my friends on this committee would approve a program of making these loans in the other 31 States and at the same time saying there would be no supervision, inspection, or travel to or expenditure on the part of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any of us could go for a program of that type, and may I say in the 17 States they do not handle the operations of these programs in this way.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dominy admitted this year that they have expended more in several instances, far beyond the will of the Congress. They have promised not to do it any more.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot have a program of this nature without someone supervising it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Dominy's testimony was with respect to the Bureau of Reclamation projects. His testimony did not apply to the small reclamation projects.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] upon his fine statement and say that I support this legislation to provide water programs on small streams through the Department of Interior for our Eastern States.

I wish to indicate to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that I have spoken to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] from time to time, urging that this legislation be passed. So there is interest of basic nature in this legislation.

There has been questions raised on the floor of the House today as to whether any interested person from the East has asked for this legislation. Yes, of course, I have consistently been a Member that requested prompt action.

Mr. Speaker, as I represent part of the city of Pittsburgh and surrounding suburbs, with a few farms, one can say, "What interest do you have in such legislation?"

My brother and I operate one of the larger sheep and cattle ranches in southwestern Pennsylvania as a business. We are able to stand the harsh effects of the 4-year drought that has created emergency conditions for our farmers and ranchers in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, but to many small family type farms, this means disaster.

Unless we in the Eastern States have adequate small stream management, as a complete project, it does little good for each farmer, or rancher to try to prevent erosion, and loss of good pasture land because of gouging and course changes due to quick runoff, spring rises of water levels, and flash floods. At present in Greene County, Pa., we just have to let the good bottom pasture land be gouged away, and the land permanently lost for future generations. If the program is not set for the complete small stream complex in this area, there is little use doing anything individually by each farmer or rancher. With individual action, the costs are high, the benefits temporary, so it is just easier to let the land wash away, and buy other land. This is an economic loss and disaster for hilly and mountainous pasture regions like Pennsylvania and West Virginia. I strongly urge this program and worthwhile help for our good hardworking farmers.

My brother and I use 450 to 500 acres and have had 500 head of sheep and cattle. We are eastern ranchers, not farmers, in the good Johnson tradition. From my own personal experience I can say the past 4 years of drought have caused tremendous losses, and have been disastrous to western Pennsylvania and West Virginia farms and ranches. The lack of water has put many small farmers completely out of business.

This legislation will authorize small stream projects for the 50 States, which authorization is already in effect for the 17 Midwestern and Western States.

In view of the extreme drought conditions in the Eastern States over the past 4 years, and in the whole Appalachian region, a vote against this conference report is against a fair share of water assistance for the Appalachian region, and a vote against assisting our farmers in the same way the 17 Midwest and Western States are aided by U.S. programs. This action will not increase the $100 million authorization but will permit eastern farmers and ranchers, as well as all the 50 States, to participate in the U.S. small stream programs, now authorized for only 17 States. We people in the 50 States all pay our taxes for these programs, and it is outrageous that there is discrimination in favor of 17 States, and all States and their taxpaying citizens can not equally participate and benefit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, first of all, for yielding to me and to observe that I think he has been quite fair and generous in the distribution of his time among others of us from three other committees of the House who have very serious reservations about the wisdom of this legislation.

I am not opposed to the Department of the Interior. I think it is doing a marvelous job. I certainly have great respect for the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior [Mr. ASPINALL]. I like the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and I regard him as a good personal friend. So I am certainly not opposed to these gentlemen. But I am opposed to the proposition of putting the Department of the Interior or any other agency in competition with the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture which for 12 long years has done a truly outstanding job in this small watershed-upstream soil conservation-flood protection program. I do not believe that they need any competition or any interference.

I think Public Law 566, enacted back in 1954 by this Congress, is probably one of the outstanding examples of congressional creativity. It was in every sense a bipartisan creation of the Congress. In these 12 years it has done magnificently. It has met with general and universal acceptance all over the country.

Let me remind you that 49 States of our Union have found in these small watershed programs that have been built by the Soil Conservation Service the answer to many of their problems. Forty-three States of our Union have passed some 285 separate statutes enabling them to participate in this program. There have been 2,405 separate applications from that many different little scattered communities all over the country to the Soil

Conservation Service for such programs covering 174 million acres of land. The program has stimulated more than $400 million in local investments in soil and water conservation.

This is not just a flood control program. This program includes irrigation. This program includes sediment and erosion control. This program includes recreation. It includes municipal water supplies. It has been a magnificent success.

I see no reason for bringing in another agency or a superproliferation of additional departmental structures into competition with this agency that has done such a great job—and a great job remains to be done.

The Soil Conservation Service, whenever it goes into an area and builds these little upstream dams, requires the farmers and every landowner to sign an agreement to do those things that will preserve the soil and hold it there, such as terracing their lands and cover cropping their acres so as to hold every inch of that topsoil in place. I do not think you can approach these problems on a scatter-gun basis. I do not think it is wise. I do not think it is wise, since we have done so well, to go into another additional and in some ways competitive program, which is not, to the best of my knowledge, required.

So I submit that the conference report should be rejected and voted down.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I appear chiefly to express a different opinion from that of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and do not agree that this extension of coverage represents any threat to the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture or the Committee on Agriculture.

Also in reference to the gentleman from Florida, and his argument that this $100 million represents a violation of President Johnson's admonition against Congress adding expenditure programs. The conference report represents an authorization—not an appropriation—and it does have administration support through the Interior Department. As a matter of fact the Secretary of Agriculture is not opposing the authorization. The only argument is about the amendment to the original bill which was put in by the very able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to extend this program outside the 17 so-called reclamation States.

There has been talk of duplication. If there is any duplication in here perhaps the Small Watershed Protection Act should be abolished because as I understand it that was enacted after the Small Projects Act was put into being and was justified on a basis of providing a different type of program. This must be true because currently both programs are operating well side by side in the Western States.

I have a 10-page memorandum here distinguishing between them and it shows that they do not duplicate each other. The Watershed Protection Act is primarily a soil conservation act and the Small Projects Act is a water conservation act. I do not see how anyone from the East could deny to their rural and urban residents these same privileges that we have in the West of having both programs which complement each other rather than duplicating each other.

The simple fact is that the Watershed Protection Act does not reach the same problems that are reached by the Small Projects Act. That is precisely the reason that they were both approved by the Congress and the reason that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], secured this amendment of the basic Small Projects Act. He wants to put all States on a par with these Western States. The issue of money has no relevance here. The $100 million authorization has no relationship whatsoever to the extension of the program to the Eastern States. The $100 million authorization will be granted regardless of whether or not the program is extended to the Eastern States.

Do not deprive the Eastern States of the same privilege we have in the West. Furthermore, do not deprive Western States of an authorization which is desperately needed as quickly as possible. I have two water projects, the whole future of which depend upon early enactment of this legislation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, may I be advised of the time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Conservation of the Committee on Agriculture, I rise in opposition to this report, and hope that it will be defeated.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, having only a brief time, I wish to make a few observations. It is strange to me that this great committee should bring this conference report before the House with this objectionable feature in it. I asked the chairman to name me three men on the eastern seaboard who had asked for this legislation, and who wanted this legislation. He could not name one.

You did not have hearings. You did not give the Secretary of Agriculture a Chinaman's chance to come before the committee and present his view.

Because of the procedures under which this bill was handled in the House, I first became aware of the amendment, extending to all the 50 States the authority of the Small Reclamation Project Act, when I received a copy of the Secretary of Agriculture's letter of May 5, 1966, to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The letter appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, 1966, page 13456.

In this letter, which has the Bureau of the Budget's approval, the Secretary of Agriculture voices his strong opposition to the extension of this authority and documents the reasons therefor.

In answer to questions raised here, I quote from the letter:

> The Bureau of Reclamation would be required to set up new offices and new personnel to serve the 31 eastern States to carry out this duplication of authority irrespective of the need for increased agricultural production.

This is the Secretary of Agriculture speaking. He has not endorsed this bill. He has not been given the courtesy of an invitation to come before the committee.

This issue before us today was thoroughly thrashed out in the Congress more than 10 years ago. I think it was properly settled at that time. Now the conference report on S. 602 proposes to reverse this previous action of the Congress. Since I was a part of this previous action, I would like to review briefly the legislative history in 1955 on this point.

On April 27, 1955, Representative Engle introduced H.R. 5881 which would supplement the Federal reclamation laws to authorize the Secretary of Interior to provide Federal assistance in the development of small reclamation projects by non-Federal organizations in all 48 States and the then territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

On May 4, 1955, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported Mr. Engle's bill.

On May 26, 1955, H.R. 5881 was debated on the floor of the House. An amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama provided that the Secretary of Interior would furnish assistance under the bill in the 17 western reclamation States, and that the Secretary of Agriculture would furnish the assistance authorized by the bill in the 31 Eastern States and Hawaii and Alaska.

Opposition was expressed vigorously in debate, to making the reclamation program of the Interior Department nationwide. In this debate I said, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1955:

> I will vote for the Jones amendment and I will vote against the bill if the Jones amendment is not adopted. The gentleman will say to the House that unless we adopt the Jones amendment the Interior Department will be extended into 31 additional States.

The House adopted the Jones amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is ample proof that this body did give careful consideration to extending the authority of this act to all the States, and after thorough debate, rejected the proposal.

My conviction remains the same now as in 1955. I have quoted from the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, agreeing with my position.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am not a great friend or supporter of the Secretary of Agriculture. Therefore I would like

to ask the gentleman this question: Is there any evidence that the Secretary of the Interior would agree with the quotation just read of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. COOLEY. I have no idea what the Secretary of the Interior would agree to, but I imagine that he approved this in the committee. Here you come out *with the Secretary* of Agriculture, for whom I have a great respect, saying that you would have to open up new offices in Michigan. You would have to employ new personnel all over these 31 Eastern States. I do not know of anyone on the eastern seaboard who has asked for this. Why should it be given to us when we are not asking for it?

I ask that the conference report be rejected.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Reclamation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 4 minutes.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Texas can tell the House what will happen if this conference report is rejected?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The chances are that if the conference report is rejected on the grounds that are being argued here, all of the money contained in the bill will be available to the 17 Western States. All of the Eastern States will be barred from participating in the program.

I am at a loss to understand the logic advanced by the Members in the debate here today. The Small Reclamation Projects Act is presently applicable to the 17 western reclamation States. The committee felt that if the Eastern States wanted to participate in this excellent program, they should be permitted to do so, and included the Eastern States in the bill. This was agreed upon in the conference report. If this conference report is adopted, all of the States in the United States would be eligible to participate in the program. In other words, the amount of money available for this program would be available to all of the States. If the conference report is rejected it means that all of this money contained in the program would be available to only 17 States in the western part of the United States.

Members from the Eastern States have been grossly misled by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. From the contents of Mr. Freeman's remarks, he too has been grossly misled by someone. The argument of Mr. Freeman that adoption of this conference report would jeopardize the Small Watersheds Act is completely falacious. The only reason that I can imagine for the opposition by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers is one based upon power to control water development in the eastern portion of the United States. Do Secretary Freeman and the Corps of Engineers fear that they will not be able to dictate to easterners the water programs in which they will be allowed to participate?

Any Member who votes to reject this conference report is voting to bar those citizens living outside of the reclamation-State area from participating in the Small Reclamation Projects Act. They will be voting to confine any water development of this Nation to the discretion of the Corps of Engineers and the Secretary of Agriculture.

The programs handled by these two named Departments are also applicable in the reclamation States. Hence, the reclamation States have three programs of this type in which they can participate. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs simply agreed to let the people in the other part of the United States increase their opportunities to obtain water relief from two chances to three. There is no increase in the amount of money involved, and there is no increase in the amount of operational expense involved.

Speaking from a selfish standpoint, it would be to the benefit of the reclamation States—one of which I come from, to wit, Texas—that this conference report be rejected so that more money would be available to these Western States. However, a battle has been fought for a long time under the able leadership of my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, to include the Eastern States in this program. He has at last succeeded in accomplishing this result, and I might say that I helped him. We in the reclamation States do not wish to deny to those in the Eastern States the right to participate in good programs.

The people in the Eastern States have one issue involved. They have the right to participate equally with the 17 western reclamation States in an excellent program that makes it possible for local groups to help meet their water needs. If they do not want this additional opportunity, they certainly do not have to take it. This is the only issue involved and it is the decision that will be made today.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Will the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Speaker, give us an example of an operation of a $100 million program that would not require the operation of local offices?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The program is already in effect and it is a local program. It is not a program of construction, or operation, or anything else. It is simply a loan program. There may need to be a few additional employees to process loan applications and make inspections. We are taking in 33 additional States in a going program, already staffed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would think the gentleman from Texas has a fancy imagination, if he figures he will not have local offices.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 602 and urge the House to adopt the conference report. This bill to amend the Small Reclamation Act of 1956 is very much needed to continue and expand the good work which has been accomplished in a cooperative effort between local agencies and the Federal Government over the past 10 years.

This program successfully compliments the regular reclamation program which is basically designed to larger, more complex and costly development of our water resources. This act has stimulated and encouraged many small communities in developing supplemental water for irrigation. It has made it possible for many areas to move forward economically.

Agriculture in Idaho depends, to a large extent, upon the storage and diversion of water from streams to the arid lands. It is necessary to provide small storage reservoirs in some localities to store the spring runoff for use on the farms. This program has been of special assistance to those not in the larger drainage areas and basins where water is more readily and easily conserved.

This act over the past years has permitted local agencies to develop plans and to construct facilities to improve the water supply. And I am pleased to report that economically this has been justified. Basically, this is a loan program under which loans are advanced to local districts and then repaid to the Federal Government from the proceeds received from the benefits of the project. It is my understanding that more than 95 percent of the money used has been in the form of loans and that there has not been a single default or delinquent account. This is a spendid record and I support the continuation of this program and urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the arguments pro and con this afternoon and have decided to, and will, support the conference report.

I do not consider a negative vote on this report to be a vote for economy. The needs of this country in the fields of reclamation will not be met for a long, long time. We cannot have too much water, as drought-stricken area after drought-stricken area now know. The 100 million authority will be needed. The question is simply whether the benefits thereof will be limited to the 17 Western States or shared by the country as a whole. These funds do not come out of the reclamation fund but from a general draft on the Treasury. I suppose from an absolutely selfish standpoint I should oppose the report because extending the benefits of this act into States other than my own and the other 16 in the West will, to a cer-

tain extent, deplete the amount available for projects in my own State.

I do not believe, however, we can take such a provincial view of the water needs of this country. Neither do I believe, from the standpoint of self-interest, we should do so. The Northwest is very proud of its water resources. Our entire congressional delegation has very jealously been guarding the waters of the Columbia River which we will need for our future development. If we are to be able to use and develop what we have and need, we must not deny to others that same right. I therefore am pleased to support the conferees on this matter.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASPINALL) there were—ayes 57, noes 46.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 136, nays 204, answered "present" 1, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—136

Adams
Albert
Annunzio
Aspinall
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Bingham
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Clarence J., Jr.
Burke
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Carey
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Donohue
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Giaimo
Grabowski
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hawkins
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kupferman
Laird
Langen
Love
McDade
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Moorhead
Morris
Morse
Morton
Moss
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Philbin
Pool
Price
Race
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stratton
Taylor
Thomas
Tunney
Tupper
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
White, Tex.
Widnall
Wolff
Wyatt

NAYS—204

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Bandstra
Belcher
Betts
Blatnik
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Callan
Callaway
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cooley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fino
Fogarty
Fountain
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gettys
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Gross
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Iowa
Hardy
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Horton
Howard
Hull
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Okla.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDowell
McEwen
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias
Matthews
Michel
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roudebush
Roush
Satterfield
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Secrest
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stanton
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Watson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Dow

NOT VOTING—91

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Baring
Beckworth
Boggs
Burton, Calif.
Cabell
Cahill
Celler
Chelf
Conyers
Corbett
Craley
Curtis
Dague
Dawson
Delaney
Dingell
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Farbstein
Farnsley
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Gathings
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen, Wash.
Hébert
Henderson
Hungate
Irwin
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Leggett
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Macdonald
Mackie
Madden
Martin, Ala.
Miller
Mills
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Morgan
Morrison
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
O'Brien
Powell
Redlin
Roberts
Roncalio
St Germain
St. Onge
Scott
Senner
Sickles
Staggers
Stephens
Sweeney
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Toll
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Watkins
Whalley
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler

So the conference report was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sweeney for, with Mr. Tuten against.

Mr. Miller for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Burton of California for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Martin of Alabama against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. O'Brien with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Gallagher with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Evans with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Moeller.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Willis.

Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Toll.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.

Mr. Sickles with Mr. St Germain.

Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Farnsley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Redlin with Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Monagan with Mrs. Mink.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Todd.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Gibbons.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Hungate with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Mackie.

Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. VIVIAN, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. BETTS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. BRAY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. DOW changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1748)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration the sum of $5,000,419,000, as follows:

"(a) For 'Research and development,' $4,248,600,000, for the following programs:

"(1) Gemini, $40,600,000;

"(2) Apollo $2,974,200,000;

"(3) Advanced missions, $8,000,000;

"(4) Physics and astronomy, $129,900,000;

"(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $210,900,000;

"(6) Bioscience, $35,400,000;

"(7) Meteorological satellites, $43,600,000;

"(8) Communication and applications technology satellites, $26,400,000;

"(9) Launch vehicle development, $33,700,000;

"(10) Launch vehicle procurement, $142,750,000;

"(11) Space vehicle systems, $36,000,000;

"(12) Electronics systems, $36,800,000;

"(13) Human factor systems, $17,000,000;

"(14) Basic research, $23,000,000;

"(15) Space power and electric propulsion systems, $44,500,000;

"(16) Nuclear rockets, $53,000,000;

"(17) Chemical propulsion, $41,000,000;

"(18) Aeronautics, $35,000,000;

"(19) Tracking and data acquisition, $270,850,000;

"(20) Sustaining university program, $41,000,000;

"(21) Technology utilization, $5,000,000.

"(b) For 'Construction of facilities,' including land acquisitions, $95,919,000, as follows:

"(1) Electronics Research Center, Cambridge, Massachusetts, $7,500,000;

"(2) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $710,000;

"(3) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $350,000;

"(4) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, $37,876,000;

"(5) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $6,100,000;

"(6) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland and Sandusky, Ohio, $16,000,000;

"(7) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $12,800,000;

"(8) Michoud Assembly Facility, New Orleans and Slidell, Louisiana, $700,000;

"(9) Mississippi Test Facility, Mississippi, $1,700,000;

"(10) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $205,000;

"(11) Various locations, $6,478,000;

"(12) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $5,500,000.

"(c) For 'Administrative operations,' $655,900,000.

"(d) Appropriations for 'Research and development' may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for 'Research and development' pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

"(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for 'Research and development' or for 'Construction of facilities' may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the 'Administrative operations' appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

"(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

"(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

"(h) When so specified in an appropriation Act, any appropriation authorized under this Act to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may initially be used, during the fiscal year 1967, to finance work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Administration and appropriate adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

"SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11), of subsection 1(b) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed a total of $90,419,000.

"SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the 'Construction of facilities' appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (12) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

"(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

"(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

"(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

"SEC. 5. It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

"SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the 'National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1967.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
EMILIO Q. DADDARIO,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
JAMES G. FULTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STUART SYMINGTON,
JOHN STENNIS,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
LEN B. JORDAN,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14324) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituted new language. The committee of conference agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain amendments proposed by the managers on the part of the House.

The differences are explained as follows:

For fiscal year 1967, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested authorization in the amount of $5,012,000,000. The House reduced this request to $4,986,864,150.

The total appropriations authorized by the Senate amendment were $5,008,000,000. This represented an increase over the House bill of $21,135,850. As a result of the conference the total amount of appropriations to be authorized was adjusted to $5,000,419,000. To this sum, the managers on the part of the House agreed.

(1) For "Research and Development," the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested $4,246,600,000. The House increased the amount to be authorized to $4,248,235,000. The Senate action on the bill resulted in an authorization of $4,248,600,000. The conferees agreed to a total to be authorized for research and development of $4,248,600,000 by effecting adjustments to the Senate amendment as follows:

(a) NASA requested a total of $131,400,000 for the Physics and Astronomy Program. The House reduced this amount by $4,500,000 representing reductions of $3,000,000 in Supporting Research and Technology/Advanced Studies, and $1,500,000 in the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory Project. The Senate restored the full amount of the House reduction.

The House reduction of $3,000,000 in SR&T/AS was made in order to make available additional funds for the unmanned exploration of Mars.

The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the Senate restoration of $3,000,000 in the SR&T/AS account, since information has been received from NASA that, due to the passage of time, one of the purposes for which these funds had been redesignated by the House could not be accomplished, specifically, the incorporation of an instrumented probe in the 1969 Mars Mariner spacecraft. NASA officials have stated that the date has passed when it would be possible to begin development of such a capsule so as to meet the launch date early in 1969.

The House reduction of $1,500,000 in the OAO Project, the amount earmarked by NASA for development of the fifth OAO spacecraft was based upon the views that there is no overriding urgency in pursuing this mission. The reduction provides for a deferral of initiation of development of the fifth OAO spacecraft for at least one year. The Senate, while agreeing with the House that work on the fifth OAO mission should be deferred, restored the House reduction so as to provide NASA with flexibility.

The Senate receded and agreed to the House reduction of $1,500,000 in this project. The managers on the part of both the House and the Senate agreed to the deferral of the fifth OAO spacecraft.

(b) NASA requested a total of $197,900,000 for the Lunar and Planetary Program. The House increased this request by a net amount of $30,000,000. An additional $22,000,000 was designated for the Voyager project, and a net increase of $8,000,000 was earmarked for the Mariner project. The $8,000,000 increase in Mariner represented a reduction of $12,000,000 by elimination of the 1967 Venus mission, and an increase of $20,000,000 for initiation of development of an instrumented probe to be incorporated in the 1969 Mars Mariner spacecraft.

Regarding the House increase of $22,000,000 over and above the NASA request of $10,000,000 for the Voyager program, the House took the position that the expenditure of relatively modest amounts of additional money in fundamental preliminary work during these early years would contribute to the success of the project and could save vastly larger sums during the period of hardware procurement toward the end of this decade.

The Senate restored the authorization for Voyager to the amount of the original NASA request, i.e., $10,000,000.

In view of the magnitude and complexity of the Voyager undertaking, however, and the desirability of making the best use of the additional time now available, the managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to a $13,000,000 increase above the NASA request. Accordingly, NASA is authorized a total of $23,000,000 for the Voyager project in FY 1967.

Regarding the Mariner Project, the House declined to authorize the 1967 mission to Venus on grounds that it had been hastily conceived and represented a solitary effort unaccompanied by any plans for later missions. Moreover, since NASA had placed priority on the exploration of Mars, the House took the position that funds requested by NASA for expenditure on the 1967 Venus mission might better be applied to the Mars Mariner and Voyager projects.

The Senate restored the full amount of the House reduction and authorized the 1967 Venus mission.

The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed that since a substantial investment has already been made in development of the spacecraft and experiments for the 1967 Venus mission, and that most of these funds would be unrecoverable in the event of cancellation, the NASA request should be authorized in full and the mission approved.

The Conferees noted, however, that NASA's plans for the continuing long-term exploration of Venus have not been fully developed, nor has NASA presented even preliminary plans for the scrutiny of the Congress and the scientific community. Such plans are necessary to a full understanding of the meaningful alternatives and options available to the nation in the conduct of a significant scientific program of planetary exploration. The managers on the part of the House and Senate agreed that NASA should, therefore, transmit to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate not later than September 1, 1966, a full report on the alternative approaches deemed scientifically, technically, and fiscally feasible for acquiring fundamental knowledge about the planet Venus. The report should cover the current state of knowledge and theory, the role of the Mariner 1967 mission in advancement of that knowledge, and, based upon expected or probable findings from that mission, the various program alternatives for a continuing effort in the exploration of Venus. The relationship of Venus exploration to that of other planets should be defined in terms of opportunities and scientific priorities as well as of technical mission possibilities. Cost and schedule projections for the various alternatives should be developed in order to permit thorough evaluation by the Congress of the program options. Careful and detailed planning is imperative if the nation is to reap the maximum gains in terms of science and technology from its program of unmanned planetary exploration.

The House increased by $20,000,000 the NASA Fiscal Year 1967 request for funds to underwrite the 1969 Mars Mariner mission. The additional funds were specifically designated for initiation of development of an instrumented probe to be incorporated in the spacecraft for the purpose of making direct measurements in the Martian atmosphere. Expert testimony had been received by the House committee to the effect that such a modification to the 1969 Mars Mariner mission would produce extremely valuable scientific and engineering data which would contribute directly to the success of the Voyager project.

The Senate restored the authorization for the 1969 Mars Mariner project to the amount of the original NASA request.

The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to reduce the authorization for the 1969 Mars Mariner project to the original NASA request on the basis that there is general agreement that time no longer permits the accomplishment of the proposed development of an instrumented probe for incorporation in the 1969 Mars Mariner spacecraft.

(c) NASA requested $14,700,000 for Supporting Research and Technology in the Bioscience program. The House reduced this amount by $2,000,000 in order to make available additional funds for the unmanned exploration of Mars. The Senate restored the full amount of the House reduction.

The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the restoration, since information has been received from NASA that, due to the passage of time, one of the purposes for which these funds had been redesignated by the House could not be accomplished, specifically, the incorporation of an instrumented probe in the 1969 Mars Mariner spacecraft.

(d) NASA requested a total of $152,000,000 for the Launch Vehicle Procurement Program. The House reduced this amount by $20,000,000 representing reductions in the following categories:

(1) A $10,000,000 across-the-board reduction in view of substantial carryovers in unobligated funds year after year in the Launch Vehicle Procurement account.

(2) A $6,000,000 reduction representing the amount requested by NASA for purchase of an Atlas-Agena launch vehicle for the 1967 Venus Mariner mission. The House eliminated the Venus mission, hence there would be no need for the launch vehicle.

(3) A reduction of $4,000,000 in the NASA request of $14,000,000 for sustaining engineering and maintenance associated with the Centaur launch vehicle. The House took the position that SEM funds are used to upgrade reliability or improve performance capabilities of developed launch vehicles; Centaur is still an undeveloped vehicle for

which substantial amounts have been requested under the Launch Vehicle Development Program.

The Senate restored the entire $20,000,000 House reduction.

The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed upon an across-the-board reduction of $5,250,000 in the Launch Vehicle Procurement account.

The managers on the part of the House receded and agreed to the $6,000,000 restoration for the purchase of an Atlas-Agena vehicle to be used in the 1967 Venus mission which has been authorized by the Conference Committee.

The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to the $4,000,000 reduction in Centaur SEM funds.

(e) NASA requested $42,500,000 for Space Power and Electric Propulsion Systems. The House bill increased this amount by $2,400,000, which was to be used for an increased component testing program for the SNAP-8 nuclear electric generator. The Senate bill denied this increase; however, the managers on the part of the Senate agreed to an increase of $2.0 million on this item. The final authorization for Space Power and Electric Propulsion Systems is $44,500,000.

(f) The NASA request for Chemical Propulsion Research was $37,000,000. That amount included $3.5 million for the continued development of the 260-inch solid propellant booster. The House bill provided an increase of $7.5 million for the project, or a total of $11 million, which would speed development and would provide for a full-length firing rather than a NASA proposed one-half length firing. The Senate amendment denied this increase and agreed with the NASA request and proposal. Although our limited propulsion capability has been a major factor in the progress of our Nation's space program to date and although solid propulsion technology has the potential of providing a safer, more versatile and more economical booster than other boosters under development, the managers on the part of the Senate would not agree to the increased funding authorized by the House. The compromise position finally agreed upon was $4.0 million additional for the project. This amount will allow NASA to initiate procurement of the long lead time items such as the nozzle, the steel case and facility modifications so that a full-length firing can be conducted within approximately 18 months.

The managers on the part of the House are concerned that NASA is not aggressively pursuing the development of large solid propellant boosters, despite the fact that the House has expressed a sense of urgency for the vigorous prosecution of large solid propellant technology. The House has also provided additional authorization in prior years and has continued to press NASA to accelerate significantly the pace of that program to realize the potential inherent in large booster system. The total amount authorized for Chemical Propulsion is $41,000,000.

(g) NASA requested $279,300,000 for Tracking and Data Acquisition. The House bill reduced this amount by $13,965,000. The Senate amendment restored the full amount. The Senate receded from their position and the Conferees compromised by agreeing to restore $5.515 million. The total authorization is, therefore, $270,850,000.

(h) The NASA request for Technology Utilization was $4,800,000. The House bill increased this amount by $200,000 to provide an increased flow of new technology to the private sector of our industry, particularly to small business. The Senate amendment denied this increase. The managers on the part of the Senate receded on this item resulting in a final authorization of $5,000,000.

(2) For Construction of Facilities, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested $101,500,000 for fiscal year 1967. The House approved $94,419,000. The Senate restored $6,081,000, authorizing a total of $100,500,000. In conference, the Senate receded and agreed to a total amount of $95,919,000 to be authorized. Adjustments to the Senate amendment were as follows:

(a) NASA requested $10,000,000 for the Electronics Research Center to construct two buildings and center support facilities. The House reduced the request to $5 million since the prior authorizations for FY 1965 or FY 1966 had not been obligated. The Senate restored the FY 1967 budget request in full. In consideration of limited progress to date in site acquisition, the managers on the part of the Senate receded to a total of $7,500,000 for facilities which will permit NASA to proceed with an integral construction unit of one of the two new buildings, plus center support facilities, along with the previously authorized construction.

(b) For the Manned Spacecraft Center, NASA requested $13,800,000 including $9,100,000 for a Lunar Receiving Laboratory. The House approved this amount for the Lunar Receiving Laboratory; the Senate reduced it by $1,000,000. The managers on the part of the House receded to the Senate figure, making the total authorization for the Manned Spacecraft Center $12,800,000.

(c) NASA requested $581,000 for the Marshall Space Flight Center for an addition to the new Hazardous Operations Laboratory. The House deleted the item for the reason that the proposed extension of the laboratory was not needed for on-going programs. The Senate restored it, but in conference the Senate managers receded to the House position, deleting the entire amount of $581,000.

(d) For Facility Planning and Design NASA requested $7,000,000. The House reduced this by $1,500,000 in view of remaining unfunded balances from prior years' authorization for this work. The Senate restored the full budget request, but in conference the Senate managers receded to the House position.

(3) For Administrative Operations, NASA requested authorization in the amount of $663,900,000. The House approved $644,210,150, effecting a reduction of $19,689,850 in the NASA request. The Senate restored $14,689,850, approving $658,900,000. The Senate also included restrictive language in the bill by: dividing the total authorized into two categories—"personnel compensation and benefits, $397,444,000", and "other expenses, $261,456,000"; adding section 3b which would limit the extent of transfer authority into "personnel compensation and benefits" to 1% ($3.97 million); adding section 3c which would limit the extent of transfer into "other expenses" to 10% ($26.1 million); and striking from section 4 the authority to transfer funds into the Administrative Operations account. The managers on the part of the Senate receded and agreed to strike all restrictive language and further receded to a net reduction of $8,000,000, resulting in a total amount for Administrative Operations of $655,900,000.

(4) Section 5—Architect-Engineer Fees.—The House receded from its proposal to include a new Section 5 which would permit NASA to waive the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2306(d) regarding limitations on architect-engineer fees.

The Conferees noted that the Comptroller General had on April 20, 1966, at the request of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House, initiated a government-wide study of the interpretations and applications of the six percent limitation imposed by various statutes on architect-engineer contracts. The Conferees agreed that the study, as proposed by the House, should be continued to completion by the GAO in lieu of a separate study by the Bureau of the Budget as proposed by the Senate.

In view of this, the Conferees agreed that any legislative action deemed necessary for NASA in this regard should await the results of this study scheduled for completion by January 1, 1967, and until such date with respect to this limitation, the Comptroller General should not take exception to or disallow as unlawful, costs incurred by NASA for research, development or engineering activities required for the establishment of design criteria or development of design concepts involving the use of nuclear energy or other advanced and unusual technology provided that in contracting for such activities NASA is consistent with practices and procedures established by the Department of Defense for similar work.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
KEN HECHLER,
JOSEPH KARTH,
EMILIO Q. DADDARIO,
JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
JAMES G. FULTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, this statement and the report were printed in the RECORD yesterday. The bill when it passed the House was thoroughly debated. There were few votes against it in the House and very few votes against it in the Senate. It is the attitude of the committee to have little debate on it but answer any questions that Members might have and get through with the conference report as quickly as possible. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with and it be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Texas in asking that this conference report be passed. There is very little difference between the House version and the Senate version. The Conference resulted in a reduced amount from what the Senate wanted. We have an increase in the solid fuel and higher energy fuel sections as well as in nuclear power development. I believe this report should be passed.

Before discussing the report, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention that the Gemini 10 spacecraft carrying Astronauts John W. Young and Michael Collins is scheduled to splash down in the Atlantic this evening at 5:07 p.m. eastern daylight time, some 300 miles east of Cape Kennedy. We all want to welcome them home. Astronauts Young and Collins deserve the sincere congratulations of the American people for their excellent performance on one of the most complex manned space flight missions to date.

This mission started on July 18 with the flawless dual countdowns of the Atlas Agena target vehicle and the Gemini

Titan rocket. With perfect timing, the Gemini 10 launch vehicle was launched during an extremely short "window" of about 35 seconds in order that the Gemini 10 would be capable of rendezvousing and docking with the Agena target vehicle in the most expeditious manner. This rendezvous was in fact accomplished on Monday evening, during the first day of the flight.

Subsequently, the astronauts activated the Agena primary propulsion system and conducted a series of orbital changes in order to position the spacecraft for later rendezvous with the Agena 8. As you may remember, the Agena 8 rocket has been passively orbiting in space since it was launched March 16, 1966.

While achieving a new altitude record of 413 nautical miles for man-in-space, the spacecraft disengaged from the Agena 10 target vehicle and maneuvered to within a few feet of the Agena 8. At this time, Astronaut Collins left the spacecraft to perform certain planned extravehicular activities, and became the first man to touch another spacecraft while orbiting in space.

In future flights we will witness with increasing frequency the ability of man to work in the hostile environment of space. In time, this capability will enable the United States to assemble and repair orbiting spacecraft, and thereby provide the means of extending the frontiers of space.

Our Committee on Science and Astronautics worked hard on this report and we have kept it within a few million dollars of our figures. As you know, under "TIGER" TEAGUE'S leadership on the manned space flight, we on that subcommittee have followed this program very carefully.

Mr. Speaker, on May 5 last, the Committee on Science and Astronautics brought to the floor of the House the results of its deliberations on H.R. 14324, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act, 1967. The committee report, filed with the bill, was the culmination of 6 weeks of intensive hearings on NASA's request of $5,012 million for new authorization for fiscal year 1967. We looked at this program in depth, and by unanimous vote within the committee, brought before this body a modified bill totalling $4,986,864,150, or $25,135,850 less than NASA's request.

Following passage by the House, the Senate passed its version, which restored all but $4 million of the NASA request, and in so doing took issue with the House on many of its findings. Thus, the duly appointed members of the committee of conference embarked on a series of meetings to resolve the differences in the actions of the two legislative bodies.

It is interesting to note that of the difference of $21,135,850 between the House and Senate passed versions of the bill, the major monetary differences occurred in the smaller elements of the authorization bill—construction of facilities, and administrative operations. The differences were $6.1 million in construction of facilities and $14.7 million in administrative operations. The total amounts involved in these two segments of the bill represent only 13.2 percent of the overall request.

Research and development, which represents over 86 percent of the total money in the bill, or almost $5 billion, passed the House and the Senate with a difference of only $365,000. While the difference in research and development was relatively insignificant, major program issues were involved, such as the Mariner-Venus, the Mariner Mars, the 260-inch solid propellant booster, and the Snap-8 nuclear electric generator projects.

As you are all aware, under House parliamentary rule, the managers on the part of the House are bound in conference by the upper and lower limits of amounts approved by either body, despite action by the Senate to strike all after the enacting clause. Thus, our task in conference was arduous, particularly in the research and development segment of the bill.

The actions taken by the conferees in arriving at an agreed conference on the NASA authorization bill are included in detail in the conference report before you in the amount of $5,000,419,000. It is not necessary for me to repeat information contained therein since the report covers an account of the efforts over a period of weeks leading to this conference report, both in the Science and Astronautics Committee and in the conference committee.

There are points that I should like to emphasize with regard to this year's NASA bill:

The House receded from its position with regard to striking from the bill the moneys for the Marine-Venus probe. I am still of the opinion that it is a needed exploration mission, but the planning has not been well ordered, is a last minute makeshift effort and without a suitable follow-on program. The Mariner-Venus mission was added to the 1967 program to fill a void caused by the deferral of the Voyager program. The Congress has every right to expect carefully conceived long-range plans for planetary exploration on the part of NASA. Our House Science and Astronautics Committee is correct in pointing out the deficiency in the planning for the 1967 Mariner-Venus flight. The Mariner-Venus 1967 project can hardly be considered a well-planned mission.

As the strong proponent of Mariner-Venus I and II flights I am pleased they have been made, and that Venus II was so successful. However, Mariner I failed because of human error. Let NASA take counsel and heed the warning that the Congress will not accept inadequate planning of this nature.

The Voyager project is probably the most ambitious unmanned effort undertaken by NASA to date. Yet the 1967 request only included $10 million which, in my opinion, is barely enough to keep a project of this nature which will ultimately cost over $3 billion, "warm." In the lunar and planetary exploration area we have witnessed such amazingly successful scientific experiments as the Ranger and Mariner projects as well as the most recent Surveyor soft landing on the moon. These projects have experienced huge cost overruns, and program slippages of from 2 to 3 years. These program deficiencies can be attributed to a lack of adequate prior planning.

The House added $22 million to the NASA request of $10 million for fiscal year 1967 as a move to provide additional money for fundamental preliminary work during these early years in the Voyager program. This will hopefully avoid program slippages and cost overruns by the earlier identification and definition of problem areas, thereby avoiding costly mistakes. While the Senate did not endorse this philosophy the House prevailed to the extent that $13 million was added to the NASA request, making available $23 million for Voyager in fiscal year 1967.

I have always been a strong proponent of research and development of big boosters, higher energy fuel technology, solid fuels, and necessary technology for advancing structures, equipment, components, guidance and control systems. We must emphasize fuels with high specific impulse, long duration use, and space storability. To support my convictions in this regard I include in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post of July 20, 1966, which clearly shows the absolute and immediate need for research and development of fuels for space travel:

DUAL LINKUP ACHIEVED BY GEMINI 10—BUT SPACE WALK IS ENDED EARLY TO SAVE FUEL

(By J. V. Reistrup)

CAPE KENNEDY, July 20.—Astronauts John W. Young and Michael Collins caught up with the dead agena 8 rocket tonight but the successful rendezvous had used so much fuel that Collins had to cut his space walk short.

The astronauts and the men supporting them on the ground were shaving it so close that by the time Young had finished a maneuver to a lower orbit late tonight, to get ready for re-entry into the earth's atmosphere Thursday, he had used all the propellant in his main tanks and was down to about 20 pounds in the auxiliary tanks.

Re-entry itself is achieved with a separate system, which has plenty of propellant.

As it was, the rendezvous came by a hair's breadth. Final maneuvers to achieve it used up all the fuel allowed.

Command pilot Young then had to use more of that precious propellant to hold his Gemini 10 spacecraft close to the spent rocket. At 7:29 p.m. (EDT) ground control sent word from Flight Director Christopher Columbus Kraft:

"No more fuel."

"Come back in the house," Young told Collins. Collins came in, rested a while and closed his hatch at 7:40 p.m., 38 minutes after he had opened it and moved out.

In that time the spacecraft had traveled from the northwest coast of Australia to the Gulf of Mexico.

The astronauts had carried out the first dual rendezvous in space by catching the Agena 8 launched last March but now completely out of fuel.

The first rendezvous of the flight came Monday when Gemini 10 sought out a live Agena 10 rocket launched earlier that day. But Young had used an unexpectedly large amount of propellant to get there and some of the activities planned for the flight had to be called off to conserve fuel.

Today space officials decided to go ahead anyway with the second Rendezvous and Collins' space walk if Young conserved enough

propellant needed to get into position for splashdown Thursday.

The Agena 10, with plenty of fuel had brought them fairly close to Agena 8. But they then needed to perform more precise maneuvering than the rocket could achieve and they had to be able to see better than they could when docked to the rocket. So they separated from it.

Just after 6 tonight, Gemini 10 fired its thrusters to sail within only 700 or 800 feet from Agena 8.

"Fantastic," said a controller from the ground.

"I don't believe it myself," said command pilot Young.

The maneuver had brought the amount of propellant aboard Gemini 10 down to 190 pounds. The cutoff point set by space officials was about 130.

The astronauts reported that Agena 8 was not tumbling on its flight through space. This removed a big worry as to whether Collins would be able to visit the dead rocket as planned.

Command pilot Young fired his thrusters again in the final maneuvering toward rendezvous. Shortly before 7 p.m., space officials reported Gemini 10 holding a position 50 feet from Agena 8. At 7:02 Collins opened his hatch and climbed out.

On the ground, space officials conferred on the fuel problem. They decided that Young had reached the limit but authorized Collins to go ahead with his space walk. They instructed Young to keep them advised on fuel use.

Protected by seven extra layers of aluminized material on his space suit and attached to Gemini 10 by a 50-foot tether, he used a hand-held maneuvering unit to move over to Agena 8.

There he picked up a micrometeorite collection box. In the process, he said, he dropped his hand-held still camera "I'm sorry to say."

He reported to Young that the nose of the Agena was loose and he did not want to get fouled up in it, so he would not go around to the other side of the target as planned. Young told him to come back to the spacecraft and he was unable to leave a new micrometeorite box on the dead rocket as planned.

Young had used Gemini's thrusters to hold it near the target rocket, coming as close as several inches from it. But his fuel level dropped to 110 pounds and the word came up to stop using it.

The astronauts were unable to carry out several other assignments.

One called for a test of the tether, another for a study of the effect on Collins's movements of the umbilical cord linking him with the spacecraft, and a third called for Young to steer the spacecraft toward his companion and pick him up.

Plans for Collins to take movies outside the spacecraft were canceled earlier when it was discovered the camera didn't work.

Later the astronauts opened the hatch again to jettison some material, including the clumsy umbilical, which would clutter the spacecraft during re-entry.

A few minutes earlier they had reported some trouble in getting the excess gear ready for jettisoning:

Young: I'm having trouble. Mike's in his seat and has about 30 feet of hose (the lifeline) wrapped around him. We may have difficulty getting him out.

Ground: Roger.

Ground: How are you coming as far as getting untangled from the umbilical.

Collins: We're about half way.

Ground: Good.

Young: Say, this place makes the snake house at the zoo look like a Sunday School picnic.

Young and Collins are to splash down at 4:38 p.m. (EDT) Thursday in the Atlantic about 300 miles east of Florida, where a recovery fleet is standing by.

The primary recovery ship for this flight is not a full-size aircraft carrier as in past missions.

It is the USS Guadalcanal, a smaller carrier-like craft called a helicopter landing platform and designed for use in copter-borne amphibious operations by the Marine Corps.

The decision to go ahead with the dual rendezvous flight plan came this morning after the astronauts woke up.

The astronauts carried out a test of Gemini 10's environmental control system, a device that filters out the carbon dioxide exhaled by the astronauts so that the air can be used again.

It was this system that had cut short the time that Collins spent yesterday with his head poked out into space.

The astronauts suddenly got a whiff of a pungent chemical, apparently lithium hydroxide used in the filtering, and it made their eyes water so badly their vision was affected. Collins was unable to complete one assigned experiment to photograph the earth's terrain but he had already managed to carry out several others.

The astronauts were told to save the small wet towels they had used to wipe out their eyes and any gum they might chew for examination later to determine whether the stuff blown into their faces was in fact lithium hydroxide.

The spacecraft was then still docked with Agena 10, as it had been since Monday night after chasing down the rocket launched an hour and 40 minutes before Gemini 10.

The process of finding Agena 10 had taken far more of Gemini 10's fuel than expected, so a number of undocking and docking maneuvers were scrubbed and the two space vehicles stayed in tandem. The astronauts used Agena's powerful engine for a series of small, or "tweak" maneuvers needed for the second rendezvous rather than use up more of their own propellant.

In the docked position, the nose of Gemini 10 was thrust into the adaptor section of Agena 10 and the astronauts' view from the spacecraft windows was greatly restricted.

They were already looking forward to undocking from their rocket in order to have the field of view necessary to complete rendezvous with Agena 8.

"I guess Mike has probably been looking forward to getting that elephant off him, isn't he?" a ground controller asked.

"He sure is," Young replied, adding, "It's like a railroad engineer driving down the road with a big freight train. All you can see is the freight train."

Just after 3 p.m. (EDT) today, the astronauts fired the thrusters on Gemini 10 to back off from Agena 10.

Shortly afterward, Young reported:

"We have lost the Agena into the sunset."

"How does it feel to get rid of that freight train, John?" a controller asked.

"It was a mighty good train," the command pilot replied.

The sturdy Agena 10 had made possible the first dual rendezvous in space. In order for Gemini 10 to catch the dead Agena 8, it had to catch up with Agena 10 first, dock with it, and then use the Rocket's power to soar into an orbit reaching as far as 474 miles into space.

Yesterday Agena 10's power brought the men back down to an orbit much closer to that of Agena 8 and at the time of separation Gemini 10 was about 158 miles from its goal—Agena 8—and closing with it.

It was the first time any spacemen had been able to link up with a rocket in space and use its power to fly.

My next point concerns space power and electric propulsion systems, and more particularly the development of the Snap-8 nuclear electric power generator. The Snap-8 is intended to provide approximately 35 kilowatts of electrical energy for 10,000 hours of continuous operation. I am firmly convinced that nuclear power is indispensable to future space operations and the Snap-8 is an essential step forward in progress toward this end.

The fiscal year 1967 NASA request included $5.5 million for further development of this project which would permit continuation of the development, but at a minimum level. The House increased the amount for this project in fiscal year 1967 by $2.4 million to make possible an increased component testing program, and to insure that minor component failures would not cause a major shutdown in these tests.

The Senate did not originally concur in this addition to the Snap-8 research project. We were able to have emphasis placed on this nuclear research project. Two million dollars have been added to NASA's request, making available $7.5 million in fiscal year 1967 for further Snap-8 development. NASA should know the Congress has decided on emphasis for nuclear propulsion research and development.

We must look beyond the landing of a man on the moon and his safe return to earth in this decade and look to the future exploration of planets far beyond cis-lunar—earth-moon—space. Nuclear power is the answer for the future and the Congress must assure that sufficient effort is being put forth toward this end.

I have always been a strong supporter of research and development in the area of solid propellant boosters, as has our House Science and Astronautics Committee. For fiscal year 1967, NASA requested only $3.5 million for continued development of the 260-inch solid propellant booster which would only permit a NASA proposed one-half length firing. The House Science Committee version of the bill provided an additional $7.5 million to speed development and to provide a longer length firing in lieu of the half length effort proposed in the NASA request. Two successful short-length firings have already been accomplished, and there is a serious question in my mind as to what is to be gained from a third similar, half-length firing.

I feel that this Nation must vigorously pursue further development of large solid propellant boosters, not only because our limited propulsion capability has been a deterrent to our U.S. space effort in the past, but the solid propellant system will provide a safer, alternative, more versatile and more economical booster capability than we now enjoy with our liquid propellant systems.

While the Senate conferees at first did not agree with this philosophy, they finally agreed, after long deliberation, to the addition of $4 million to the NASA request for this purpose. This amount will not be adequate to pursue vigorously the further development of solid boosters. It is a step in the right direction, and of a certainty expresses the sense of Congress in this regard. Solid propellant research and development must be emphasized.

In the NASA construction of facilities program, there is one project upon which I would like to comment. For facility planning and design, NASA requested $7 million for fiscal year 1967. The House reduced the request to $5.5 million basically because of large unfunded balances of authorization granted in prior years for this purpose. As you may recall, I offered an amendment on the floor of the House during consideration of H.R. 14324 that would have repealed $10 million of the $11.4 million balance remaining of unfunded authorization. My proposed amendment was defeated, unfortunately, and NASA's record on excess authorization above current use and current needs in this account continues to look bad.

The Senate conferees receded to the House position and agreed to limit the new authorization to $5.5 million, supporting the logic of my previously proposed amendment. This item should have been cut further. This is an area within NASA where the Congress must tighten up. There is no rhyme nor reason to continually adding authorization each year to an already large balance that remains unfunded year after year. This is loose budget supervision.

I have made my position plain on various NASA programs and projects in printed dissenting views published as an addendum to the House Science and Astronautics Committee report on the 1967 NASA authorization legislation, Report No. 1441 of the 89th Congress, 2d session.

I have recommended that NASA authorization be reduced by $66 million and that management procedures, both in NASA and NASA contractors be substantially revised.

LUNAR RECEIVING LABORATORY

I strongly oppose the decision of the Science and Astronautics Committee to approve the construction of a lunar receiving laboratory at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, Tex., at this time. I believe that this proposal, with an initial construction cost of $9.1 million, is poorly conceived and has not been given an adequate amount of study and analysis.

We must have, for the processing and analyses of lunar samples, existing laboratory facilities, be they Government, university or college, corporate, foundation or private. We will also need vacuum chamber facilities, combined with specialized laboratory equipment and instruments to make a thorough study of the spacecraft and astronauts returning from the moon.

I do not agree with the NASA arguments that there should be one facility, that it should be centralized, that it should be located at the Manned Spacecraft Center, or that it should be started at this time.

We do not have at this point any of the results of the planned unmanned lunar research missions, such as the Surveyor and Lunar Orbitor programs. These are to provide the very directions that our future programs are to take. Making a decision at this time could as well be based on the "green cheese" theory of the moon.

Nobody has now any knowledge other than surmise or guess as to what the crust of the Moon is. Let us face it, we simply have no facts at this time on which to build a practical foundation for a laboratory. Hence, no considered judgment can be formed.

The ideal location for analyzing lunar samples is in the lunar environment on the Moon, namely, a lunar-based laboratory. Under the circumstances, possibly and probably, temporary interim Earth facilities or installations should be planned. For this, we should use as many of our existing facilities as are available, with such modifications as may be necessary in the light of the results of the coming unmanned lunar exploratory flights.

It would make more sense to have a small delay at this time rather than guess 3 to 4 years into the future, before the unmanned lunar exploratory programs are completed, so that the finally constructed facilities can really meet the actual needs when the lunar samples are actually returned from the Moon.

Considering the vast distances involved in our galaxy and the very close proximity of our satellite, the Moon, as well as its close identity to the Earth in mass, density, color, and surface variations, and other factors, we should not proceed on the bare assumption that the Moon's composition varies greatly from that of the Earth. This will certainly be an expensive and costly guess.

The question of contamination of the Earth from lunar samples is at best a debatable one. High NASA officials have stated that the chances of such contamination are now lower than one in a million. This "number" is pure fantasy.

I would like to add that the Earth now receives hundreds of millions, really uncounted numbers, of micrometeorites, many of which are not dissipated in the upper atmosphere but reach the earth relatively unchanged from their original state. Many of these are so small that they become entrapped in the moisture of our upper atmosphere and fall to earth slowly rather than in a fiery descent as is the case with the larger "shooting stars" or sizable meteors. We have yet to know of any contamination occurring as a result of these particles of matter reaching the earth from outer space. Or are we contaminated already?

In the NASA site selection survey, I enjoy pointing out the method of selection of the NASA site selection committee.

From the point of view of an intelligent person, the appointment by NASA of five out of nine members on this committee from the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston, is charmingly innocent. It is really disarming to learn that, to insure a majority of five members working as a team, two additional members were appointed from NASA Headquarters to the committee.

It is enchanting to learn that the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston was the very site finally chosen, as there seems to have been some slight predisposition in that direction. Entirely by accident, as top officials of NASA have so adequately pointed out in their testimony to our Science and Astronautics Committee.

Needless to say, such predisposition does cause a few wry smiles and rather knowing chuckles, particularly in the complete absence of any doubt or disagreement by any member of the site selection committee, as evidenced in testimony, either before or after the final choice, on any factor, or on other installations. When everybody on a committee thinks alike, some people are not thinking very much—or at all.

A reading of the site selection survey reports does not convince me that an adequate and thorough survey was made. For example, NASA gives an order of consideration in site selection as: First, Availability of utilities; second, accommodations for visitors; third, scientific investigation capabilities; and, lastly, fourth, construction, operation, and maintenance costs. I believe the last two factors shown, namely third and fourth, should properly be first, and second in the order of consideration.

NASA officially predicts that the proposed laboratory will have to be expanded as samples are obtained from other planetary bodies. Hence, the decision to locate the basic foundation of all extraterrestrial sample processing only at the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston is tantamount to locating all such future activity at the same location.

I believe this is wrong, particularly in view of the many existing facilities in the country which are capable of being used with but minor modifications and which already possess pools of scientific talent trained in biological quarantine and processing of metals and mineral samples. Many also have vacuum chamber facilities.

Considering only selected Government facilities, these include: First, the Communicable Disease Center of the U.S. Public Health Service at Atlanta, Ga., with facilities for radiation counting, and laboratory work as well as trained personnel; second, the U.S. Army Biological Center at Fort Detrick, Frederick, Md., with facilities for radiation counting, quarantine, biological research and development, as well as trained personnel; third, the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., with facilities for radiation counting, quarantine and laboratory support, with trained personnel; fourth, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory at Oak Ridge, Tenn., with facilities for vacuum chamber support, radiation counting, quarantine and laboratory support, as well as trained personnel; fifth, the U.S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base, Tex., with facilities for radiation counting and trained personnel; sixth, the Ames Research Center at Moffett Field, Calif., with facilities for vacuum chamber support, radiation counting and laboratory support, as well as trained personnel; seventh, the Naval Biological Laboratories at Oakland, Calif., with facilities for quarantine and laboratory support as well as trained personnel; and eighth, the Los Alamos Laboratories at Los Alamos, N. Mex., with facilities for vacuum chamber support, radiation counting, and laboratory support as well as trained personnel.

In addition to these facilities with capabilities, there are numerous other Government installations with capabilities as well as numerous industrial corporations with the ability and plant to perform analyses on all types of metals and minerals.

I believe existing facilities can easily perform the required tasks. This would eliminate a further concentration of still more research and development dollars at one NASA center.

Should none of the existing facilities be used, separately or in combination, the best location for a lunar receiving laboratory would be in an area as close to the splashdown point in the Pacific Ocean as is possible and where power and utilities exist, such as Honolulu or some other Pacific island.

I oppose strongly the thesis advanced by NASA that the returning spacecraft, astronauts and lunar samples be kept together from the time of splashdown to the time they reach a lunar receiving facility. I advocate the exact opposite, that they be kept separate to prevent any losses or contamination in the event of an accident while being transported across the oceans and the country.

I see no reason why the facility proposed must be constructed at this time with a crash program. NASA states that the facility must be started now if the United States is successful in achieving a lunar landing in early 1969. Why did they take so long to make up their mind? Why was it necessary to ask for approval of a project with inadequately prepared presentations and with such a sense of urgency and rush?

NASA claims it needs 15 Saturn V-Apollo systems to insure a successful lunar landing mission. If most optimistically the lunar landing mission is successful in early 1969, then some receiving facilities must be considered.

If this early triumph and success occurs, then NASA will not need at least half of the expensive systems which they have already ordered.

NASA programs cannot be presented in opposite and contradictory ways.

Either the laboratory could be started now or NASA should eliminate about half of the 15 Saturn V-Apollo systems and return the funds saved to the taxpayers.

Let us face it, the original NASA presentation on the lunar receiving laboratory was completely inadequate. Everybody, but everybody on the Science and Astronautics Committee agrees to that. Their second presentation took place less than 1 month later without adequate preparation.

I must point out that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight which examined this matter and on which I am the ranking minority member, unanimously and on a nonpartisan basis, deferred the NASA proposal for the laboratory in its report of March 24, 1966, to the full Committee on Science and Astronautics.

My position against the proposed construction project is based on: inadequate justification for a central, major facility; improper consideration of the many alternative facilities available; and insufficient time for the conduct of a meaningful field study, with outside expert help, of these alternative facilities.

I criticize the proposed project specifically because the Science and Astronautics Committee could not conduct a full and detailed field examination of the problem and its possible solution. No effort was made to make the necessary field investigations, to contact various competent industrial and construction contractors, to discuss the problem with members of the scientific community or to examine the inadequate estimates presented on the costs of modifying existing facilities.

Over my strong objections, the full Committee on Science and Astronautics approved reinstatement of the lunar receiving laboratory based on a further hearing of several hours on 1 day. I believe the decision to start the laboratory on a centralized basis, at this time, at the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston is a shot in the dark rather than a decision made on an adequate development of area of reference and basic facts upon which to base sound business over judgment.

APOLLO APPLICATIONS AND ADVANCED MISSION PROGRAMS

I strongly and firmly oppose the NASA request for $41.9 million for the Apollo Applications program and recommend it be deleted for purposes of economy and efficiency.

The Apollo Applications program has not—repeat not—been approved by the administration, according to testimony presented to the Science and Astronautics Committee. In fact, the administration saw fit substantially to reduce the original request of NASA for this program. It must be remembered that this Apollo Applications program follows the completion of the Apollo lunar landing program in this decade. This is at least 3 or 4 years from now.

NASA witnesses stated that the entire $41.9 million would be used in fiscal year 1967 to buy long-leadtime hardware for additional Saturn I-B vehicles and additional Apollo spacecraft. This hardware is beyond the needs of the Apollo program. We do not even know and cannot possibly, at this time, estimate how much and how many surplus boosters, spacecraft, and hardware will be available from the Apollo program after the lunar landing is completed.

NASA has not determined how many additional boosters, spacecraft, and hardware will be needed for post-Apollo programs. Nobody can even guess at the programs. NASA has not presented to the Science and Astronautics Committee any information on the number of Apollo Applications flights, their purposes, missions, or destinations—absolutely nothing.

NASA witnesses during the hearings stress that the funds requested for Apollo Applications programs are merely to maintain the current production capability. I would point out that this program capability is to be maintained without a set program or purpose, and no use has been planned for the hardware.

It is impossible to hold "open options," as claimed by NASA, for decisions on the Apollo Applications program to be made, hopefully, in fiscal year 1968. This is an expensive, really expensive theory. Businessmen would laugh as such "bone yard" production.

NASA indicates that the delay in approving the Apollo Applications programs already has increased its estimated program cost by as much as 20 percent. This is pure poppycock. No reasonable person can make such estimates at this time.

It is my opinion that NASA's plans for the Apollo Applications program are so indefinite that any estimates as to cost increases are purely speculative. They cannot be considered as substantive factors by the Congress in reaching a decision on this matter.

The hardware planned to be purchased by NASA will surely be obsolete by 1970, which is the earliest date for any flights under the Apollo Applications programs. The present generation of boosters, spacecraft, and hardware, as well as fuels, will look like 1914 Fords by 1970. What are we to have: "Army and Navy and Space" surplus sales stores on every town corner?

The leadtime on the Saturn 1B vehicle and the Apollo spacecraft and current manufacturing lines are such that the proposed hardware will not be available until late 1969. We know that the tempo of launch activity will increase in the next few years. It is certain that the facts that will be learned from coming Apollo flights will require major changes and developments in the current generation of boosters, spacecraft, and hardware.

On my insistence, along with others, the Science and Astronautics Committee has voted additional funds for work (above administration requests) on high energy propellants, large solid rockets, and nuclear propulsion. This research will lead to propulsion breakthroughs, automation, and control equipment, that will make the current launch vehicles obsolete elephants with rabbit-size payloads.

It is therefore premature to procure launch vehicles, at this time, that cannot be used until 1970 at the earliest, when known purposes cannot be determined for such vehicles.

I have always supported and continue to support the manned lunar landing programs. I have always stated that man's exploration of space will not end with the first landing on the moon. We should continue to take advantage of the almost limitless possibilities of space exploration and benefits to mankind.

The discovery of the relations of the 9 planets with their 37 moons of our solar system will be the work of generations. It staggers the imagination to realize there are over 30,000 objects in the area between Mars and Jupiter alone, the largest known to us being Ceres with a diameter of about 500 miles—and consider the tremendous size of Jupiter.

Future U.S. space programs beyond the manned lunar landing must be undertaken in a realistic, efficient, and orderly manner. I strongly recommend the requirements that NASA submit definite plans for Apollo Applications programs to Congress prior to the Science and Astro-

nautics Committee's consideration of the fiscal year 1968 NASA authorization request. This is a must.

I state my firm conviction that NASA should delay the procurement of any hardware or additional launch vehicles and spacecraft until its plans for Apollo Applications programs have been more thoughtfully and thoroughly defined. This definition must take into account the results of the coming Apollo research flights on an integrated basis. It must include plans and specific projects and outline future research programs.

These plans and projects should be submitted through appropriate channels to Congress for prompt approval when the necessary justification and base for decisionmaking has been provided.

Consequently, I strongly recommend the deletion of the $41.9 million requested for the Apollo Applications program at this time. NASA should be encouraged to continue project definition but I strongly oppose the purchase of any "shelf-type," unnecessary hardware at this time of Government deficits, war, and inflation.

The U.S. Government is advising U.S. business at present to forgo unnecessary inventory purchases and to defer capital expenditures, to assist the war effort, prevent inflation, and ease pressure on the economy because of the shortage of skilled personnel. The U.S. Government certainly should not now buy this large amount of useless, expensive, technical inventory that has no definite use or program.

I also recommend the deletion of $5 million from the $8 million request by NASA for its advanced missions program. NASA has failed to provide any justification, plans, projects, or results in its presentations regarding this program.

In my opinion, the advanced missions program is purely "blue sky" and should be reduced by at least $5 million. I therefore recommend $3 million as the budget level for this "no purpose" think department.

FACILITY PLANNING AND DESIGN

As a senior member of this committee, I joined with other committee members in placing heavy and firm emphasis on the efficient use of facility planning and design funds. The purpose of this emphasis has been to bring about improved construction planning and management procedures within NASA. I have strongly supported this element of NASA's program since I am a firm believer in sound, long-range planning.

NASA has not used or programed a substantial part of the authorization granted for these purposes in past years. At present, the records show a balance of $11.9 million in unfunded and unprogramed authorization for facility planning and design. In addition to prior years' authorization remaining unfunded, testimony received from NASA witnesses indicated that $5 million in funds appropriated in past years for facility planning and design remain unobligated at the present time.

NASA requested $7 million for facility planning and design in fiscal year 1967. The committee wisely reduced the amount of the request to $5.5 million. There seems to be no reason why NASA should continue to request from $7 million to $10 million annually for advance facility planning in view of the large unfunded and unobligated balances available. There is no doubt in my mind that amounts available and to be made available for these purposes in fiscal year 1967 are not justified.

In my opinion, this element of the space program should be tightened in order to insure careful use of the funds authorized. The theory behind advance facility planning is sound and serves a good purpose, but the Congress must insist upon better use of the authority in order that the full benefit may be obtained.

Under these circumstances, I recommend that $10 million of prior years' unfunded authorization now available to NASA be rescinded.

CHANGING NASA OBJECTIVES

My criticism of the development of NASA is that its original objective was to be the research and development agency of the Federal Government in the fields of space and aeronautics. But primarily, research and development jurisdiction was to include research and development, wherever it occurred, be it in the Government, private or public sectors, civilian or military sectors.

NASA is now settling down to become primarily a manufacturing, production and engineering operation. Frankly, the research effort in every field is being crowded out and held to a bare minimum by the demands of the Apollo lunar landing mission. This started to become true in the original Mercury era, advanced greatly in the Gemini era to the point where science, research and development are now being forced into total eclipse in the $5.012 billion presently requested by NASA.

In fact, I consider that only about 5 percent of the total current NASA budget request is to be devoted to science, research and development.

NASA's claim that the construction of boosters, the development of hardware, flight training and navigation missions, the production of spacecraft, the operation of tracking networks, and so forth, constitute research and development is a far cry from the scientific meaning of the term.

My view of the present Apollo program is that its proponents are afraid at this point to try anything new or integrate new boosters or high energy fuels into the complex.

It is safer to proceed with the same old fuels, the same old generation of boosters, and the same old type of hardware, as the demand is for immediate success, and not for the best type of performance nor for the scientifically most productive and advantageous. It is better not to risk any new developments but to make do with what NASA has at present, simply performing engineering, plumbing and construction chores.

The race with Russia is hurting NASA scientific and research programs.

URGENT NEED FOR MANPOWER SURVEY OF NASA

I believe that the continuing mushrooming of NASA personnel strength, particularly in the area of scientific and engineering personnel, has reached the point where it requires a detailed review by the Congress.

As an example, I point out the situation at the only recently approved Electronics Research Center at Boston, where personnel requirements have increased from 250 in fiscal year 1965 to 550 in fiscal year 1966 to an estimated need of 1,000 in fiscal year 1967. All this increase happens while the Center itself has yet to build one building for its activities.

If the large amounts of personnel used by NASA were blue-collar workers rather than technicians, there might not be such need for caution. But the fact of the matter is, that the great bulk of NASA personnel are scientists, engineers, and technicians, all of whom are in critical shortage in the U.S. economy.

Aside from the question of determining the actual needs of NASA, there is the major question of management. Is NASA using these critically scarce personnel in the best possible fashion? Is NASA management responding to the sudden changes in our space program as projects phase out and others expand or reach their peak effort?

The impact of reserving to our space activities, both in Government and contractor plants, a large percentage of our scientific and technical personnel can only be judged serious and critical, in view of the war in Vietnam, the current inflation in the economy, and the need to maintain a healthy scientific pool of talent in our scientific and academic communities, as well as for defense industries and business in general.

I strongly recommend that a management survey be conducted by an outside firm of experts of the management and utilization aspects of scientific and technical manpower in NASA. I further recommend that the report of this survey be provided to the Congress before final action on the fiscal year 1967 NASA authorization bill takes place.

I recommend a study in depth of NASA manpower utilization by the appropriate committee of the Congress—either the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee—or by the House Government Operations Committee.

INADEQUATE FIELD MONITORING OF NASA ACTIVITIES

I am seriously concerned over the lack of field monitoring of NASA activities by the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Science and Astronautics Committee.

For example, the Bureau of the Budget has far too few people with far too much control over the NASA budget. I understand that there are only two or three people in the Bureau of the Budget who have the responsibility to make all types of major decisions concerning the $5 billion NASA budget, and this over a period of less than a week. This type of control can only be superficial.

The General Accounting Office has yet to provide Congress with any meaningful management surveys or audits of one of the largest agencies in the Government. I feel that this agency is far too bound

with its past history and is emphasizing accounting and bookkeeping practices at the expense of scientific management surveys.

On a $5 billion annual budget, we need to move far beyond the limitations of accountancy and bookkeeping so that we have available for congressional purposes personnel with adequate judgment and experience in research and development activities. These are needed in the General Accounting Office as well as on the Science and Astronautics Committee so that Congress can make decisions of choice among the various programs presented by NASA in the light of the potential research and development gains, all based on an adequate base of reference.

The days of monitoring and supervising large technical programs on the basis of accountancy and bookkeeping are gone forever. We must have technically qualified people to oversee technical programs. Real current and continuing program evaluation is badly needed, and sorely lacking.

For several years I have been urging the Science and Astronautics Committee to increase its technical staff by at least five scientists, engineers and accountants, for continuous field investigatory duties. I repeat my recommendation, particularly in view of the fact that the committee has not used all of its presently allocated funds.

For the Congress to be fully responsive to the U.S. taxpayers on a highly technical program involving about $5 billion a year, it must have research and development, construction and technical management personnel assigned exclusively for field duties.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

An Inspector General, with necessary staff and facilities, should be established in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The current NASA program is replete with a myriad of complex and sophisticated projects designed to meet a wide variety of objectives of importance to the Nation.

Management problems are bound to arise as a result of the various programs and objectives involving an annual Federal expenditure of over $5 billion and the future of the national space program. I believe it is necessary that the Administrator of NASA be provided with the capability of obtaining independent evaluations and examinations of management actions by personnel other than those involved in formulating or implementing management policies.

It is significant to note that numerous other agencies of the Federal Government have recognized the importance of utilizing inspector general offices to effectuate internal and periodic examinations, evaluations, and corrective measures. Among these agencies are the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Department of State, and, more recently, the Department of Agriculture.

The cost reduction directorate within the NASA Headquarters, supposedly established for investigative purposes, is only a bug on the surface of the problem. It is a superficial device which centers attention on minor cost accounting matters to determine if eggs are cheaper on another counter. There is insufficient depth of investigation in the cost reduction activities of this directorate, and it does not provide the across-the-board analysis of NASA activities at all levels of management that an inspector general-type of organization would provide.

This directorate, established in 1964, consists only of three professional persons, none of whom have any engineering, scientific, or technical background in the space and aeronautics field. Assigning three nontechnical people to oversee a $5 billion program from a management analysis point of view is like a canary pecking at the mountain. This directorate was established after the introduction of my H.R. 7770, in July 1963, for an independent NASA Inspector General and does not solve the problem.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that NASA establish and maintain an Inspector General to insure that the space program and objectives of this Nation are carried out and met with both economy and efficiency.

UNBALANCE IN GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF NASA CONTRACTS

NASA continues to place the bulk of its contracts on a noncompetitive basis in areas of the country which have been the recipients of major prior-year contracts. The provision by the Science and Astronautics Committee in the fiscal year 1966 NASA authorization act, that NASA take measures to promote a more equitable distribution of its contracts has had, in my opinion, no effect whatsoever. NASA has simply ignored this provision.

I have yet to see any reports from NASA as to what, if any, measures they have taken to carry out this congressional mandate. Nor have I seen any practical results since the inclusion of the provision in last year's authorization act. The plain fact is that NASA displayed its complete lack of interest in the subject by excluding this provision in the administration bill sent to the Science and Astronautics Committee for fiscal year 1967.

The NASA program which appears to be distributed on an equitable basis is the NASA sustaining university program of research, facilities, and training grants. But this is not to be considered to be a solution to the problem of securing a reasonable and equitable distribution of NASA contracts throughout the Nation and the various States. NASA is to be complimented on its efforts in distributing this $40 million annual program on broad geographical basis. But the overwhelming portion of the remaining $5 billion continues to be awarded or expended annually in specific, almost fixed locations, with no known efforts to spread new work, or diversify to neglected regions.

This causes an unhealthy concentration of science, research, and engineering talent and drains the taxpayers of the rest of the country of their most valued asset, "brains." Technical competence in this country is an asset to which every State and section of the country is entitled to its just share, and as a step in the opportunity for progress.

I recommend that NASA be required to report to the Congress, not later than January 26, 1967, the specific measures NASA has undertaken to correct the current distortion and unbalance in the geographical distribution of NASA contract awards. This report should also include the most current distribution of all NASA expenditures by State, region, congressional district, or metropolitan area.

Congress should take specific action to correct this situation and prevent the continuation of the current "brain-drain" of outstanding engineers, scientists, teachers, and students to certain concentrated areas. The problem of trained students should be faced directly and handled by Congress to protect the local taxpayers who finance the local education and specialized training of outstanding students who are immediately lost to local communities, through actions of NASA roving recruiting teams for technical, scientific, and engineering personnel.

JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

I believe that the "reform" of the management of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory has gone too far.

I remain strongly opposed to the industrial-type management structure that has been imposed upon the organization of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory by the current NASA contract. I believe that the Laboratory, devoted to science, research, and development, should not be severely limited to carrying out programs under specific contracts of NASA.

The Laboratory should be organized so as to permit maximum flexibility in the employment of expertise. It should also be organized to bring about the greatest amount of interchange of knowledge in the various scientific disciplines, both on a horizontal basis as well as on a perpendicular basis.

I believe that the present type of industrial organization heavily emphasizing completion of programs under NASA's contracts does not at present allow the degree of flexibility necessary in a high-level research laboratory such as the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

The rigid channels of communication imposed by this type organizational structure tend to limit and put a real constraint upon the creativity of the scientific and research personnel of the Laboratory. This prevents the optimum use of the scientific talent of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory process.

There are two extremes in organization applicable to the Laboratory:

First. A purely industrial-type operation where all tasks are specifically defined; or

Second. An academic or university-type operation where the initiative in formulating tasks comes from the faculty.

What is required at the Laboratory is a "formula" or "middle of the road" organization and relationship with NASA which permits responsible NASA control and at the same time does not inhibit the creativity and initiative of the Laboratory scientists.

The important thing is not manpower or money but rather flexibility in opera-

tions. The interchange of interdisciplinary information remains an internal problem within the Laboratory. Working level scientists must have the initiative to effect such an interchange.

JPL should have an inbetween type organization compared to a solely industrial-type or academy-type organization. It would not be proper for NASA to completely free wheel. There must be a middle ground to permit initiative on scientific research and development. There is "room for improvement" at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

The present NASA contract spells out broad areas of scientific research to be undertaken by the Laboratory concerning the moon and planets. NASA must not, in its zeal to maintain control, restrict the Laboratory from exercising its initiative in proposing the specific tasks and methods to achieve the broad goals specified in the basic contract.

Let us face it: the imposition of an industrial-type organization on a research laboratory such as Jet Propulsion Laboratory can well smother creative activity and reduce the quality of the output and make the facility a manufacturing and plumbing concern.

There is room for improvement in the management and relations of the NASA under the contracts at JPL.

It is my belief that NASA has tightened the management control of the Laboratory, as was necessary in the test phase of the Ranger and Mariner programs. The technical and managerial performance of the Laboratory has certainly improved and is now on a high level. Now there is no need for maintaining rigid, tight managerial control and close program supervision and direction, which in reality is useful only in spacecraft and hardware manufacturing activities and scientific payload construction.

There is no doubt that the purely industrial-type organization clearly specifies what programs are to be done, when they are to be done, and how they are to be done. But we need a compromise management and organizational form at JPL which is between the industrial-type organization and the university type.

There is no doubt that many of the scientists and research people at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory feel that they are constrained under NASA contracts at the working level. There is, therefore, a real necessity for compromise in order to be able to restore initiative and provide flexibility so that initiative is given to the scientists at the working level.

I recommend that an early meeting be held between NASA, Dr. Pickering of Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and Dr. DuBridge of California Institute of Technology on measures to improve the management and structure.

MANNED ORBITING LABORATORY PROGRAM

I strongly oppose the administration's placing the manned orbiting laboratory program under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Air Force.

MOL should be placed under the jurisdiction of NASA, the research and development agency of the Federal Government for space and aeronautics. Or, at best, MOL should be placed under the joint jurisdiction of NASA and the U.S. Air Force for development.

I believe the action is a serious mistake both in organization and philosophy as well as for public relations purposes.

I strongly oppose the action of Secretary of Defense McNamara when, in his December 10, 1963, news conference, Mr. McNamara announced without prior notice of any kind that the manned orbiting laboratory program would be assigned to the Air Force. Neither Congress nor the scientific community of the country had any prior notice or inkling that this was to be the case until Mr. McNamara made his bland announcement.

I also oppose the announcement by the President on August 25, 1964, at a news conference that the MOL program would be worked upon by certain major contractors. This is certainly not the way to do business nor is it appropriate to ignore the existing science and research facilities of the Federal Government without any consultation or authorization by Congress whatever. It is complete fiction to state, as Secretary of Defense McNamara has assumed, that MOL is completely a military task and, therefore, can be handled by him as Secretary of Defense, as if he and that Department are the only people concerned in this tremendous development.

The announcement by Secretary McNamara makes a fiction and is in direct violation of the expressed intent of the Congress in section 102(a) of the original Space Act, Public Law 85-568, dated July 28, 1958, wherein it was expressed that—

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

The action of Secretary of Defense McNamara is also in direct violation of the provisions of Resolution 1472, "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space," adopted by the United Nations at the 856th plenary meeting of the 14th General Assembly on December 12, 1959. Under this resolution, the United States along with other countries including the U.S.S.R., agreed to, among other things, foster international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. It was a privilege and a real responsibility for me to be able to work as one of the delegates on the U.S. mission to the United Nations for this purpose, under the leadership of Henry Cabot Lodge, chief U.S. delegate.

Is the Presidential order the beginning of a new military era in space? This basic national policy the Congress of the United States should decide, according to the will of the American people after thorough study and due deliberation.

Being first in space for scientific and prestige purposes is one thing. Being first in space to better deliver weapons of destruction or nuclear and atomic weapons is quite another field entirely.

Do the American people want the administration to have the first Manned Orbiting Laboratory solely dedicated for military purposes, and by so doing, to exclude all research and development which could be done by NASA for the benefit and progress of the American people?

I call attention to the House, of the Action of Conference Committee on H.R. 14324 NASA authorization request for fiscal year 1967:

[In thousands]

| | Budget request | House | Senate | Conference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Research and development: | | | | |
| Gemini | $40,600 | $40,600 | $40,600 | $40,600 |
| Apollo | 2,974,200 | 2,974,200 | 2,974,200 | 2,974,200 |
| Advanced missions | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| Physics and astronomy | 131,400 | 126,900 | 131,400 | 129,900 |
| Lunar and planetary exploration | 197,900 | 227,900 | 197,900 | 210,900 |
| Bioscience | 35,400 | 33,400 | 35,400 | 35,400 |
| Meteorological satellites | 43,600 | 43,600 | 43,600 | 43,600 |
| Communications and applications technology satellites | 26,400 | 26,400 | 26,400 | 26,400 |
| Launch vehicle development | 33,700 | 33,700 | 33,700 | 33,700 |
| Launch vehicle procurement | 152,000 | 132,000 | 152,000 | 142,750 |
| Space vehicle systems | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 | 36,000 |
| Electronics systems | 36,800 | 36,800 | 36,800 | 36,800 |
| Human factor systems | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 | 17,000 |
| Basic research | 23,000 | 23,000 | 23,000 | 23,000 |
| Spacepower and electric propulsion systems | 42,500 | 44,900 | 42,500 | 44,500 |
| Nuclear rockets | 53,000 | 53,000 | 53,000 | 53,000 |
| Chemical propulsion | 37,000 | 44,500 | 37,000 | 41,000 |
| Aeronautics | 33,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 |
| Tracking and data acquisition | 279,300 | 265,335 | 279,300 | 270,850 |
| Sustaining university program | 41,000 | 41,000 | 41,000 | 41,000 |
| Technology utilization | 4,800 | 5,000 | 4,800 | 5,000 |
| Total | 4,246,600 | 4,248,235 | 4,248,600 | 4,248,600 |

[In thousands]

| | Budget request | House | Senate | Conference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Construction facilities: | | | | |
| Electronics Research Center | 10,000 | 5,000 | 10,000 | 7,500 |
| Goddard Space Flight Center | 710 | 710 | 710 | 710 |
| Jet Propulsion Laboratory | 350 | 350 | 350 | 350 |
| John F. Kennedy Space Center | 37,876 | 37,876 | 37,876 | 37,876 |
| Langley Research Center | 6,100 | 6,100 | 6,100 | 6,100 |
| Lewis Research Center | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Manned Spacecraft Center | 13,800 | 13,800 | 12,800 | 12,800 |
| Marshall Space Flight Center | 581 | (1) | 581 | 0 |
| Michoud Assembly Facility | 700 | 700 | 700 | 700 |
| Mississippi Test Facility | 1,700 | 1,700 | 1,700 | 1,700 |
| Wallops Station | 205 | 205 | 205 | 502 |
| Various locations | 6,478 | 6,487 | 6,478 | 6,478 |
| Facility planning and design | 7,000 | 5,500 | 7,000 | 5,500 |
| Total | 101,500 | 94,419 | 100,500 | 95,919 |
| Administrative operations | 663,900 | 644,210 | 658,900 | 655,900 |
| Grand total | 5,012,000 | 4,986,864 | 5,008,000 | 5,000,419 |

[1] Deleted.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other programs and projects which were in dispute in the committee of conference. I would like to report that all of the items in dispute were settled on a bipartisan basis, and none were influenced by partisan positions.

I urge that the report of the conference be accepted and passed.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much is the bill above the figure approved by the House?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The figure approved by the House was $4,986 million. The bill as approved by the conference is $5,000,419,000. There is a total of about $12 million cut from the request of NASA.

Mr. GROSS. Is the new laboratory to be located in Houston, Tex., for the examination of 60 to 80 pounds of lunar moon dust still in the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, sir. It is in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Despite the fact that no one knows when we will ever get to the moon, if ever, and whether we will be able to bring back dust?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think that the gentleman will admit we have made considerable progress on getting to the moon.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the information.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. We were opposing this particular lunar laboratory, but the gentleman will be interested to know that it has been cut $1 million from the House figure, so we are saving 10 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say $1 million?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very enthusiastic about the results of our conference committee deliberations on the NASA authorization.

In the field of advanced research and technology, I am very proud to report that the thorough deliberations of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology really paid off when it came to defending the House position in the conference committee.

We have to look ahead many years into the future to devise the kind of propulsion system, the kind of on-board power systems, the life support systems, and the many other features of space development which insure our leadership in space in the latter years of the 20th century. How are we going to do this? Only by investing now in the advanced research and technology to keep pushing back the frontiers in space. Successful space flight depends largely on two things: First, how are you going to get them up there? and second, how are you going to keep them up there? The first item depends on propulsion; the second on spacecraft power and fuel.

You have heard our great debates about developing the 260-inch solid propellant booster. On October 5, in a 30-minute special order, I outlined the great potential for the future contained in the successful test firing of the world's largest rocket motor. This is why the House in May voted $7.5 million over and above the President's budget for the further development of this giant solid booster. There was no single issue that divided the conference committee as deeply as the argument over funds for the 260-inch solid motor. The other body was quite adamant in limiting funds for this development, while we in the House underlined the importance of moving as quickly as possible from the successful half-length test firings to a full-length firing.

The conference broke up at one point because we were so far apart on this issue. But when we reassembled after the Independence Day recess, sweet reason prevailed and the conference finally agreed on an increase of $4 million.

Now what are the implications of this decision? It means that NASA will go ahead and do another short-length test firing next summer. They will also use the extra money we are giving them to start getting the long leadtime items needed for a full-length test firing. These critical items are a new nozzle, and new steel case, and some modifications to the facilities needed to build the full-length case. To make a full-length, 7½-million-pound-thrust test firing of the 260-inch solid will take us into fiscal year 1968, so next year I hope you will be watching closely, and help get the funds to make this program a success. It provides a filling of the gap between the Saturn I–B and the Saturn V, since it can put 90,000 pounds into orbit. It has great potential for future space missions, either space rescue missions, or missions to Mars and beyond.

In our Mercury and Gemini flights to date, if there is one subject we have chewed our nails about the most, it is spacecraft power and how to husband the power on board the spacecraft. When we plan for missions to Mars, and establish large space laboratories either on the Moon or elsewhere in space, we need generating equipment which has two characteristics: First, it must be powerful; and second, it must last a long time. That is why we are concentrating on a great, long-life nuclear electric power system called Snap–8. Here is another area where the House voted $2.4 million additional beyond the NASA budget in order to speed the development through more reliable component testing. Once again the Senate did not feel the need for additional funds, but the conference action finally pegged the additional figure at $2 million, which pleased me very much.

Another item of conference disagreement was in the field of technology utilization. I am very enthusiastic, Mr. Speaker, about the results NASA is achieving in applying our great space developments to private industry. The House was so impressed with the importance of this area that we added $200,000 to the $4.8 million asked in the NASA budget. I am pleased to say the conference committee agreed to accept this increase.

I have been talking about research and development and in this phase of the Office of Advanced Research and Technology I am pleased the conference came out with authorizations totaling some $7 million over the NASA budget.

In the area of tracking data and acquisition, the House recommended a

5-percent cut in the NASA budget, the other body recommended no cut, and the conference committee wound up with a 3-percent cut, much closer to the House position.

Now when we go into conference and talk about the Electronics Research Center, we are always fortunate to escape with our shirts. In this case, the House cut the construction authorization in half, largely because funds previously authorized and appropriated had not been spent. The House wanted $5 million instead of $10 million authorized. The conference split this right down the middle, and we came out of conference with an authorization of $7.5 million. I sincerely trust that the Committee on Appropriations will take its usual thorough look at this item, and carefully assess the progress and pacing of construction at this vital facility.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the House action in increasing the authorization in the field of aeronautics will stick. The Senate accepted the recommendation of the House that we raise from $33 million to $35 million the amount authorized for advanced research in aeronautics. This was not a matter of disagreement in the conference, because the other body accepted the House position. When we first considered this matter in the subcommittee, it was our thought that the additional $2 million might best be spent on aircraft noise research, as well as V/STOL and development of supersonic and hypersonic aircraft.

I feel very strongly that we must place additional emphasis and put more funding into aircraft noise control. The President in proposing the new Department of Transportation recognizes this fact. The Jet Aircraft Noise Panel of the Office of Science and Technology supports this view. Many Members of this body have expressed their support of additional work in aircraft noise abatement. The other body stated in its report on the authorization that the additional $2 million should be confined to aircraft noise control, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, I endorse this approach.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the conference report receives the overwhelming endorsement of this body.

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

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the able gentleman from Indiana, the second ranking member on the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the conferees for including section V, which relates to the matter of the geographic distribution of Federal research funds.

I believe the statement included in this section, that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution research funds, is one which is well taken.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that unless this Congress continues to insist that we pay some attention to the geographical distribution of research funds, we are going to have great "desert areas" in this country where there will be very little research, and very little intellectual endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is very important, and I would hope that NASA might listen to the admonition of this particular section of this bill.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] brought up this point, because he is the author of this particular amendment which was written into the measure by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and which was accepted by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], and the other members who served on this conference for their leadership in bringing this bill through conference and back to the floor of the House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the conference, but I am a member of the Space Committee.

Included in fiscal year 1967 NASA request for space power and electric propulsion systems was $42.5 million. Of this, $5.5 million was earmarked for Snap–8, a power system capable of generating 35 kilowatts of electrical energy for 10,000 hours of operation. The amount requested by NASA would have only permitted further development at a minimal level. The House increased the NASA request by $2.4 million in order to provide further development, particularly in small-component testing.

The Senate version denied this increase. However, during the conference they receded, agreeing to an increase of $2 million versus the $2.4 million recommended by the House. The bill now provides $7.5 million for Snap–8 in fiscal year 1967.

Nuclear power will be an essential element to continued exploration of space in the future The Soviet Union gained an advantage over us by their early development of the large booster It is therefore important that we continue our research and development in this area of nuclear propulsion. This effort should be put forward now to meet the needs of long-term space flight.

Snap–8 is a step in this direction.

I support the conference report and hope for a substantial vote of approval.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote to accept this conference report, but I will be doing so with extreme reluctance.

When the NASA authorization bill was before us, an amendment was offered by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WYDLER], which would have set up a $20 million program to conduct research into the abatement of aircraft noise. Unfortunately, this amendment was defeated, thanks to the opposition of the administration.

I think that this was a shortsighted action for the administration to take. It is all very nice to put a man on the moon, and have him walk around in space on the way, but we have to remember the down-to-earth needs of the people, too. And one of the greatest needs we have today is the need to find a way to deal with the thunderous noise of the increasing number of jetplanes which fly over residential neighborhoods before landing at their airports.

More and more of America's travel is in the air—and more and more of America's air travel is by jet aircraft. This noise problem is going to grow. What are our homeowners supposed to do? They cannot stick their heads in the sand and ignore this problem like the administration. How can you ignore the screaming monsters that drive you out of your skin every 2 minutes or 4 minutes or whatever the case may be?

I am very sorry that this NASA authorization bill does not include the $20 million proposed for research into aircraft noise abatement. I do not see how we can spend millions and millions on seeing how monkeys and chimpanzees can stand the stress of outer space when we do nothing to relieve the shattering throb of endless flights of jets on the ears of those of our citizens who live near airports.

This serious problem must be faced up to. This Congress has not yet faced up to it. It is only reluctantly that I vote for this conference report's acceptance. I feel the lack of any provision to make a serious and affirmative attempt to cope with the aircraft noise abatement problem is a very serious shortcoming.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to sincerely thank the members of the conference committee on the NASA authorization bill for working out its difficulties and keeping alive the chemical propulsion research program. As I have stated in this Chamber previously, the need for continued development of our rocket thrust power is essential to our Nation's space program. The additional funds provided for in this authorization will allow NASA to procure the items needed for a long-length rocket firing. The items are a full-length steel case, new nozzles, and tools and facilities needed by shipbuilding companies to build full-length firing equipment. The authorization of these funds will have an important impact on my district as well. The Aerojet-General Corp. in Dade County, Fla., has played a key role in future space exploration with its two half-scale test firings using a solid propellant rocket. These funds which have now been authorized will enable the full-scale test firing of the rockets—a more efficient and less expensive undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees who participated on the committee handling this bill are to be commended for their insight and awareness of the needs of our space program by granting authorization for these funds. I am sure that the

committee will continue its strong interest in this program for full implementation in fiscal 1968.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this conference report.

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

There was no objection.

## SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment to the bill (S. 602) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, ROGERS of Texas, JOHNSON of California, SAYLOR, and REINECKE.

## LITTLE APPARENT CONCERN ON THE PART OF ADMINISTRATION TO SOLVE AIRLINE STRIKE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, there is so little apparent concern on the part of this administration for solving the airline strike that is having such a disastrous impact on many sections of this country, including my own Northwest, that I am deeply frustrated and genuinely concerned.

On last Saturday I wrote the President of the United States advising him that in my judgment the only way this crippling strike could be quickly terminated would be by his own personal intervention, holding the principals in session around the clock until the issues were resolved. I pointed out to the President that upon occasion it has been difficult to locate the negotiators and then to get them in the same room together. Aggressive action on his part, I said, along the lines suggested would be the only quick solution to the problems.

On Tuesday of this week I received a call from Secretary of Labor Wirtz advising me that he did not feel he could become personally involved in the negotiations but that he was urging everyone to press for acceptance of the recommendations of the emergency board.

On Tuesday night when I finally went home I was shocked to see on the society page of the Washington Evening Star, page B-8, a four-column photograph of Secretary Wirtz and his wife, together with Secretary Weaver and his wife. The picture is captioned "Democrats Cruise Down the River." The picture shows Secretary Wirtz smiling gaily, waving his hand. The story in the social columns accompanying the picture reported that the four in the picture were signaling "bon voyage" as they joined the District Democratic Central Committee on a cruise down the Potomac.

Yesterday in his news conference President Johnson is reported as having said "wryly" that he was not much of a politician but that as a matter of fact this coming Saturday he was going to fly into four separate States on a political speechmaking tour.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that this administration has no real concept of the havoc the current airline strike is making on the economy of this country. The day the Secretary of Labor spent cruising down the Potomac on a local political mission was the 10th day of the strike. This coming Saturday when the President will be expending his time and precious energy campaigning in four States will be the 15th day of the strike.

Mr. Speaker, I call on President Johnson again personally to take charge of the negotiations and see them through to a successful conclusion to eliminate this crippling and serious strike. I call upon the President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor to drop "their politics as usual" attitude, to show some real and deep concern and to make some meaningful efforts to settle this strike so that we can start repairing the great economic damage which we have suffered.

## WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR INCITING RACIAL RIOTS?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I am just as distressed as anyone here when there is violence or racial trouble in any part of our great country. But as I said yesterday, there is very little interest manifested by northern Members in the violence and interracial killings that have recently taken place in Cleveland, California, and Chicago, and the race riots in South Bend, New York City, and other places.

There seems to be none of you who will speak out when it happens in your own northern and western areas.

We picked up the papers this morning and saw again that for the sixth or seventh successive day trouble—racial trouble—had lifted its ugly head in areas other than my own. But the Members of this body who represent those areas are just as silent as the tomb. What has happened to you?

When such happens down my way, some of my northern colleagues take a plane and head south, visit among us and report back how bad it is. You are accompanied by NBC, CBS, ABC, XYZ, and the Washington Post, Life, Time, Newsweek, and everyone who can obtain travel accommodations. You come down and then return in utter horror of what you claim to have seen.

I do not say this to needle any one, but you ought to be ashamed. You should be concerned also about your own racial problems.

I say to the Members of this House and the people of the country that we do have a serious problem all over the country. And we are not going to solve it by annually bringing to this House the type of legislation that is scheduled to be brought in next week, another so-called civil rights bill. This is not going to solve a thing. Oh, yes, it may help some of you to satisfy your political ambitions, but it is not going to settle or solve the racial problems that are visited upon this country.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many citizens around the country, not only in the South, but in the far corners of the North, East, and West, as well as in other parts of the free world, were heartened, as I was, over the strong appeal made by the world renowned and highly respected Rev. Dr. Billy Graham to President Johnson that he and the Department of Justice reveal now to the American people the identity and affiliation of those who are really responsible for inciting the racial riots and unrest which are literally tearing this great Nation of ours to bits. Some of us have long been making the same appeal, loud and clear, but the only response has been dead silence. The time has not only come, Mr. Speaker, it has long since passed, for the leadership of this country to bring our citizens within full knowledge of the element behind, and responsible for, stirring up racial strife and precipitating these bloody riots.

Mr. Speaker, no one could have more frankly and clearly presented to the American people the urgency of and sound basis for the Reverend Billy Graham's appeal to the President, than has the able and widely read David Lawrence in his column appearing in the July 20 edition of the Evening Star. I commend it to the attention of every red-blooded, loyal, and patriotic American citizen who cares what is happening to our country. The editorial follows:

BILLY GRAHAM'S PLEA TO JOHNSON

(By David Lawrence)

The Rev. Dr. Billy Graham, evangelist of world renown, has appealed publicly to Presi-

dent Johnson—his close friend—to identify the groups inside America "who are teaching and advocating violence, training in guerrilla tactics and defying authority."

The famous Baptist minister declares that, "incredible as it may seem, we are on the road to anarchy in some of the large cities of this country, and the symptoms are ominous and dangerous." He says that "our leaders should not ignore this threat any longer."

Recently, Congress has been studying the Ku Klux Klan and is about to consider legislation dealing with "clandestine organizations." But this does not go far enough. For it is becoming known that some of the persons with considerable influence in the terroristic activities being carried on in the name of the "civil rights" movement in America either are Communists themselves, or are sympathetic to communism.

Dr. Graham points out that many of the demonstrations have "the pattern of defiance of authority," and he emphasizes that "they are organized and planned by a hard core of extremists who are taking advantage of just grievances by people living in the frustrations of ghettos." He adds that "the FBI and the President know who they (the extremist leaders) are and what they are up to. Now the people need to know. Congress has no more urgent business than to pass laws with teeth in them."

Police Superintendent O. W. Wilson in Chicago says the recent riots there were intensified by militant groups which courted violence. So far as is known, not one of the principal leaders of the civil rights groups is himself accused of being a Communist. But among the different organizations are said to be top advisers with a wide knowledge of Communist tactics who are accomplishing what the Communists want—namely, to produce a state of anarchy by means of violence, as mobs are incited and collisions with the police are stimulated.

Nearly every day the newspapers are reporting hundreds of Negroes shouting either "Black Power!" or other provocative slogans, as they clash with the police. Innocent bystanders have been hurt and lives have been lost. Big riots have occurred not only in Chicago and New York, but also in many other cities in nearly every section of the country, from Los Angeles to Jacksonville, Fla., and from Memphis, Tenn., to South Bend, Ind.

It is difficult for the President himself to reveal individual identifications. He can only denounce in general terms the types of organizations which are guilty of what amounts to a process of subversion. Congressional committees, on the other hand, have the power to subpena witnesses and to expose the inner workings of Communist and other groups. But there has been a tendency in recent months to deal gently with civil rights organizations for fear of alienating votes. The theory is that Negroes themselves would resent such accusations and that this would be considered as a blanket indictment of the Negro cause.

The time has come, however, in the opinion of many observers—particularly those who agree with Dr. Graham—for the administration to initiate hearings in Congress and tell the people what is going on that has caused much of the rioting and mob violence, allegedly in support of the civil-rights movement. Actually the result has been a disturbing of the peace generally and a heating up of friction between the races.

Dr. Graham's appeal expresses the viewpoint of many citizens who have been hopeful that Congress would forget about politics, courageously tackle the problem of mob violence, and make it a crime to impair the safety of citizens anywhere in the United States by incitements to violence. Many people are unable to traverse the city streets nowadays and go to and from their homes without being subjected to the risks and dangers of physical violence.

In these days of increased reliance on the federal government there has been a strange indifference here to the use of those powers which could be lawfully exercised to stop the wave of mobocracy that has been developing throughout the country.

---

## HOUSING BILL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Vice President of the United States addressed the National Association of Counties in New Orleans.

Coming during a period of riots in our larger cities, his words could not have been more untimely. In referring to what he called ghetto conditions in our larger cities, he said:

> I think you'd have had more trouble than you have had already because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under these conditions.

He then went on to predict open violence in every major city and county in America unless Congress voted all the money the President wants for rent supplements.

This is downright disgusting. It is an attempt by the Vice President to blackjack Congress into a mood of panic in order to save a floundering and highly unpopular administration request. It is also inciting to riot on the basis of misrepresentation, because rent supplements will do nothing for the ghetto. Secretary Weaver has often said that the rent supplement program is aimed at lower middle income groups, and the Catholic archdiocese of New York has said that per unit cost levels laid down by Secretary Weaver are too low to permit new rent supplement housing to be built in the urban core areas of cities like New York.

I have been an outspoken opponent of rent supplements, and after reading the Vice President's remarks, I am more fortified in my convictions than ever before. The Vice President will bear a grave responsibility in blood and lives if he tries to provoke minority group members to riot for rent supplements. The Vice President will not convince the Senate to vote rent supplement appropriations with the specter of bloodshed.

A few years ago, the Congress was told this same line of malarkey in connection with the below-market interest rate rent subsidy program. We were told that this was a program to house the poor. Today, barely 5 years after its enactment, this program is subsidizing the rentals of families making up to $14,000 a year. The same sad story will evolve with regard to rent subsidies if the Congress bows to the threats of the administration and funds the rent subsidy program.

In a few weeks we will hear the same warnings and threats in connection with this year's housing bill. We will be told that it must be passed to avert further riots and civil disobedience in every city in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in my remarks an editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 20, and a copy of the FHA maximum income limits for the section 221(d)(3) below market interest rate rent subsidy program:

### HHH AND THE LONG HOT SUMMER

About the last thing the nation needs during this long hot summer is any implication that violence has official sanction as an instrument of protest.

Yet that is what no less an official than HUBERT HUMPHREY implied during his speech to the National Association of Counties in New Orleans.

If he had to live in a slum, said the voluble Vice President, "I think you'd have more trouble than you have had already because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt under those conditions."

He predicted "open violence in every major city and county in America" unless the Administration's plan for rent subsidies was adopted.

Whatever else he might have had in mind, Mr. HUMPHREY's vicarious "revolt" and his forecasts of further violence will serve only to encourage the brick throwers.

Nor will Federal rent subsidies, if approved, automatically cure the complex problems of slum dwellers or restrain the violent, who will use any excuse for lawlessness.

The Vice President, who included in his speech other and more constructive suggestions for upgrading slums, knows that.

But his irresponsible remarks do him no credit and won't help those, who live much closer to violence than he, to get the job done. The Vice President's tongue obviously outran his good judgment.

---

[FHA No. 748 Rev. 8/65]

MAXIMUM INCOME LIMITS FOR OCCUPANCY OF SECTION 221(d)(3) BELOW MARKET INTEREST RATE HOUSING—3%—AUGUST 1965

(Federal Housing Administration, Washington, D.C.)

If area is an SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area), income limits are applicable to all other localities within the SMSA, provided such localities have current Workable Programs.

Titles and definitions of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas as defined in 1964 are listed in the Bureau of the Budget release "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas," 1964, or inquiry can be made at any FHA Insuring Office. This publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402—Price 25 cents.

*Maximum income limits for occupancy of sec. 221(d)(3) below market interest rate housing (3 percent), August 1965*

| State and city | 1-person households [1] | Families of— 2 persons | 3 and 4 persons | 5 and 6 persons | 7 persons or more |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama: | | | | | |
| Birmingham SMSA [2] | $4,300 | $5,250 | $6,150 | $7,050 | $8,000 |
| Decatur | 4,000 | 4,850 | 5,700 | 6,550 | 7,400 |
| Mobile SMSA | 4,100 | 4,950 | 5,850 | 6,750 | 7,600 |
| Opelika | 3,800 | 4,600 | 5,400 | 6,200 | 7,000 |
| Selma | 3,400 | 4,100 | 4,850 | 5,550 | 6,300 |
| Alaska: | | | | | |
| Anchorage | 7,100 | 8,650 | 10,150 | 11,650 | 13,200 |
| Cordova | 7,100 | 8,650 | 10,150 | 11,650 | 13,200 |
| Fairbanks | 6,800 | 8,250 | 9,700 | 11,150 | 12,600 |
| Juneau | 7,650 | 9,250 | 10,900 | 12,550 | 14,150 |
| Kodiak | 7,100 | 8,650 | 10,150 | 11,650 | 13,200 |
| Petersburg | 7,650 | 9,250 | 10,900 | 12,550 | 14,150 |
| Seldovia | 7,100 | 8,650 | 10,150 | 11,650 | 13,200 |
| Seward | 7,100 | 8,650 | 10,150 | 11,650 | 13,200 |
| Valdez | 7,100 | 8,650 | 10,150 | 11,650 | 13,200 |
| Wrangell | 7,650 | 9,250 | 10,900 | 12,550 | 14,150 |
| Arizona: | | | | | |
| Flagstaff | 5,050 | 6,100 | 7,200 | 8,300 | 9,350 |
| Phoenix SMSA [2] | 4,600 | 5,600 | 6,600 | 7,600 | 8,600 |
| Tucson SMSA | 4,350 | 5,250 | 6,200 | 7,150 | 8,050 |
| Yuma | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| Arkansas: Little Rock-North Little Rock SMSA | 4,450 | 5,400 | 6,350 | 7,300 | 8,250 |
| California: | | | | | |
| Anaheim-Santa Ana-Garden Grove SMSA | 5,900 | 7,200 | 8,450 | 9,700 | 11,000 |
| Brawley | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Calexico | 4,400 | 5,300 | 6,250 | 7,200 | 8,150 |
| Clear Lake | 4,200 | 5,100 | 6,000 | 6,900 | 7,800 |
| El Centro | 5,150 | 6,250 | 7,350 | 8,450 | 9,550 |
| Fresno SMSA | 4,950 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| Holtville | 5,100 | 6,200 | 7,300 | 8,400 | 9,500 |
| Los Angeles-Long Beach SMSA [2] | 5,550 | 6,750 | 7,950 | 9,150 | 10,350 |
| Modesto | 4,950 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| Napa County [2] | 5,050 | 6,100 | 7,200 | 8,300 | 9,350 |
| Sacramento SMSA [2] | 4,750 | 5,800 | 6,800 | 7,800 | 8,850 |
| Salinas area (Monterey-San Benito-Santa Cruz) | 5,450 | 6,600 | 7,750 | 8,900 | 10,100 |
| San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario SMSA | 4,800 | 5,800 | 6,850 | 7,900 | 8,900 |
| San Diego SMSA [2] | 5,500 | 6,650 | 7,850 | 9,050 | 10,200 |
| San Francisco SMSA [2] | 5,750 | 6,950 | 8,200 | 9,450 | 10,650 |
| San Jose SMSA | 5,550 | 6,700 | 7,900 | 9,100 | 10,250 |
| Santa Barbara SMSA | 5,750 | 6,950 | 8,200 | 9,450 | 10,650 |
| Santa Rosa | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Stockton SMSA | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Tulare | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Ventura County [2] | 5,450 | 6,650 | 7,800 | 8,950 | 10,150 |
| Colorado: | | | | | |
| Colorado Springs SMSA | 4,750 | 5,750 | 6,750 | 7,750 | 8,800 |
| Denver SMSA [2] | 4,450 | 5,400 | 6,350 | 7,300 | 8,250 |
| Connecticut: | | | | | |
| Bridgeport SMSA [2] | 5,200 | 6,300 | 7,400 | 8,500 | 9,600 |
| Bristol [2] | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Danbury | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Hartford SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Meriden SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Middletown | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| New Britain SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| New Haven SMSA [2] | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| New London-Groton-Norwich SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Norwalk SMSA [2] | 5,450 | 6,600 | 7,750 | 8,900 | 10,100 |
| Stamford SMSA [2] | 5,100 | 6,150 | 7,250 | 8,350 | 9,450 |
| Waterbury SMSA | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Windham | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Delaware: Wilmington SMSA [2] | 4,400 | 5,300 | 6,250 | 7,200 | 8,150 |
| District of Columbia: Washington SMSA [2] | 5,500 | 6,650 | 7,850 | 9,050 | 10,200 |
| Florida: | | | | | |
| Brevard County [2] | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| Crestview | 3,750 | 4,550 | 5,350 | 6,150 | 6,950 |
| Fort Pierce | 3,700 | 4,450 | 5,250 | 6,050 | 6,850 |
| Fort Walton Beach | 4,150 | 5,000 | 5,900 | 6,800 | 7,650 |
| Gainsville [2] | 4,450 | 5,400 | 6,350 | 7,300 | 8,250 |
| Jacksonville SMSA [2] | 4,150 | 5,050 | 5,950 | 6,850 | 7,750 |
| Key West-Marathon | 4,050 | 4,950 | 5,800 | 6,650 | 7,550 |
| Miami SMSA | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Orlando SMSA | 4,150 | 5,000 | 5,900 | 6,800 | 7,650 |
| Pensacola SMSA [2] | 4,300 | 5,250 | 6,150 | 7,050 | 8,000 |
| Tampa-St. Petersburg SMSA | 3,900 | 4,750 | 5,600 | 6,450 | 7,300 |
| Volusia County | 3,800 | 4,600 | 5,450 | 6,250 | 7,100 |
| West Palm Beach SMSA | 4,550 | 5,550 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 8,450 |
| Georgia: | | | | | |
| Atlanta SMSA [2] | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Macon SMSA | 4,150 | 5,050 | 5,950 | 6,850 | 7,750 |
| Savannah SMSA | 4,050 | 4,950 | 5,800 | 6,650 | 7,550 |
| Hawaii: | | | | | |
| Hilo | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Honolulu SMSA [2] | 6,150 | 7,500 | 8,800 | 10,100 | 11,450 |
| Idaho: Boise City SMSA [2] | 3,900 | 4,700 | 5,550 | 6,400 | 7,200 |
| Illinois: | | | | | |
| Carbondale | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Champaign-Urbana SMSA | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Chicago SMSA [2] | 5,900 | 7,150 | 8,400 | 9,650 | 10,900 |
| Danville | 5,200 | 6,350 | 7,450 | 8,550 | 9,700 |
| Decatur SMSA | 5,300 | 6,400 | 7,550 | 8,700 | 9,800 |
| Galesburg | 5,250 | 6,400 | 7,500 | 8,650 | 9,750 |
| Montgomery County | 4,150 | 5,050 | 5,950 | 6,850 | 7,750 |
| Peoria SMSA [2] | 5,350 | 6,500 | 7,650 | 8,800 | 9,950 |
| Rockford SMSA [2] | 5,850 | 7,100 | 8,350 | 9,600 | 10,850 |
| Illinois—Continued | | | | | |
| Savanna | $4,950 | $6,050 | $7,100 | $8,150 | $9,250 |
| Springfield SMSA | 5,250 | 6,400 | 7,500 | 8,650 | 9,750 |
| Indiana: | | | | | |
| Anderson | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Bloomington | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Bremen | 4,600 | 5,600 | 6,600 | 7,600 | 8,600 |
| Elkhart | 4,800 | 5,800 | 6,850 | 7,900 | 8,900 |
| Evansville SMSA | 4,600 | 5,550 | 6,550 | 7,550 | 8,500 |
| Fort Wayne SMSA | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Gary-Hammond-East Chicago SMSA | 5,200 | 6,350 | 7,450 | 8,550 | 9,700 |
| Indianapolis SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| Kokomo | 4,550 | 5,550 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 8,450 |
| La Porte | 5,150 | 6,250 | 7,350 | 8,450 | 9,550 |
| Lawrenceburg | 4,600 | 5,600 | 6,600 | 7,600 | 8,600 |
| Michigan City | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Rockport | 3,850 | 4,700 | 5,500 | 6,350 | 7,150 |
| South Bend SMSA | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Terre Haute SMSA | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| Vincennes | 4,550 | 5,550 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 8,450 |
| Iowa: | | | | | |
| Davenport-Rock Island-Moline SMSA | 5,300 | 6,450 | 7,600 | 8,750 | 9,900 |
| Des Moines SMSA | 5,350 | 6,500 | 7,650 | 8,800 | 9,950 |
| Garner | 4,250 | 5,150 | 6,050 | 6,950 | 7,850 |
| Pella | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| Rockwell City | 4,350 | 5,250 | 6,200 | 7,150 | 8,050 |
| Kansas: | | | | | |
| Hutchinson | 4,600 | 5,550 | 6,550 | 7,550 | 8,500 |
| Topeka SMSA | 5,150 | 6,250 | 7,350 | 8,450 | 9,550 |
| Wichita SMSA | 4,750 | 5,800 | 6,800 | 7,800 | 8,850 |
| Kentucky: | | | | | |
| Frankfort [2] | 4,100 | 4,950 | 5,850 | 6,750 | 7,600 |
| Louisville SMSA [2] | 4,400 | 5,350 | 6,300 | 7,250 | 8,200 |
| Louisiana: | | | | | |
| Baton Rouge SMSA | 4,750 | 5,750 | 6,750 | 7,750 | 8,800 |
| New Orleans SMSA | 4,750 | 5,800 | 6,800 | 7,800 | 8,850 |
| Shreveport SMSA | 4,400 | 5,350 | 6,300 | 7,250 | 8,200 |
| Maine: | | | | | |
| Augusta | 4,750 | 5,800 | 6,800 | 7,800 | 8,850 |
| Bangor [2] | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Portland SMSA [2] | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Maryland: Baltimore SMSA [2] | 4,150 | 5,050 | 5,950 | 6,850 | 7,750 |
| Massachusetts: | | | | | |
| Boston SMSA | 5,100 | 6,200 | 7,300 | 8,400 | 9,500 |
| Brockton SMSA | 4,800 | 5,800 | 6,850 | 7,900 | 8,900 |
| Fall River SMSA | 4,550 | 5,550 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 8,450 |
| Lawrence-Haverhill SMSA | 4,950 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| Lowell SMSA | 5,050 | 6,100 | 7,200 | 8,300 | 9,350 |
| Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| Taunton | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Worcester SMSA | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Michigan: | | | | | |
| Ann Arbor SMSA [2] | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Battle Creek SMSA | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Bay City SMSA | 4,600 | 5,550 | 6,550 | 7,550 | 8,500 |
| Detroit SMSA | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Flint SMSA | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Grand Rapids SMSA [2] | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Jackson SMSA [2] | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Kalamazoo SMSA | 4,600 | 5,600 | 6,600 | 7,600 | 8,600 |
| Lansing SMSA [2] | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Saginaw SMSA | 4,900 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| St. Joseph-Benton Harbor | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Minnesota: | | | | | |
| Duluth-Superior SMSA | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Elk River | 4,800 | 5,800 | 6,850 | 7,900 | 8,900 |
| Grand Rapids [2] | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Mankato | 4,900 | 5,950 | 7,000 | 8,050 | 9,100 |
| Minneapolis-St. Paul SMSA [2] | 5,100 | 6,150 | 7,250 | 8,350 | 9,450 |
| Rochester [2] | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| St. Cloud | 5,200 | 6,350 | 7,450 | 8,550 | 9,700 |
| Winona | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Mississippi: | | | | | |
| Corinth | 3,500 | 4,250 | 5,000 | 5,750 | 6,500 |
| Gulfport | 3,900 | 4,700 | 5,550 | 6,400 | 7,200 |
| Jackson SMSA [2] | 4,050 | 4,900 | 5,750 | 6,600 | 7,500 |
| Missouri: | | | | | |
| Columbia | 4,900 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| Joplin | 4,200 | 5,100 | 6,000 | 6,900 | 7,800 |
| Kansas City SMSA [2] | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| St. Joseph SMSA | 4,400 | 5,300 | 6,250 | 7,200 | 8,150 |
| St. Louis SMSA [2] | 5,300 | 6,450 | 7,600 | 8,750 | 9,900 |
| Springfield SMSA | 4,500 | 5,450 | 6,400 | 7,350 | 8,300 |
| Montana: | | | | | |
| Bozeman | 5,150 | 6,250 | 7,350 | 8,450 | 9,550 |
| Butte | 4,900 | 5,950 | 7,000 | 8,050 | 9,100 |
| Glendive | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Great Falls SMSA [2] | 5,200 | 6,300 | 7,400 | 8,500 | 9,600 |
| Helena | 5,300 | 6,400 | 7,550 | 8,700 | 9,800 |
| Nebraska: | | | | | |
| Lincoln SMSA [2] | 4,600 | 5,550 | 6,550 | 7,550 | 8,500 |
| Omaha SMSA | 5,550 | 6,750 | 7,950 | 9,150 | 10,350 |
| Nevada: | | | | | |
| Las Vegas SMSA [2] | 5,450 | 6,600 | 7,750 | 8,900 | 10,100 |
| Reno SMSA [2] | 5,500 | 6,650 | 7,850 | 9,050 | 10,200 |
| New Hampshire: Manchester SMSA [2] | 4,600 | 5,600 | 6,600 | 7,600 | 8,600 |
| New Jersey: | | | | | |
| Asbury Park | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Atlantic City SMSA | 4,550 | 5,550 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 8,450 |

Footnotes at end of table.

*Maximum income limits for occupancy of sec. 221(d)(3) below market interest rate housing (3 percent), August 1965*—Continued

| State and city | 1-person households [1] | Families of— 2 persons | 3 and 4 persons | 5 and 6 persons | 7 persons or more |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New Jersey—Continued | | | | | |
| Camden [2] | $4,400 | $5,350 | $6,300 | $7,250 | $8,200 |
| Jersey City SMSA [2] | 5,500 | 6,650 | 7,850 | 9,050 | 10,200 |
| Long Beach [2] | 5,050 | 6,100 | 7,200 | 8,300 | 9,350 |
| Metuchen | 4,950 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| Newark SMSA [2] | 5,500 | 6,650 | 7,850 | 9,050 | 10,200 |
| New Brunswick [2] | 5,500 | 6,650 | 7,850 | 9,050 | 10,200 |
| Paterson-Clifton-Passaic SMSA [2] | 5,100 | 6,200 | 7,300 | 8,400 | 9,500 |
| Perth Amboy | 5,200 | 6,350 | 7,450 | 8,550 | 9,700 |
| Red Bank-Eatontown | 5,200 | 6,350 | 7,450 | 8,550 | 9,700 |
| Trenton SMSA [2] | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| New Mexico: | | | | | |
| Albuquerque SMSA [2] | 4,000 | 4,850 | 5,700 | 6,550 | 7,400 |
| Las Cruces [2] | 3,900 | 4,750 | 5,600 | 6,450 | 7,300 |
| Santa Fe | 4,100 | 4,950 | 5,850 | 6,750 | 7,600 |
| New York: | | | | | |
| Albany-Schenectady-Troy SMSA [2] | 4,750 | 5,750 | 6,750 | 7,750 | 8,800 |
| Binghamton SMSA [2] | 4,900 | 5,950 | 7,000 | 8,050 | 9,100 |
| Buffalo SMSA [2] | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Ithaca [2] | 5,100 | 6,150 | 7,250 | 8,350 | 9,450 |
| Middletown | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| Monticello | 4,350 | 5,250 | 6,200 | 7,150 | 8,050 |
| Newburgh | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| New York SMSA [2] | 5,750 | 6,950 | 8,200 | 9,450 | 10,650 |
| Poughkeepsie | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Rochester SMSA [2] | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| Syracuse SMSA | 5,050 | 6,100 | 7,200 | 8,300 | 9,350 |
| Utica-Rome SMSA | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| North Carolina: | | | | | |
| Charlotte SMSA | 3,900 | 4,700 | 5,550 | 6,400 | 7,200 |
| Durham SMSA | 3,850 | 4,700 | 5,500 | 6,350 | 7,150 |
| Greensboro-Highpoint SMSA [2] | 3,800 | 4,600 | 5,400 | 6,200 | 7,000 |
| Raleigh SMSA | 3,800 | 4,650 | 5,450 | 6,250 | 7,100 |
| Salisbury [2] | 3,550 | 4,300 | 5,050 | 5,800 | 6,550 |
| Winston-Salem SMSA | 3,800 | 4,650 | 5,450 | 6,250 | 7,100 |
| North Dakota: | | | | | |
| Beach | 3,800 | 4,600 | 5,400 | 6,200 | 7,000 |
| Bismarck [2] | 5,050 | 6,100 | 7,200 | 8,300 | 9,350 |
| Fargo-Moorhead SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,900 | 6,950 | 8,000 | 9,050 |
| Garrison | 3,850 | 4,700 | 5,500 | 6,350 | 7,150 |
| Glen Ullin | 3,600 | 4,400 | 5,150 | 5,900 | 6,700 |
| Valley City | 4,450 | 5,400 | 6,350 | 7,300 | 8,250 |
| Wishek | 4,750 | 5,800 | 6,800 | 7,800 | 8,850 |
| Ohio: | | | | | |
| Akron SMSA | 5,100 | 6,200 | 7,300 | 8,400 | 9,500 |
| Canton SMSA | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Cincinnati SMSA [2] | 4,750 | 5,800 | 6,800 | 7,800 | 8,850 |
| Cleveland SMSA | 5,300 | 6,450 | 7,600 | 8,750 | 9,900 |
| Clyde | 4,600 | 5,550 | 6,550 | 7,550 | 8,500 |
| Columbus SMSA [2] | 4,900 | 5,950 | 7,000 | 8,050 | 9,100 |
| Dayton SMSA [2] | 4,600 | 5,600 | 6,600 | 7,600 | 8,600 |
| Hamilton-Middletown SMSA | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| Huron | 5,100 | 6,150 | 7,250 | 8,350 | 9,450 |
| Lorain-Elyria SMSA | 5,100 | 6,150 | 7,250 | 8,350 | 9,450 |
| Toledo SMSA | 5,100 | 6,150 | 7,250 | 8,350 | 9,450 |
| Youngstown-Warren SMSA | 4,950 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| Oklahoma: | | | | | |
| Oklahoma City SMSA [2] | 4,550 | 5,550 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 8,450 |
| Tulsa SMSA [2] | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Oregon: | | | | | |
| Arlington | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| Corvallis | 5,100 | 6,200 | 7,300 | 8,400 | 9,500 |
| Eugene SMSA | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Portland SMSA [2] | 5,100 | 6,150 | 7,250 | 8,350 | 9,450 |
| Salem [2] | 5,150 | 6,250 | 7,350 | 8,450 | 9,550 |
| Pennsylvania: | | | | | |
| Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton SMSA | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| Chambersburg | 4,400 | 5,300 | 6,250 | 7,200 | 8,150 |
| Harrisburg SMSA | 4,500 | 5,450 | 6,400 | 7,350 | 8,300 |
| Johnstown SMSA | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Lancaster SMSA | 4,400 | 5,300 | 6,250 | 7,200 | 8,150 |
| Pennsylvania—Continued | | | | | |
| Philadelphia SMSA [2] | $4,300 | $5,250 | $6,150 | $7,050 | $8,000 |
| Pittsburgh SMSA [2] | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| State College | 4,250 | 5,200 | 6,100 | 7,000 | 7,950 |
| York SMSA | 4,450 | 5,400 | 6,350 | 7,300 | 8,250 |
| Rhode Island: | | | | | |
| Newport County | 4,400 | 5,350 | 6,300 | 7,250 | 8,200 |
| Providence-Pawtucket SMSA | 5,000 | 6,100 | 7,150 | 8,200 | 9,300 |
| South Carolina: | | | | | |
| Charleston SMSA | 4,150 | 5,050 | 5,950 | 6,850 | 7,750 |
| Columbia SMSA [2] | 3,700 | 4,450 | 5,250 | 6,050 | 6,850 |
| Spartanburg | 3,700 | 4,500 | 5,300 | 6,100 | 6,900 |
| South Dakota: Sioux Falls SMSA [2] | 4,700 | 5,700 | 6,700 | 7,700 | 8,700 |
| Tennessee: | | | | | |
| Chattanooga SMSA | 4,400 | 5,300 | 6,250 | 7,200 | 8,150 |
| Franklin | 4,050 | 4,950 | 5,800 | 6,650 | 7,550 |
| Jackson | 3,700 | 4,450 | 5,250 | 6,050 | 6,850 |
| Johnson City | 3,800 | 4,650 | 5,450 | 6,250 | 7,100 |
| Knoxville SMSA | 4,250 | 5,200 | 6,100 | 7,000 | 7,950 |
| Lewisburg | 3,700 | 4,500 | 5,300 | 6,100 | 6,900 |
| Memphis SMSA [2] | 3,850 | 4,700 | 5,500 | 6,350 | 7,150 |
| Morristown | 3,550 | 4,300 | 5,050 | 5,800 | 6,550 |
| Nashville SMSA | 4,750 | 5,750 | 6,750 | 7,750 | 8,800 |
| Texas: | | | | | |
| Austin SMSA | 4,400 | 5,350 | 6,300 | 7,250 | 8,200 |
| Beaumont-Port Arthur SMSA [2] | 4,400 | 5,350 | 6,300 | 7,250 | 8,200 |
| Crystal City | 4,500 | 5,450 | 6,400 | 7,350 | 8,300 |
| Dallas SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| Diboll | 3,350 | 4,050 | 4,750 | 5,450 | 6,200 |
| El Paso SMSA [2] | 4,050 | 4,900 | 5,750 | 6,600 | 7,500 |
| Fort Worth SMSA | 4,450 | 5,400 | 6,350 | 7,300 | 8,250 |
| Galveston-Texas City SMSA | 4,500 | 5,450 | 6,400 | 7,350 | 8,300 |
| Harker Heights | 3,300 | 4,000 | 4,700 | 5,400 | 6,100 |
| Hearne | 3,150 | 3,850 | 4,500 | 5,200 | 5,850 |
| Houston SMSA [2] | 4,550 | 5,550 | 6,500 | 7,500 | 8,450 |
| Killeen | 3,200 | 3,900 | 4,600 | 5,300 | 6,000 |
| Longview | 4,000 | 4,900 | 5,750 | 6,600 | 7,500 |
| Lubbock SMSA [2] | 4,250 | 5,200 | 6,100 | 7,000 | 7,950 |
| San Antonio SMSA | 4,350 | 5,250 | 6,200 | 7,150 | 8,050 |
| Waco SMSA | 4,100 | 4,950 | 5,850 | 6,750 | 7,600 |
| Utah: Salt Lake City SMSA [2] | 4,300 | 5,250 | 6,150 | 7,050 | 8,000 |
| Vermont: Burlington [2] | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Virginia: | | | | | |
| Charlottesville | 4,200 | 5,100 | 6,000 | 6,900 | 7,800 |
| Newport News-Hampton SMSA | 4,050 | 4,950 | 5,800 | 6,650 | 7,550 |
| Norfolk SMSA [2] | 4,100 | 4,950 | 5,850 | 6,750 | 7,600 |
| Richmond SMSA [2] | 4,100 | 4,950 | 5,850 | 6,750 | 7,600 |
| Roanoke SMSA | 3,950 | 4,800 | 5,650 | 6,500 | 7,350 |
| Washington: | | | | | |
| Pasco-Kennewick-Richland | 5,150 | 6,250 | 7,350 | 8,450 | 9,550 |
| Seattle SMSA [2] | 4,950 | 6,050 | 7,100 | 8,150 | 9,250 |
| Spokane SMSA [2] | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| Tacoma SMSA | 4,950 | 6,000 | 7,050 | 8,100 | 9,150 |
| West Virginia: Charleston SMSA | 5,100 | 6,200 | 7,300 | 8,400 | 9,500 |
| Wisconsin: | | | | | |
| Kenosha SMSA | 4,850 | 5,850 | 6,900 | 7,950 | 8,950 |
| Madison SMSA [2] | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| Milwaukee SMSA [2] | 5,200 | 6,350 | 7,450 | 8,550 | 9,700 |
| Wyoming: | | | | | |
| Casper [2] | 4,500 | 5,450 | 6,400 | 7,350 | 8,300 |
| Cody | 4,400 | 5,350 | 6,300 | 7,250 | 8,200 |
| Gillette | 4,500 | 5,500 | 6,450 | 7,400 | 8,400 |
| Powell | 4,400 | 5,300 | 6,250 | 7,200 | 8,150 |
| Puerto Rico: | | | | | |
| Ponce | 3,250 | 3,950 | 4,650 | 5,350 | 6,050 |
| San Juan | 3,250 | 3,950 | 4,650 | 5,350 | 6,050 |
| Virgin Islands: | | | | | |
| St. Croix | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |
| St. Thomas | 4,650 | 5,650 | 6,650 | 7,650 | 8,650 |

[1] Single persons, who are 62 years of age or older or who are handicapped, are eligible for sec. 221(d)(3) housing.

[2] Income limits based on noncurrent data. Income limits for these areas are not to be used for commitment processing. The FHA insuring office must submit to the Office of Technical Standards an updated cost estimate of example structure exhibit B before firm income limits can be established.

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this memorable and momentous week is the eighth anniversary observance of Captive Nations Week. Since 1959 it has become a national observance for us in this great Republic. Considering the sad fate of so many millions in central and eastern Europe, we could do no less, and I am indeed glad that through a joint congressional resolution and by the proclamation of the President the observance of Captive Nations Week was established. It was done in protest against the Soviet Government's deliberate effort to uproot and eliminate all freedom in all central and east European countries over which communism is maintained today through brute force. In adopting this joint resolution the unmistakable intent of the Congress was to proclaim to the free world that neither the people nor the government of the United States would recognize as permanent the present unenviable status of these nations suffering under Communist totalitarianism in their homeland.

At the end of the last war calamities and tragedies followed each other on unprecedented scale and in quick succession. As a matter of fact even before

the victory of the allies over Axis totalitarianism was assured, Communist totalitarianism had already shown its ugly head and grasping hands by occupying and annexing a number of hitherto independent countries in Europe, thus dooming inhabitants there to eventual Soviet enslavement. At the time, however, these moves were not regarded by some people too seriously. Some people even tried to justify certain Soviet moves. Moreover, the governments of democratic countries in the West hoped that these excesses of the Soviet Government could be corrected in calm deliberations that were expected to follow the end of the war. This tolerant and patient attitude of leniency and forbearance on the part of the West toward the Soviet Union, as we all ruefully admit today, was a most serious and grievous mistake. Since the end of the war, for 21 years, the governments of the free West have been trying to correct that major mistake and undo the resulting mischief. Unfortunately thus far all efforts on the part of the West have brought no tangible result.

As the consequence of the Soviet Union's militant aggressive policy in Europe there are today a number of Eastern European nations which are captives of the Kremlin, and a part of another nation—Germany—shares the same fate. These peoples live in countries extending from the Bay of Finland to the Black Sea. They include the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Czechoslovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Albanians, and Rumanians, besides some 17 million Germans in the so-called People's Republic of East Germany. Peoples in all these countries have been suffering under Communist totalitarian dictatorship, imposed and maintained upon them by the Kremlin, for more than two decades. The peoples in the three Baltic countries, the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians, have endured the oppressive Communist rule longer than other captive nations.

These people suffer under an additional stigma in that their homelands have been annexed by the Soviet Union and, as far as the Soviet Union is aware, there are no such independent and sovereign entities today as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

The other captive nations named above, including East Germany, are called free and independent states by the Soviet government. But this is a misleading falsehood. In the West we christened these nations with a new name; to us they all are Soviet satellites, mere marionettes chained to the Soviet steamroller. Today, and until they attain their freedom, the peoples of these countries are captive peoples. In their foreign and domestic policies, in their political, economic, and social structure, the governments of these countries, and their helpless subjects are compelled to follow the inflexible, unbending Kremlin line.

No deviation from that consistent Communist line is tolerated or permitted, and the slightest show of deviation on the part of any of the governments in these countries is ruthlessly punished. Thus the peoples and governments in the Baltic countries, in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, and Rumania are captives of the Kremlin. They have been practically sealed off from the free world by the detestable Iron Curtain, one imposed deliberately and maintained quite effectively by the Kremlin between the free West and enslaved East. The truth about these countries is carefully hidden from the peoples of the West, and of course the peoples of these countries are not allowed to travel freely to the countries in the West.

This wholesale enslavement of so many nations, with nearly 100 million freedom-seeking souls, quite unprecedented in known human history on such a scale, has become well-nigh unbelievable, yet it is the saddest and the most depressing truth we are facing today. Of course the helpless and unfortunate millions suffering there know this better than we do, and at times in defiance of their inhuman oppressors they have staged revolts. Unfortunately their valiant efforts have ended in veritable blood baths. However, it is heartening to know that, even under the most disheartening and depressing circumstances these peoples have not given up hope; they have not lost their faith in freedom, and to free themselves from the deadly clutches of Communist tyranny they are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice for the sublime cause of freedom and democracy.

The people of this great Republic and their government have always shown genuine sympathy for the lot of these unhappy and unfortunate peoples, the captive nations of Europe. Their fate has been, and continues to be, a most serious concern of our Government and of its allies. These captive nations feel that they have a claim upon us, upon our sympathy and humanitarian feelings. They seem to feel that in these anxious days for democracy they are continuing the struggle for the cause of freedom in central and eastern Europe. We are fully cognizant of that, and are aware of our sacred moral responsibility toward these peoples. As proof of that, the observance of Captive Nations Week was duly enacted and proclaimed in 1959.

I offered the resolution in the House. By that act the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." That is our credo, and I am happy to affirm it unequivocally and wholeheartedly on the eighth observance of Captive Nations Week.

---

## A BILL TO DIMINISH THE RIGHTS OF THOSE "BORN TO RAISE HELL"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday, July 10, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star there appeared an article concerning a riot in the Maryland Penitentiary. The Associated Press wire story stated in part:

> Injuries were few and minimal although hundreds of prisoners with baseball bats ran amok for more than two hours, starting fires in four buildings.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Tort Claims Act, as we all know, imposes liability upon the United States for the negligent or wrongful conduct of its employes, acting within the scope of their employment, in cases where a private individual in like circumstances would be liable under the law of the place where the conduct occurred—28 U.S.C. 1346, 2674.

But this waiver of sovereign immunity from suit was not intended to be an all-encompassing one as the act, itself, contains 13 exceptions to such waiver thereby reserving the traditional sovereign immunity from suit to the United States in the circumstances enumerated in the exceptions—see 28 U.S.C. 2680.

Today, I am introducing a bill, which, if enacted, will provide a 14th exception to suit against the United States by providing that the Tort Claims Act shall not apply to "any claim by an individual confined in a Federal penal or correctional institution arising out of an act or omission of any employee of the Government engaged in the operation or management of such institution," that is, if enacted, the bill would preclude claims and recoveries by Federal prisoners for damages for personal injuries sustained during confinement and allegedly caused by the negligence of Federal prison personnel.

In this area of tort law, the lower Federal courts which have considered the issue, which is the substance of my bill, have held, with rare exception, that the Government was not liable for the negligence of its prison officials under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

However, the Federal Supreme Court, in 1963, reversed this rule in its decision in *U.S.* v. *Muniz*, 374 U.S. 150, on the ground, chiefly, that the legislative history of the Tort Claims Act establishes a congressional intent to include prisoner's claims within the act.

Since this decision, no doubt, a number of prisoner's claims for compensation have been, rightly or wrongly, initiated. In fact, on March 21, 1966, Judge Sidney O. Smith, Jr., of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta Division, awarded the sum of $110,000 to Meyer Harris Cohen, a/k/a Mickey Cohen, as total compensation to him for injuries sustained during an assault upon him by a fellow inmate of the U.S. Penitentiary of Atlanta, Ga.

Against results such as these, I am inclined to seriously question not only the legal soundness of the Court's decision in the Muniz case, but, more importantly, its propriety.

The choice of a career in crime is an individual matter. Once made, it must be assumed that the individual also chooses the elements of violence and punishment which are attendant to the

perpetration of the crime, or the confinement upon conviction of a crime. In brief, it may be said that having chosen a criminal career, the individual assumes all the risks inherent in such a life, not the least, of which, is the risk of violence at the hands of his fellow careerists either within or without the prison walls.

Having made the choice, and assumed the risks of his career, why, then, should the taxpayer be put to the burden of responding in damages when the violence the criminal assumes does, in fact, occur to his personal disadvantage.

The American soldier, charged with the constructive task of defending our freedoms, is not similarly privileged. To the contrary, the same Supreme Court held, in *Feres* v. *United States*, 340 U.S. 135, that a soldier could not sue under the Federal Tort Claims Act for injuries which arise out of or are in the course of the activity incident to his military service.

Among the reasons articulated by the Court, in support of its decision in the Feres case, was the existence of a comprehensive compensation system for the armed service personnel.

A similar, comprehensive system of compensation, of course, does not exist with regard to Federal prisoners. But a limited system does exist whereunder inmates or their dependents might be compensated for injuries suffered or sustained while engaged in any industry or in any work activity in connection with the maintenance or operation of the institution where such inmate is confined—see 18 U.S.C. 4126, which further provides that in no event shall the compensation paid be an amount greater than that provided in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act which is set forth at 5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.

Imperfect, or incomplete as this system of compensation may be, nevertheless, I submit, that it is the only system of compensation the Congress intended with regard to prison inmates who sustain injuries during their period of confinement. To contend otherwise, would, to me, endow those destructive elements of our society with privileges, advantages, and compensation superior to those granted to our military personnel whose service and career efforts are pointed to the constructive task of protecting and defending our Nation.

Given the authority to remedy this apparent inequity, can it be doubted that the taxpaying constituency would certainly prefer to legislate in a manner limiting the prisoner's recovery for personal injuries sustained during his confinement to those provided for in the aforesaid compensation act:

How, then, can we as the elected representatives of that constituency do otherwise?

To this end, then, I earnestly request your favorable consideration and prompt enactment at my bill to firmly declare the intent of the Congress in this area of tort claims by providing that the claims of Federal prisoners for damages for personal injuries sustained during confinement and allegedly caused by the negligence of Federal prison personnel are without the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point two editorials from the May 19, 1966, issue of the Peoria Labor News and the July 19, 1966, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

[From the Peoria Labor News, May 19, 1966]

SO, WHO'S WRONG?

There seem to be fashions in thinking, as well as in apparel, architecture, interior decorating, music, the arts, and practically anything else that comes to mind, and perhaps there is nothing basically wrong with intellectual cycles or anything else.

Unfortunately, most of us are prone to accept—if not necessarily follow—these trends without giving much thought to their validity.

Apparently there is an "in" way of thinking, and those of us who aren't the automatic "joiner" type and thus pass up the opportunity to participate in the "jet set" intellectuals probably should keep quiet.

But here is one lone voice of possible dissent, or at least skeptical question, to the rapidly spreading theory that the increasing crime rate and other unpleasant developments of modern living are due primarily to the fact that our modern society isn't perfect.

Well, in the first place no one of any consequence has ever claimed that the society of our times is perfect, or that the average Joe Blow citizen is a paragon of virtue, without blemish or without fault.

But how or why should that excuse the criminal who can't or won't obey the law like anyone else; why should living in an imperfect society condone the lazy, the unwilling or the "I want-it-now" kooks who think that working hard and saving are all right for others but not for them?

For the victims of misfortune, of illness, accidents or such economic hazards as unemployment and layoffs, there should be understanding and constructive help; for those who are denied equal opportunity there must be effective aid; for the aged, the ill and the unemployable there must be compassion and a chance to live with some measure of individual dignity.

But let's not go overboard in excusing those who deliberately rob, cheat, steal or chisel because they haven't developed a taste for honest work.

Certainly, our society isn't perfect. Admittedly, there are some things wrong—perhaps even quite a few things wrong—with the economic, social and cultural structure that people are building, and trying to improve, in this country and the rest of the world.

But take a closer look at those who refuse to abide by the rules and regulations that society has devised for its own protection.

Isn't it barely possible that there may be something wrong with them?

---

[From the Peoria Journal Star, July 19, 1966]

"BORN TO RAISE HELL" UNHINDERED

Not a single soul was surprised that the man behind the fingerprints in the bloody Chicago apartment where eight nurses were slaughtered turned out to be an ex-convict with a long record of trouble. We're used to it.

Indeed, he was not only a man with a penchant for getting into trouble but one who advertised his war against society in tattoos on his arms.

Yet, society, itself, refused to recognize him as a serious menace until eight young women, preparing for a life of service to their fellow men, were led out to brutal slaughter one by one.

Were they the first? Were they the only ones to pay a frightful cost for our self-righteous indulgence of men like their murderer?

It is an interesting exercise to wonder how men become as bestial as that, and to speculate about the possibilities of curing them. It would be a wonderful thing if we could find a genuine solution by such means.

The record is written in blood from one end of the country to the other, however, that we have failed to do so effectively.

What we have succeeded in doing is releasing such men, over and over again, to carry on this and other kinds of depradations on their fellow men.

We have succeeded in making their capture and conviction increasingly difficult. We have succeeded in making it virtually impossible to hold them in safe restraint as they develop down the path of beatings and burglaries and robberies such as preceded this violent outbreak.

We have succeeded in finding ways for them to return to lives of violence if, by some stroke of fortune, we do manage to convict them.

And with it all we have succeeded in abandoning the reasonable protection of the population—in this case eight young women learning a humanitarian skill.

Society must learn to protect itself—intelligently, realistically, and with restraint—but to successfully protect itself from those who prey upon their fellow man, regardless of how "they got that way."

Ironically, if this man had killed all nine, and one had not miraculously escaped his knife, the chances of convicting him under existing Supreme Court rules would be very slim, indeed.

You don't invite witnesses to crimes of murder and robbery. Yet, we have imposed rules now, whereby without witnesses effective investigation is crippled and effective prosecution almost impossible.

Ironically, too, we have news of major crime in California now being suppressed because of another Supreme Court ruling regarding "pretrial publicity"—and if similar procedures were followed in this case the man might never have been found nor arrested.

If the practice initiated by the Supreme Court spreads, the public will not even have the basic knowledge of what is going on and what criminal activities are threatening their lives—or what public officials are failing in their duty regarding criminal activities.

A change will come when the skyrocketing crime rate reaches the point of public explosion, and tragically, if we wait until then the answer may then be a system of justice much harsher than necessary.

---

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is Captive Nations Week here in America once again. And once again I am happy to raise my voice in support of the cause of freedom for the peoples of these unfortunate countries.

Captive Nations Week, which we have now been observing annually since it was established in 1959, serves a very useful purpose.

It keeps us continually aware of democracy's unfinished work and deserves the attention and support of citizens throughout our land.

It is a time, Mr. Speaker, to renew our pledge to those who lost their freedom

at the ruthless hands of Communist tyrants. It is an opportunity to make it clear once again to the rulers in Moscow, Peking, and tyrants wherever they exist, that democracy is a living and dynamic force that will not only survive but will grow. We can make it clear, as we do today on the battlefields of Vietnam, that the United States as leader of the free world does not shrink from that responsibility but rather accepts it as a challenge and an opportunity recognizing that our freedom and that of every nation throughout the world will rise or fall together. This fact has become even abundantly clear in a world which grows smaller every day.

Therefore, the plight of the captive nations is our plight; their hope to regain their freedom and independence is our hope, for we share with them a common goal of independence and the common cause of liberty. Let it be known to those who yearn for their freedom and those that deny it to them that the United States is determined in this cause and committed to this goal.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the struggle for freedom is an endless one. Even when the independence of the captive nations is regained, the struggle will not be over. The forces of freedom must constantly be alert and freemen must always be ready to defend the liberty they love.

The conditions that exist in the captive nations today, the lack of free speech, the lack of religious freedom, in short, the absence of those institutions which are the sacred rights of a freeman, should be made known to those who are asked to make the choice of which type of society they wish to be a part and remembered by those who question whether the sacrifices over the years and today in Vietnam are worthwhile.

Most of all, Mr. Speaker, this week serves the purpose of reminding us that communism has not changed her spots. When we thought that tension had eased in the Caribbean and in Europe, the war in Vietnam heated up. And today the Soviet Union has even refused to send athletes to compete against our own boys in a track meet just because of our determination to resist aggression in Vietnam. No, it does not take much to break through the thin veneer and see the same old Communist tyranny underneath.

So let us not think the problem is solved. Let us not think we can forget the people of the captive nations. Let us resolve instead to keep up the pressure. Since we last met here in this well Indonesia has come over to freedom. Rumania and Bulgaria are making unusual noises. Our efforts, I am convinced, are paying off. Let us keep on pushing, and working, and fighting for freedom, everywhere in the world.

## HOUSE SHOULD ACT ON ETHICS LEGISLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation continues to be shocked and puzzled about the recent Senate investigation and hearing into possible conflicts of interest and the possible misappropriation of campaign funds of a Member of Congress. This situation again points up the need to put teeth into the Code of Ethics for Government Service, which a number of us were successful in enacting in 1958.

During the Senate Rules Committee hearings in 1964, I urged the committee to adopt legislation which I have pushed for almost two decades. I am proud to say that my idea to establish a policing body in the Congress was adopted at least in the Senate. It should be adopted in the House as well.

I am hopeful the Committee on the Organization of Congress will include in its recommendations to the House of Representatives, the proposals which I have worked on and presented to the 89th Congress. I list them here and urge that the Committee give serious attention to reporting out a bill to include these proposals:

House Joint Resolution 36, to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government: This Commission would have investigative powers and would advise officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of breaches of ethics for appropriate disciplinary action.

House Resolution 18, to establish a House Committee on Grievances: This committee would be authorized to require members of the House to make a full and complete disclosure of personal income and investments, and would have investigative powers leading to recommendations for censure, expulsion, impeachment or prosecution in case of wrongdoings.

H.R. 9626, to tighten the lobbying laws by turning over the administration of lobbying procedures and reporting to the Comptroller General of the United States, to enforce the lobbying law, which is not now being done.

Speedy action will clear the air on possible continued violations of the Code of Ethics which needs these strengthening provisions in the public interest.

## GENERAL OBSERVATIONS OF U.N. COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in December 1965, the General Assembly of the United Nations established an Ad Hoc Committee of Experts to examine the finances of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies.

The Ad Hoc Committee was composed of 14 countries designated by the President of the United Nations General Assembly. They were: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, France, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Nigeria, Senegal, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America.

During the past 6 months the Ad Hoc Committee held some 95 plenary meetings devoted to analyzing the financial situation of the whole family of United Nations organizations. In addition, the Ad Hoc Committee worked through various working and drafting groups which met as required to perform various specific functions.

The report which culminates the comprehensive efforts of the Ad Hoc Committee has been released this week and will be submitted to the United Nations General Assembly at its 21st session.

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time allotted to me today I shall not attempt to comment on the numerous recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts. I simply want to draw the attention of the Congress to the publication of the report and to some of the major recommendations included in it. A summary of these recommendations will follow at the end of my remarks.

I should also like to compliment the Ad Hoc Committee for their outstanding effort to improve the financial procedures of the entire family of United Nations organizations. As chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have long advocated a thorough review of such procedures with a view to achieving greater economies, more efficient performance, and better coordination. I believe that the remarks of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts, if properly implemented, will contribute to the attainment of those objectives.

Mr. Speaker, the "General Observations" of the Ad Hoc Committee of Experts, together with their recommendations on various subjects, are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS

II. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

14. The growth of economic and social activities in the United Nations family of organizations over the past decade has been truly remarkable. During that period, the total funds available to them have increased from about $186 million to almost half a billion dollars annually. Although a proportion of the total funds has been absorbed by increased administrative costs, a sizable part has been expended on new programmes in the field of economic and social development. But in spite of this growth in the developmental activities of the United Nations family of organizations, it must be recognized that the total needs of the developing countries are far in excess of available resources.

15. This unprecedented expansion of vital activities in the economic and social fields has not always followed a preconceived plan. Concern has been expressed lest uncontrolled expansions and growth should render less effective the increased efforts Member States must be prepared to make in order to accelerate economic and social progress in the

developing countries. A judicious allocation of the limited resources available must be made in order to achieve maximum results. For the same reason, it is incumbent upon the organizations, both individually and collectively, to keep their programmes and methods of work under constant review with a view to increasing the effectiveness of their action.

16. The recommendations which follow in this report are based on the general considerations contained in resolution 2049 (XX), namely that any expansion of the activities of the United Nations family of organizations "should take into account both the needs they are intended to meet and the costs Member States will have to bear as a result." In this context, and in addition to the recommendations set forth in the body of the report, certain members were of the opinion that the United Nations and the agencies should attempt to keep the expenditures provided for in their regular budgets within predetermined limits, or to define in advance a rate of growth for the United Nations family of organizations. Several other members were of the view that this was not practicable.

17. The Committee concentrated its endeavours on the basic measures needed to ensure greater efficiency and real value for money in the vital work of human, social and economic development. As a group of experts, the Committee has paid particular attention to over-all efficiency, to the elimination of possible duplication and overlapping, to improved methods of budget preparation and presentation, to inspection and control, to better administration, long-term planning and evaluation and to the best utilization of available resources, both human and material. It is the hope of the Committee that its recommendations, if found acceptable to the General Assembly and subsequently implemented, will further strengthen and invigorate the United Nations family of organizations in the performance of their fundamental task.

III. BUDGET PREPARATION, PRESENTATION AND PERFORMANCE

The Committee recommended the following:

*A. Budget preparation*

26. The heads of the organizations should transmit preliminary and approximate estimates to the bodies responsible for examining the budget early enough to enable them to consider the main items of the budget well in advance of formal presentation and to make comments and suggestions thereon in good time. This could be done about one year before the date on which the legislative bodies of the organizations are required to give their final approval to the budget.

27. The heads of the organizations would then prepare and draw up their budget estimates for detailed consideration by the competent constitutional organs. The documents constituting the budget estimates should be passed to the competent organs early enough to enable them to make a thorough study before the beginning of their budgetary sessions.

28. In all the organizations, a financial committee or similar body should make a report on the budget estimates, giving its comments thereon. The report should be made available to Members States in adequate time before formal adoption of the budget by the appropriate legislative bodies. Organizations should make sure that bodies responsible for examining financial matters should be so constituted as to make this examination as effective as possible and where members of financial committees or executive boards are not themselves specialists in financial matters they should as far as possible be assisted by such specialists at meetings at which budgetary matters are considered.

29. The organs responsible for examining the budget estimates should arrange their work in such a way that they can devote as many meetings to this subject as are necessary for a thorough discussion.

*B. Standardization of budget documents*

Uniform Budget Layout

30. A study should be undertaken under the auspices of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions with a view to defining ways and means of bringing the organizations' budget layouts into line and of consequently securing, if possible, their acceptance of a uniform budget presentation.

31. Pending the formulation of such a uniform budget presentation, each of the organizations, while retaining for its own budget the layout most closely suited to its particular operating conditions and at the same time to the requirements of control, should provide, in a special document, a breakdown of its expenditures following the standard classification which has been or will be proposed by the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. As far as the United Nations is concerned, the special document should contain information on the various units included in the budget, particularly those related to the economic and social fields.

Common Principles of Budgetary Presentation

32. Without disrupting the practices followed by each organization, the organizations should in the first instance provide a certain amount of supplementary information for the purpose of imparting greater clarity to the existing budget documents.

(a) The organizations using the traditional budgetary breakdown by object of expenditure, should submit, either in the budget itself or in a special document, a breakdown of their expenditure by main fields of activity.

(b) The organizations using the functional method of budgetary breakdown by main fields of activity should submit, either in the budget itself or in a special document, a breakdown by object of expenditure.

(c) All organizations should submit certain annexes to their budgets, one of which should give a breakdown of expenditures into administrative costs, operational costs, and general research and study costs.

(d) All organizations should include in their budget documents a foreword and comments which are drafted along approximately the same lines.

Cost Increases for Present Establishment

33. Estimates should show clearly to what extent proposed increases are due, on the one hand, to expansion of staff, programs, or activities generally, and, on the other hand, to increases in prices (including in this term salaries and wages). All organizations should adopt a standard budgetary practice and nomenclature in identifying and showing separately increases in proposed expenditure due solely to rises in prices (including salaries and wages), noting that in this context the expression "mandatory increases" is inaccurate.

*C. Budget practices and performance*

Reporting on Budget Performance

34. The heads of all organizations should prepare a report on their budget performance, emphasizing the salient features of the performance and drawing attention to the main changes as compared with the original estimates including transfers and supplementary expenditures which have taken place during the financial period under consideration and measures taken to meet the cost increases for present establishment (particularly by way of savings, reassessment of priorities and redeployment of resources). These reports should be forwarded to Member States as soon as possible after the close of the financial year.

Transfers

35. The head of each organization should retain full discretion to make transfers within each "appropriation line", provided, however, that he report such transfers at the earliest opportunity to the competent organs vested with financial responsibility. The term appropriation line means the basic heading for the appropriation, whatever the name used by the organization in question.

36. The provisions set forth in paragraph 35 above might leave undue latitude where a particular appropriation line represents a disproportionately large percentage of the total budget. Accordingly, for the purpose of applying that paragraph, such appropriation lines should be subdivided into subheadings of a reasonable size, each of which would be considered as an individual "appropriation line". It should be left to the competent organs vested with financial responsibility to decide which appropriation lines represent a disproportionately large percentage of the total budget, and what ought to be the size of the sub-headings.

37. As far as transfers between appropriation lines are concerned, the head of the organization should request prior authorization from the competent organs vested with financial responsibility, resorting, if necessary, to a postal approval procedure, which would have the advantage of enabling him to poll the members between sessions.

38. In his financial report on budget performance, the head of the organization should describe any transfers effected, and explain why they were made.

Supplementary Estimates

39. The heads of the organizations should calculate the budget estimates and control obligations in such a way as to ensure that appropriations are not exceeded.

40. Unavoidable increases in expenditure in certain sectors should, as far as possible, be financed in the first instance by savings in other sectors. This applies in particular to increases due to rises in prices (including in this term salaries and wages) which should so far as possible be absorbed by reassessment of priorities, redeployment of resources, and, where necessary, by adjustments within the budget.

41. In order to provide the heads of the organizations with a small amount of funds to meet contingencies which may arise and which cannot be met by savings or postponed until the adoption of the next budget, a special appropriation line might, where necessary, be included in the budget for these minor contingent expenses.

42. Drawings on the working capital fund to finance supplementary expenses without prior appropriation should, as a general rule, be discontinued as from the time when the organizations adopt the procedures suggested above.

43. Drawings on the working capital fund without prior appropriation should be made only in clearly exceptional cases involving emergencies within the limits laid down by legislative bodies, and to the extent that they cannot be financed out of the measures mentioned in paragraphs 40 and 41 above.

44. When drawings on the working capital fund without appropriation have been made, the heads of the organizations should report at the first opportunity to the competent organs vested with financial responsibility and submit the appropriate requests for supplementary appropriations to their organization's legislative body.

45. Adherence to the above procedure should ensure that recourse to supplementary appropriations would be kept to a minimum.

46. In every case the heads of the organizations should include as part of their annual financial reports the requisite explanation of the supplementary expenses incurred

and the financing procedure used to meet them.

Working Capital Funds

47. Working capital funds should not be used to finance supplementary expenses without prior appropriation, except in clearly exceptional cases (see paragraphs 43 and 44 above). The essential purpose of such funds is to make it possible to finance expenditures pending the collection of contributions.

48. The practice whereby some organizations credit all or part of their miscellaneous income to their working capital fund should be discontinued; miscellaneous income should be paid into the general fund.

49. The level of the working capital fund should be determined by reference not merely to the total budget but also to the expected timing of the inflow and outflow of total funds at the disposal of the organization.

50. Consequently, any requests for an increase in an organization's working capital fund should be accompanied by a statement of liquid funds, showing inflows and outflows on a monthly basis during set periods in preceding years and a forecast for the coming year. Explanatory comments should be provided specifying the main factors which might jeopardize the organization's liquidity and the time of year when they most usually occur. The competent organs would thus be in a better position to approve the most appropriate level for each organization's working capital fund.

51. The States members of the various organizations should pay their contributions as promptly as possible, so as not to create additional difficulties for the organizations in respect of liquidity.

*D. Standardization of financial regulations*

52. If the organizations decide to adapt their internal regulations in order to follow the recommendations made by the Committee in A, B and C above, they should try as far as possible to reconcile and standardize their respective financial regulations when making the necessary amendments thereto.

IV. THE BUDGET CYCLE

The Committee recommends that:

(a) Specialized agencies having an annual budget cycle should adopt a biennial cycle;

(b) The Secretary-General should be asked to make a detailed study of the advantages and disadvantages of a biennial cycle for the budget of the United Nations, having in mind the discussion of this matter in the Committee, and his report, together with the comments of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions thereon, should be submitted to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

V. STANDARDIZATION OF NOMENCLATURE

The Committee recommends that:

(a) The Secretary-General should be requested to pursue this matter actively in consultation with the agencies, and to prepare a report for the information of the General Assembly;

(b) The specialized agencies should lend their full co-operation to the Secretary-General in this matter;

(c) A standard nomenclature of budgetary and financial terms should be adopted and followed throughout the United Nations system.

VI. AUDIT, INSPECTION

The Committee recommends that:

*A. External auditors*

(a) The various organizations should, wherever necessary, amend their financial regulations which set out the duties of the external auditors, in order to enable them to make observations on the administration and management of these organizations;

(b) The Secretary-General, as chief administrative officer of the United Nations, and as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, in co-operation with the heads of the specialized agencies after consultation with the Chairman of the United Nations Board of Auditors should study the question of the establishment of a common panel of auditors, responsible for auditing, on a rotational basis, the accounts of all the organizations of the United Nations family, and report thereon to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session.

*B. Establishment of an inspection unit*

An Inspection Unit should be established on the following lines:

(a) Establishment of the Inspection Unit: There should be established, in agreement with the various organizations of the United Nations family, a joint Inspection Unit. This Unit would be administratively attached to the Secretary-General, as chief administrative officer of the United Nations and as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.

(b) Composition and appointment: The Inspection Unit should consist of a very limited number (not exceeding eight) of inspectors chosen from among members of national supervision or inspection bodies, or from among persons of similar competence, on the basis of their special experience in national or international administrative and financial matters. The President of the General Assembly should draw up, with due regard to equitable geographical distribution, a corresponding list of countries, each of which should be requested to nominate a candidate or preferably a panel of candidates. The inspectors should be appointed initially for a period of four years by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, after consultation with the other members of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination. The inspectors should not be appointed to any post in the secretariats of the organizations of the United Nations family until the expiry of at least three years after termination of their functions.

(c) Functions and powers: The inspectors should make on-the-spot inquiries and investigations, some of which may be without prior notification, as and when they may themselves decide, in any of the services of the different organizations of the United Nations family. Acting singly or in small groups, they should have the broadest powers of investigation in all matters having a bearing on the efficiency of the services and the proper use of funds, and should be accorded at the highest level full co-operation and facilities for the discharge of their duties, including access to any particular information or document. They should be bound by professional secrecy as regards all the information they receive and the contents of their reports. Standards for the conduct of the inspections, and the inspection programme, should be determined by the unit itself. The inspectors themselves should have no power of decision nor should they interfere in the operation of the services they inspect.

(d) Reports: The inspectors should draw up, over their own signature, reports for which they should be alone responsible, and in which they should state their findings and propose solutions to problems they have noted. As regards these inspection reports:

(i) They should be sent to the service being reported on and to the Executive Head of the organization concerned simultaneously;

(ii) The service should have an opportunity to present in writing, in a document to be attached to the inspection report, any comments it may wish to make;

(iii) The combined documents should be transmitted by the Head of the organization concerned to the members of the organization's Executive Board or Governing Body (in the case of the United Nations to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) with a statement of his own stating what action he has taken, or proposes to take, on the inspection report and any other comments he may wish to add;

(iv) The Executive Board should follow up on the matter until it has been satisfied;

(v) The Executive Board should decide on the further distribution, if desirable, of the inspection report and its appendices;

(vi) The Executive Board should communicate to the Special Committee on Co-ordination of the Economic and Social Council for its information a résumé of the above-mentioned reports, comments and action.

(e) Administrative and financial provisions: The cost of the operation of the Inspection Unit should be shared by the organizations of the United Nations family, as agreed upon by them.

(f) Temporary provisions: The Inspection Unit should be established for an initial period of four years. Prior to the end of that period, the organizations of the United Nations family should decide, upon the recommendation of the General Assembly whether the Inspection Unit should be continued.

VII. PROGRAMME PLANNING AND EVALUATION

*A. Long-term planning*

*The Committee recommends to each of the organizations of the United Nations family that:*

(a) Early steps should be taken to develop and adopt an integrated system of long-term planning, of programme formulation and of budget preparation;

(b) To this end, each organization should develop an effective long-term plan in keeping with the broad goals included in its charter or statute. The process would involve making these broad goals more specific by formulating the priority objectives to be accomplished by the organization within the planning period. Specific courses of action for accomplishing the agreed objectives and goals would be contained in the organization's proposed plan;

(c) Throughout the planning process choices should be made among competing demands. This entails establishing further priorities by the organization as well as giving consideration to alternative ways of accomplishing its specific objectives;

(d) Each organization should develop its own processes and staff capability to carry out the following:

(i) Define clearly its specific objectives—i.e., *what* it hopes to accomplish within definite points of time—by taking into account the priority needs of Member States, the over-all capability of the organization, and the probable financial costs to Member States;

(ii) Formulate, following consultations with other interested organizations, major alternatives, with related costs, which would express in specific terms *how* to accomplish the previously defined objectives; analyse these alternatives (with related costs); and include in the plan those which would be likely to achieve the best results in terms of cost-effectiveness;

(iii) Provide leeway for possible adjustments to changing circumstances and for the inclusion of further activities which might respond to the special and often changing needs of the developing countries;

(iv) Present the proposed plan to its governing body for consideration and comment on the content of the plan, the priorities, and the general magnitude and time-phasing of expenditures;

(v) Prepare an integrated document (containing all programmes financed from both budgetary and extra-budgetary funds) for the selected time period, which would be based on the agreed plan, which, in addition

to containing the long-term agency plan, would include the proposed programme and budget for the next budget period, having taken into consideration prospective resources. This programme would be detailed and provide information on specific activities while the plan would concentrate on major activities and would be drawn up so as to provide the necessary degree of flexibility. The document would show the estimated total cost time-phased over the expected duration of the plan. The appropriate bodies of the organization would review and comment on this document, and approve with whatever changes they considered necessary that part which corresponded to the next budget period. In preparing subsequent programme and budget documents, the heretofore agreed plan might be revised in the light of changed circumstances, and an additional two-year tentative plan formulated to complete the suggested six-year time period. An essential aspect is the continuous process of review and updating. The introduction of new elements into the plan would depend in part on the progress achieved in the preceding period;

*B. Evaluation*

The Committee recommends that:

(a) The organizations should take steps to improve and strengthen the evaluation process wherever possible;

(b) The organization should utilize information resulting from internal reviews of their operations, as well as the views of Member States in which these operations are conducted, to a greater extent in programme formulation and execution, thus making results of their reviews an important element of the system of long-term planning, programme formulation, and budget preparation which the Committee has recommended;

(c) The organizations should be required to provide governing bodies (including executive committees or councils), as a part of timely progress reports, with evaluation data on continuing projects or programmes at intervals of no more than twelve months, as well as reports on evaluation of projects or programmes when completed;

(d) The Economic and Social Council and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination should encourage to the fullest extent the development of common evaluation methods and standards for the organizations;

(e) The Economic and Social Council should continue its systematic evaluation of the impact, both over-all and specific, of the programmes of the organizations in the economic and social field in meeting the needs of Member States and, if necessary, strengthen arrangements for co-ordinating evaluation.

VIII. COORDINATION

The Committee makes the following recommendations:

(a) The agencies, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the General Assembly should, to the extent practicable, perform their respective reviews of budgets in such a way as to enable the agencies to take the recommendations of the General Assembly into consideration before adopting their respective budgets.

(b) The United Nations and the agencies should give careful consideration to the harmonization and adjustment of meeting and conference schedules in order to secure the greatest benefits from the reviews discussed above.

(c) The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Economic and Social Council should give increasing attention to identifying vital issues and making recommendations thereon for consideration by the General Assembly and each body should share with the other its comments and recommendations on these and other matters within their respective spheres.

(d) The Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions should, from time to time, review systematically and in depth the administrative and management procedures concerning the programmes and budgets of the specialized agencies. This might be done by examining in depth one or two agencies each year. This, in addition to its direct usefulness, should enable the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to recommend the application of more consistent standards and approaches to common problems.

(e) In the intervals between the scheduled meetings of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination at the executive head level, meetings of their alternates should be organized to prepare for top-level discussions, to handle problems not requiring executive heads' consideration and to ensure the execution of decisions taken. The alternates should be from among the direct assistants of the executive heads of the organizations.

(f) In addition to the effective role at present being carired out by the Resident Representatives in achieving co-ordination among the organizations in the field, the United Nations Development Programme, the principal dispenser of funds in the operational field, which has already initiated internal procedures to develop its own information on the actions carried out by a number of organizations on a geographical basis, should, in agreement with the various organizations, systematically improve the procedures for co-ordination on a geographical basis. Accordingly, the organizations should inform the United Nations Development Programme, at the earliest possible stage, of the actions they plan to carry out, in order to make it possible to eliminate the possible overlapping and to improve the harmonization of different projects through mutual information and consultations.

(g) The Economic and Social Council, in order to carry out more effectively its responsibilities for co-ordination under provisions of the United Nations Charter, should reconstitute its Special Committee on Co-ordination, to consist of experts.

(h) As regards the new Committee:

(1) The Economic and Social Council should elect twelve experts out of nominations by States Members of the United Nations, for a period of three years, on a rotational basis, taking into account the principle of equitable geographical distribution, to serve as governmental representatives in their expert capacity; experts should be eligible for re-election.

(2) Those elected should have a high degree of experience and competence in the following or similar fields:

(a) The United Nations and related organizations, in the economic, financial and social areas;

(b) The governing bodies of the specialized agencies and subsidiary bodies of the United Nations.

(3) The Committee should meet as necessary to review the activities of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in order to prepare recommendations for the Economic and Social Council on the co-ordination of their programmes in the economic, social and human rights fields; it should, inter alia, pay particular attention to possible overlapping and duplication.

(4) The Committee might at an early stage consider the existing procedures for co-ordination.

(5) In the accomplishment of its task, the Committee should place emphasis upon a full exchange of views with representatives of the secretariats of the organizations.

(6) The Committee should, in the discharge of its functions, work in close liaison with the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination.

(i) Adequate staff support should be provided to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the Economic and Social Council, and the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination by utilizing as far as possible the present staff of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies.

91. Despite the other steps recommended above, effective co-ordination will eventually be achieved through co-ordination within Governments themselves of their own efforts and of the positions of their own representatives to the several organizations. It is hoped that the observations and comments contained in this report will impress Governments with the necessity for more effective co-ordination at all levels, including the national level of Member States.

IX. CONFERENCES, MEETINGS AND DOCUMENTATION

The Committee makes the following recommendations, the implementation of which would make it possible not only to rationalize the programme of conferences but also to ensure the best possible use of the financial and human resources available:

(a) Each major organ of the United Nations and the specialized agencies should review the conference programmes of each of its related bodies, including the functional and regional economic commissions or committees of the United Nations and similar commissions or committees of the specialized agencies. This review should be conducted with a view to reducing total meeting time to the extent possible, including consideration of the possibility of biennial meetings;

(b) Those specialized agencies whose legislative bodies now meet on an annual basis should consider the possibility of biennial sessions;

(c) All the organizations in the United Nations family should inform the Secretary-General in good time of the conferences and meetings they are planning and when taking their decisions in this regard, they should be guided by the following procedures:

(i) The Secretary-General, in order to carry out his responsibilities for servicing conferences and meetings, and as Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, should, in consultation with the organizations in the United Nations family, draw up in advance a draft consolidated annual calendar of all conferences and meetings, reconciling as far as possible the total available resources and the views expressed by the various bodies concerned;

(ii) The appropriate organs of each of the organizations concerned, in their endeavours to bring about close co-ordination among themselves, should be invited to take their decisions in establishing their own programmes of conferences and meetings on the basis of the consolidated calendar;

(d) In the budgets of the organizations of the United Nations family, the costs of conferences and meetings should be the subject of:

(i) A special line in the budget, showing the expenditure directly attributable to conferences and meetings;

(ii) An annex containing an estimate of the total expenditure pertaining directly and indirectly to these activities;

(e) The Secretary-General should be asked to recommend a definition of the term "major special conference" which appears in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 2116 (XX);

(f) The Member States of the United Nations and the specialized agencies should be urged to spare no effort in reducing substantially their requests for all conference

documentation, so as to facilitate the possibility of presenting it at the most opportune time, in a concise form and in the most economic way, avoiding all unnecessary expenses; that whenever possible the Chairmen should encourage the holding of meetings without verbatim or summary records since, while affording participants an opportunity to express their views more freely, this would lead to a substantial reduction in services and documentation;

(g) Governments normally sending large delegations to international conferences should substantially reduce the size of their delegations with a view to easing the strain on existing conference facilities and decreasing the quantity of documents required for distribution;

(h) No dependent body should be permitted to increase the number or length of its meetings already authorized without the specific approval of the organ which established it;

(i) Where practical, physical facilities for conferences should not be expanded until it has been possible to evaluate the effect of putting into practice the above recommendations;

(j) Only the most urgently needed new conference personnel should be added to the secretariats of the United Nations family of organizations until it has been possible to evaluate the effect of putting into practice the above recommendations;

(k) In the planning of future conferences and meetings the following guidelines should be taken into consideration by the United Nations family of organizations:

(i) Priorities should be established for fixing the areas and programmes of meetings and conferences on a long-term basis;

(ii) The availability of human and physical resources necessary for servicing conferences should be determined and taken into account;

(iii) The financial ability of the organizations and of Member States to meet the requirements necessary to hold conferences should be determined and taken into account;

(iv) An adequate interval of time should be allowed between conferences of the same body or of a similar nature;

(v) There should be effective co-ordination between the United Nations and the specialized agencies on the convening of major international conferences;

(vi) Whenever possible the United Nations and the specialized agencies should jointly convene conferences, meetings or seminars which are of a similar or complementary nature.

X. LOCATION OF SERVICES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Committee recommends that:

(a) The Secretary-General's attention should be drawn to the views expressed in the Committee;

(b) The Secretary-General should be invited to maintain his continuous review of the location of the various services of the United Nations Secretariat, bearing in mind the need for the most effective and economical arrangements.

XI. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF EXTRA-BUDGETARY PROGRAMMES

The Committee recommends that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions keep the problem of the administrative costs of extra-budgetary programmes under review in order to ensure equitable sharing of the overhead cost of the United Nations Development Programme by the executing agencies and the United Nations Development Programme.

XII. OTHER QUESTIONS

*a. Personnel questions*

The Committee recommends that the Secretary-General should make every effort to improve the measures he has already undertaken in the matter of permanent and fixed-term contracts, in order to correct the imbalance in the composition of the Secretariat to the largest extent possible, keeping fully in mind the principles of Articles 100 and 101 of the Charter.

## BILL TO EXTEND CITY POSTAL DELIVERY SERVICE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, a week ago I introduced a bill numbered H.R. 16256, which would extend city postal delivery service to the doors of approximately 3.3 million American families now being wrongfully deprived of such service.

It is a fact that 3.3 million American homes have been placed just a few feet beneath the rest of the country because of an arbitrary decision in the Post Office Department. In trying to determine why certain homes have been refused door delivery service, even though they qualify for such service under Post Office Department regulations, I was told simply that it was an economic measure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no argument with economy, but I do disagree with the way the Post Office Department is trying to economize. The Department has determined that homes in new developments which did not have door delivery prior to May of 1963 shall have curbside service.

In other words, if a family buys a new home in a new development, that family can expect curbside delivery. But, if the family buys a home a block away on a residential row which existed prior to 1963, it may expect door delivery.

The inconsistencies in postal policy were clearly demonstrated to me in the sixth district city of Sheboygan, Wis., recently, when a group of residents picketed the post office to protest the fact that they do not receive door delivery service, even though the area in which they live is an isolated island within a postal route currently receiving door delivery. In fact, they pointed out, the postman who rides a three-wheel vehicle along the curb and drops the mail in their curbside boxes parks his vehicle when he comes to the next block and walks to the door of the home to deposit the mail.

I feel that the principle involved here is not merely a matter of a few feet—the distance these people must walk to pick up their mail. The principle is that all Americans should receive equal service, since they pay equal taxes and equal postal fees. I strongly object to this discrimination against postal patrons whose only fault is that they live in homes which did not qualify for door delivery prior to 1963—possibly because they did not exist—but now fall within the Post Office Department's requirements for such service.

Since the Post Office Department has informed me that the denial of such service is purely an economic problem—that there are insufficient funds for such purpose—I have introduced H.R. 16256 to appropriate $39,325,000 for the remainder of the current fiscal year. This appropriation is for the express purpose of providing the door delivery service in question to the American homes now qualifying but not receiving such service.

It is a short, simple bill. It serves the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of H.R. 16256 in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 16256

A bill making an appropriation to enable the Post Office Department to extend city delivery service on a door delivery service basis to postal patrons now receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby appropriated to the Post Office Department the sum of $39,325,000, to remain available until expended, for the purpose of providing door delivery service to postal patrons receiving curbside delivery service who qualify for door delivery service.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to consider this matter carefully and to lend their support to this bill. This is simply a matter of authorizing the Post Office Department to provide equal services for equal taxes and fees.

## COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield?

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, we have finished our legislative business for the week.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday and the balance of the week, the resolution, House Resolution 910, a 21-day resolution providing for consideration of the bill, H.R. 14765, will be taken up. Following that, the bill itself, H.R. 14756, the Civil Rights Act of 1966 will be considered under an open rule with 10 hours of general debate.

The announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference

reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the Members of the House that we will proceed on Monday to the consideration of the rule on the civil rights bill. We will continue until the rule is disposed of. Following the adoption of the rule, it is our intention to continue through the week with the consideration of the Civil Rights Act until it is finished. If consideration of the bill is not completed, we will go on through Saturday and pick up again the next week. I do want to advise the Members that we will not break off the consideration of the civil rights bill during the week and we will not adjourn early in the week unless the bill is disposed of.

---

## REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966, H.R. 15111

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the July 19, 1966, meeting of the House Republican policy committee a policy statement regarding H.R. 15111, Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966 was adopted. As chairman of the policy committee, I would like to include at this point in the RECORD the complete text of this statement:

The House Republican Policy Committee is opposed to H.R. 15111, the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966. The Administration's so-called War on Poverty is scandal-ridden and in serious trouble. Even so, this bill would authorize the expenditure of $1.75 billion for fiscal year 1967 without attempting to correct many abuses and gross mistakes that plague the present program. The anti-poverty program must be reformed and reoriented if public confidence is to be regained.

Unfortunately, the Education and Labor Committee has not fulfilled its responsibility. The Democratic majority on the Education and Labor Committee repeatedly promised a full-fledged study of the war on poverty and was given $200,000 for this purpose. However, field hearings did not materialize and an ever-changing investigative staff has been confused by changes in direction, cancelled trips and recalls from investigations. The reports which were issued have been sketchy and contained statistics and percentages rather than the material needed to draft corrective legislation. Some reports were intentionally withheld from the Republicans and, to date, no final report has been made public.

The hearings that were finally held developed into an eight-day parade of administration spokesmen and apologists for the poverty program. The Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee recommended 67 witnesses who were knowledgeable in all aspects of the anti-poverty program. However, these recommendations were ignored and the hearings abruptly terminated. When Chairman POWELL of the Education and Labor Committee was questioned concerning the arbitrary action and asked why this had been done, his only reply was "Because I am the Chairman."

For these reasons, this bill should be returned to the Education and Labor Committee for the adequate hearings and detailed consideration that it deserves and must receive.

For many years, Republicans in and out of Congress have proposed a variety of programs to assist those on the lower rungs of the economic ladder. We have consistently advocated appropriate educational programs, employment training, tax incentives, equal opportunity as the major means of helping the disadvantaged. These are all incorporated in the Republican Opportunity Crusade Act of 1966. These affirmative and constructive proposals are contrasted with the extravagant, wholly-uncoordinated and makeshift Democratic programs.

In view of the Democrat approach to this serious problem, it is little wonder that the record of the administration of the anti-poverty program is filled with stories of mismanagement, abuse, and scandal. For example:

(a) After one year, the Women's Job Corps Center, Hotel Huntington, St. Petersburg, Fla., graduated only 42 enrollees at a cost of $1,646,601, which averages $39,205 per graduate.

(b) In Boston, Mass., Youth Corps officials were unable to locate 200 youths listed as employees and for whom W-2 income tax forms had been issued.

(c) In Memphis, Tenn., youths with a weekly salary of $31.25 were forced to kickback $25 each from their salaries for the hiring of an unauthorized supervisor.

(d) In Bellevue, Nebr., a neighborhood Youth Corps Project was cancelled after investigators reported 90 percent of the youths enrolled were not from low-income families.

(e) Job Corps costs per enrollee have been estimated to be between $9,120 and $13,000 per year and salary increases for large numbers of Job Corps officials have ranged well over 50 percent. Moreover, known felons have been selected for Job Corps camps and disgruntled Job Corpsmen have terrorized whole communities.

(f) In the selection of Youth Corps enrollees, admitted political favoritism has been employed by local Democratic leaders. And prominent Democrats have been rewarded with unwarrantedly profitable contracts.

(g) Unjustifiably high salaries have been paid to OEO and Community Action officials. Of the 2,350 permanent employees budgeted for the Washington and regional offices of OEO, 1,006 will get $10,619 or more, 521 will be paid over $14,600, at least 54 will get over $19,600, 24 get over $25,000, and 6 will get between $26,000 and $30,000. In Washington, D.C., and Newark, N.J., the Executive Directors of UPO receive $25,000, and in Boston, Mass., the Executive Director of the Action for Boston Community Development received $27,500.

(h) In city after city, the poor have not been properly represented in the Community Action programs.

Providing meaningful assistance to the poverty stricken in this country is one of the most important domestic problems facing America today. There must be a genuine war against poverty—one that is waged for the benefit of the poor—not the politicians. Unfortunately, the present bill does not do this. In order that this may be accomplished, H.R. 15111 must be amended as follows:

1. The known and documented abuses of the Job Corps must be eliminated.

2. In all Community Action programs, the poor should be involved.

3. The States should be given a larger role and greater responsibility.

4. Program and funding priorities should be established which would emphasize the needs of the very young and the training opportunities afforded by private enterprise.

5. All OEO programs and functions should be transferred to other agencies or departments, with the exception of Community Action and VISTA.

6. A select committee should be appointed that would conduct a thorough and bipartisan investigation of the structure and operation of the Economic Opportunity Act.

7. Employees of all OEO-sponsored projects should be placed under the Hatch Act's prohibitions on political activities.

The Job Corps must be completely revamped with an accent on intelligent evaluation of applicants, necessary discipline in the camps, use of private enterprise to create realistic working and training conditions and the immediate elimination of extravagant spending for staff, facilities, and travel. The young men who cannot meet Selective Service standards but want to volunteer for the military should be prepared for service in the armed services.

The poverty program must include active and broad-based participation by the States. The States and local communities are, and have been, in the business of fighting poverty far longer and to a far greater extent than the Federal Government. Welfare and education programs historically have been funded and administered by State and local governments. Cooperation and assistance at the community level must not be set aside. On the contrary, it must be encouraged if the waste and duplication of the present program are to be eliminated.

Project Headstart was originally proposed by Republicans as early as 1961. It is the most successful of the new poverty programs. Unfortunately, since it derives its support from both OEO and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, confusion, overlapping administration and inadequate funding have occurred. Without question, this program can, and should be even more successful. It is an educational program and, as such, it should be funded through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and administered by the Office of Education.

Except for the Community Action program and VISTA, all programs presently under the Economic Opportunity Act should be taken from OEO and placed in the department or agency where they logically belong. Due to the waste, inefficiency, and political favoritism that have become so much a part of the Office of Economic Opportunity, public confidence can be restored only through this type of reorganization. Moreover, this transfer of functions would result in greater efficiency between all government programs in the same field and would cut down on the present overlapping and duplication of administration.

Employees of OEO-sponsored projects should be placed under the Hatch Act prohibition on political activities. Since the inception of OEO, Republicans have documented the fact that the War on Poverty has been operated in great part for partisan political purposes. To curb these abuses, we urge that Hatch Act provisions applied to Title I be extended to all sections of the Act. In 1965, the poverty hearings were opened with the charge by Chairman POWELL that the poverty program contained "giant fiestas of political patronage." Unfortunately, the House Democrats turned down Republican amendments to provide Hatch Act coverage. This year the Democratic Committee members have admitted the truth of our charges by adopting a Hatch Act amendment which would cover all war on poverty activities. We applaud this long-delayed action. We trust that, if enacted, this provision will be vigorously enforced.

We believe that an honest war on poverty can be waged and won without the scandal and mismanagement that have surrounded the Administration's program. The basic

reforms that we have urged can be adopted by substituting the Republican Opportunity Crusade Act for the faltering and misfiring War on Poverty. This substitute will help rather than hinder those who are fighting this important battle.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE'S GENERAL COURT PROVES STATE LEGISLATURES CAN DO GOOD WORK EFFICIENTLY; REPRESENTATIVE BROWN REPORTS SUCCESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Bob Brown, one of the two Representatives to the New Hampshire General Court from Peterborough, periodically writes an excellent and perceptive column reporting on the events in our State capital when the legislature is in session and on other matters of interest to his constituents. His reports in the Peterborough Transcript are always of high quality and interest.

His recent column, about the accomplishments of a 1-day special session, is especially interesting and pertinent. It shows clearly and concisely how good a job can be done by a State legislature when it wishes to. This fact is particularly appropriate now when State legislatures, and the National Congress, too, are so often criticized for inefficiencies and failures to cope with the needs of the people. In reading Mr. Brown's comments, it should also be kept in mind that the General Court of New Hampshire consists of 400 representatives and 24 senators, making it one of the largest legislative bodies in the world. This size does not mean inefficiency, however.

My colleagues may be interested to know, also, that Bob Brown is a retired Air Force colonel, a jet fighter-pilot who holds a commercial flying license. His military duty included assignments to the U.S. Embassies in Turkey, Syria, and Lebanon, as well as combat flying in World War II and Korea. Since his retirement, he has continued his education, winning a masters degree in education in 1964, and has taught statistics and mathematics in a number of schools in New Hampshire on a part-time basis.

He also finds time to assist his wife in her work as managing director of the nonprofit, professional Peterborough Players summer theater. Bob Brown is an experienced and trained observer. I think my colleagues will find his observations on the legislature's special session interesting and encouraging. It appeared in the June 16 issue of the Transcript.

"$9,000 TO FIND WHAT PUBLIC WANTS IS BARGAIN"

(By Bob Brown)

On Monday our efficient and inexpensive state legislature met in special session from late morning until after the normal dinner hour.

In that long working day we demonstrated why a broad-based representative government is the most stable way in which men can live together in 20th century society.

We sampled statewide public opinion.

We listened while experts talked about our problems. We listened while some speakers tried to push pet remedies.

We listened to some attempts to wheel and deal in devious ways. We halfway listened when an exhibitionist or a clown got to the microphone.

Sometimes we talked over what had been said with the men and women sitting near us. Sometimes we left our seats to get opinions or further facts from legislators whose competence we had learned to value.

From time to time we expressed our opinion by voice vote. Our confidence in the proven integrity of our organization is so great that we left it up to Speaker Walter Peterson's trained ears to decide how the majority had voted.

When the wording of the law or the closeness of the vote made an exact count necessary, we stood up to be counted. We knew we could trust the totals reported by the one man in each of the five sections chosen to count heads.

Critics of our large, amateur part-time legislature seem to me to miss two important points.

First: What happens in states like Massachusetts doesn't seem to indicate that having a legislature whose members make their living out of politics is the best way to get a reasonably honest and a reasonably efficient government.

Second: Sometimes the reason our legislature doesn't adopt some pet plan favored by the particular critic is that the public is against the critic's pet plan. (It's a good rule of human nature that the majority is usually right when it turns down pet plans which promise too much.)

Somebody told us that the special session was costing the taxpayer $9,000 per day. He meant to scare us by quoting this high figure.

When you consider how much money industry or the federal government often spends for a marketing survey or for an in-depth public opinion study, an occasional $9,000 spent to find out what the New Hampshire public really wants represents quite a bargain rate.

Other States with different traditions or with long distances which legislators must travel might not be able to use our town meeting type legislature. For New Hampshire, I'm now convinced, our present legislative arrangements are good ones.

Certainly there is room for improvement—as in all human institutions. It is easy to point to short-comings. It is easy to poke fun.

But I noticed lots of short-comings in Army and USAF organizations, from small units right up to headquarters in Washington. The diplomats I served with didn't always have a perfecet record.

High school and college faculty meetings I've attended have sometimes come up with rather odd decisions. Detroit and Madison Avenue experts covered themselves with no glory when they designed and tried to market the Edsel automobile.

Winston Churchill summed it all up when he agreed that democracy is wasteful and inefficient. But, he added, the one thing you can say for it is that it works better than all those other systems that have been tried.

If you don't like the results of our legislative process, don't waste time in day dreams about the magical results that would come from changing the system.

If you want to improve the quality of our legislation, and if you have the time to go to Concord and the ability to influence other representatives, you ought to consider trying to be nominated and elected.

On the other hand, those of us now serving in the legislature have learned from the other 399 representatives that there is more than one side to every question. We have also learned—the hard way—that sometimes there is somebody around who knows more about some subject than we do.

So the next best thing to getting yourself elected is to phone your representative or to stop him in the street to give him your suggestions.

He may not follow your suggestion. But he will listen to the suggestion and consider it carefully.

If he doesn't, you can be sure he isn't planning to run for reelection.

## GRAND LARCENY IN THE GRAND CANYON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, although political leaders might give the impression that Arizona residents solidly support the legislative maneuvering to steal the beauty of the Grand Canyon in exchange for uneconomic hydroelectricity from Marble Gorge and Bridge Dams, there is increasing evidence that more than a few of that State's populace are suspicious of the artifice even though it might not be discreet to make their distrust public.

One Phoenix resident who prefers to be identified with opponents of the plan of destruction for the Grand Canyon is Dale Slocum, whose opinion has been published in the June issue of Arizona Wildlife Sportsman, which generously devotes space to individual sportsmen for comment on issues pertaining to the outdoors. In fairness to that publication, I cite this sentence from the page on which the Slocum editorial appears: "These views are those of the writer only, unless otherwise designated."

The editorial follows:

LET'S PRESERVE THE GRAND CANYON

(An editorial by Dale L. Slocum)

(NOTE.—The following editorial was written by Dale Slocum, an outdoor writer and ardent conservationist who successfully led the fight to keep the oil interests out of the Kaibab North while he was the executive secretary for the Arizona Game Protection Association.)

When Clayton Niles, representing the Governor of Arizona at the forum held at Grand Canyon, condemned the individuals, organizations and *Reader's Digest* for using ". . . unfounded, inaccurate and irresponsible propaganda" in defense of preserving the Grand Canyon it reminds one of the old adage—"the kettle calling the pot black."

Proponents for the construction of Bridge and Marble Canyon dams have flagrantly been using "misleading propaganda" in their promotion. From the text of last month's editorial in this magazine it is quite evident that the Governor received his information from these sources.

In support of the construction of Marble Canyon dam they carefully point out that it will be built 12½ miles upstream from the

Park boundary and Niles said, "It follows that this can have no conceivable effect whatsoever upon any portion of the Grand Canyon National Park and to imply that it will is untrue . . . the reservoir being upstream from the dam."

He fails to point out as Ben Avery, outdoor writer for the Arizona Republic wrote, that this dam would have a far greater effect upon the canyon than would Bridge Canyon dam as it would cut off access to the use of the river below this point. Although proponents state there would be 100-miles of river left untouched for those who would care to enjoy such adventure, they fail to say how one is to get their equipment down the precipitous canyon walls to the water. The only access to the river is presently at Lee's Ferry, several miles upstream from Marble Dam.

It is beyond any understanding how the trickle of water, the 1,000 feet per second flow which the Bureau of Reclamation hopes to regulate for downstream commitments, could do anything but effect the canyon. River runners do not care to venture a trip with less than 15,000 fps and they would rather have something in the vicinity of 25,000 fps.

I have been on the river trips on several occasions. On one occasion someone "pulled the cork" and the water dropped to below 7,000 fps by the time we reached Phantom Ranch and one could nearly kick up dust hiking across to the other shore.

Let's turn to Bridge Canyon dam. Here everyone, even the proponents admit it does indeed encroach upon the park area. But how carefully they use their figures. With full realization that few people are aware there are two separate areas of this natural wonder that have been set aside as a shrine to nature they state, ". . . there is no accessible point on either rim of Grand Canyon National Park, or from any trail along the canyon wall, or in the bottom of the canyon from which it would be possible to see any portion of the dams or reservoirs created by either dam."

By referring to the Grand Canyon National Park they can divert attention to the fact that the reservoir would inundate the entire inner gorge of the Grand Canyon National Monument. They do not point out that here is the only point . . . the only point where one can drive an automobile to the very edge of the inner gorge and see the river nearly 3,000 feet directly below. There is absolutely no place like it in the entire Nation.

Proponents for the dam, and our Governor quoted them, say, "The Hermit's Rest viewpoint would be nearer to Bridge Canyon reservoir than any other developed viewpoint in the park. And, when we speak of developed viewpoints and trails on the canyon wall, it brings to mind that if it were not for these highways along the rim and these developed trails, this great scenic wonder would only be available to a small handful of wealthy, healthy people who are fortunate enough to be: rich, endowed with physical stamina; and possessed of the inclination to take expensive trips along the canyon rims."

The key word here is again, "park." They overlook the improved road and lookout developed on the north rim, still within the park, to Point Sublime, several miles nearer the Bridge Canyon reservoir than Hermit's Rest. They fail to mention the road to, and the ranger headquarters that have been constructed in the Monument area that has previously been described. The key word in all of their propaganda is "PARK."

Now I am neither wealthy, nor do I feel that I am endowed with any amount of physical stamina, nor do I feel that it requires any particular amount of stamina to drive a car to the very rim of the inner gorge of the Monument area where one can look directly into the area of Bridge Canyon reservoir that is more than 40 miles below the backup point of the water.

Proponents for the dams state that their plan is not wasteful and that thousands of Arizonans face economic ruin as their wells dry up if these dams are not built. This is misleading. Neither Bridge nor Marble Canyon dams are designed to be diversion dams. The diversion to central Arizona will be made at Lake Havasu near Parker Dam. They are not needed to regulate the river's flow as the Bureau has Glen, Hoover and Davis dams for this purpose.

Then what are they for? They are part of the Bureau's program to perpetuate projects for themselves and to create hydroelectric power sources. Such power costing nearly twice that of atomic energy producing plants.

Overlooked, also, is the loss by evaporation from the surface of these reservoirs. Here proponents say there will be very little loss. But look at their own figures as presented at a public hearing in Los Angeles by Duane L. Georgeson, head of that city's water planning group. ". . . the combined evaporation of these two new reservoirs would be only one-tenth of the present evaporation of Lake Mead. Without power plants at Bridge and Marble Canyon there would be need to construct in excess of 2-million Kilowatts by thermal generating plants. The water requirement for these steam plants would be approximately one-half of the projected evaporation at Bridge and Marble Canyon, therefore, it can be seen that the two new dams will create no significant increase in evaporation in the river."

They did not state that the Interior Department intended to create the steam generating plants regardless. This announcement came from Secretary Stewart Udall at a later date when it was announced as the "largest regional electric power program in history."

This simply means that the evaporation loss will be the combined amount from both dams and that of the steam generating plants. The latter amount being the amount they suggested we would save by the building of the two dams!

One-tenth of the evaporation of Lake Mead does not mean very much until we realize that the evaporation from Lake Powell is great enough to care for the annual needs of a city the size of Denver. The surface area of Lake Mead is approximately nine times that of Lake Powell. And they state their plan is not being wasteful!

The Grand Canyon National Monument and the Grand Canyon National Park were not set aside as areas for exploitation by water users and electric power development, but for its unique scenic qualities.

In closing I would like to quote from Secretary Udall's own statement pertaining to such spoilers when he said, "The land raiders will continue to scar and contaminate our land until enough conservation minded people organize a vigilante movement that will check their desecrations.

"The trouble these days is that few people are aroused until blight hits their own backyard. We will lose most of the big fight to save our countryside unless enough people get involved—and stay involved. Wrong-headed bureaucrats, indifferent public officials and short sighted engineers will put the future uppermost in their planning (and I might add, only) when they feel the hot breath of public opinion."

## CRIME RATE MUST BE REDUCED

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of Congress would agree there must be a combined assault on crime by the Federal, State, and local governments if the appalling crime rate in this Nation is to be reduced.

Perhaps the greatest need today is to awaken every American to his personal responsibility in the war against crime. Every citizen must come to realize that local police departments can function effectively only if they have the complete support of the communities they serve—and that means the support of every law-abiding man, woman, and child in that community. It means primarily support of two kinds—dollar backing and a willingness on the part of citizens to become "involved."

Every American who believes in law and order must become an ally of the police officer in his neverending war against the criminal. It is only with this kind of active assistance that our police can do their job well and take pride in it.

Apart from local effort and Federal help, the State must muster stronger forces if the nationwide war on crime is to produce significant results.

I would like to call attention to action being taken in my own State of Michigan, where Gov. George Romney has just named a new State commission on crime, delinquency, and criminal administration.

The new commission is headed by John B. Martin, of Grand Rapids, former State auditor general and a man with more than 10 years' experience on similar State and local groups.

Under Martin's direction, the commission will study all of the facets involved in reducing the incidence of crime in Michigan—the scope of crime; the problems of law enforcement faced by State and local police and by county sheriff's departments; police training, recruitment and salaries, with a possible view to establishing State standards in this connection; the carrying out of criminal justice, including the administration and expediting of criminal cases; the effects of criminal treatment, particularly aftercare programs and how criminal repeat patterns may be deterred; and the extent to which the individual citizen may become "involved" and may assist in solving crimes.

State and Federal funds are being used to finance this study. It is the kind of endeavor which should be undertaken throughout the Nation if America's streets ever are to be made safe again.

## A GRAVE SITUATION

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer of the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., has pointed out that the paralyzing airline strike could have grave consequences on the traditional collective bargaining between unions and employers.

I wish to draw this thoughtful commentary to the attention of my colleagues, and request unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD.

A GRAVE SITUATION

The massive airline strike which has paralyzed passenger transportation over a large part of the nation could have grave consequences on the traditional collective bargaining between unions and employers.

The strike (still on as this is written) appears to be another example of a "damn the public" attitude by a power hungry labor leader.

Joseph W. Ramsey, vice president of the union that has grounded 60 percent of the nation's air traffic, has spurned the settlement recommended by a presidential board even though this panel ignored the president's 3.2 percent guide lines and offered a proposal that would cost the airlines an estimated $76 million a year. The airlines accepted the board's offer. Ramsey wanted more.

The danger, far greater than the inconveniences to the public and economic hurt to the lines, is that the public, and congress, fed up with ridiculous strikes in essential industries and in public transportation, may turn to compulsory arbitration as a solution. Both labor's Ramseys and employers generally will be the loser if this comes to pass.

Collective bargaining has seen labor, generally, pacing our growing economy. The give and take at the bargaining table has, on the whole, proved a very effective way of providing a fair balance between employe and employer. Compulsory arbitration is something else, again. Labor would lose its most effective weapon, the right to strike, and the employer would, in effect, find the government controlling his costs and hence his business.

Our system of enlightened capitalism would suffer a staggering setback.

Certainly any labor leader capable of reason does not want to see his bargaining rights in the hands of a government arbitrator or panel. But brinksmanship, as exercised by Ramsey, is going to bring this about.

When a union, such as the International Association of Machinists, can, in the face of a generous recommendation by a panel appointed by a sympathetic administration, ground a large part of the air traffic of a nation at war, something is going to give. It will probably be the workers' hard won right to bargain face to face with his employer.

---

## HANDCUFFING THE POLICE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of much of the rural press in southwestern Minnesota to recent Supreme Court rulings on law enforcement and crime procedures can be seen in two recent editorials appearing in the Second District. Les Curtis, editor of the Watonwan County Plaindealer in St. James, and Al McIntosh, editor of the Rock County Star-Herald in Luverne, have addressed themselves to this important subject. I include their editorials for the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

[From the Watonwan County Plaindealer]

SHOOT AND BE MERRY! COPS ARE HANDCUFFED!

(By Les Curtis)

The recent ruling of the United States Supreme Court barring signed confessions from being used as evidence in the trial of a criminal unless they are obtained under very restrictive procedures, has caused quite a furor among police officials and other law enforcement agencies.

During the past few years the Supreme Court has made so many interpretations and rulings for the protection of the individual that we wonder just how long it will be before criminals, communists and extremists of all kinds will have no fear whatever of the law, or of being prosecuted for their acts against other individuals or groups.

One very good discussion of the situation was written by Paul Harvey, newspaper columnist and radio commentator of Chicago, and published in the June 22, 1966 issue of The Minneapolis Daily American. It is headed: "Shoot and be merry! Cops are handcuffed!" Here is how he views the situation:

"The man with the smoking revolver standing over the dead body says, 'I did it and I'm glad', yet he may go free.

"The policemen at the scene of the crime are now required (by Supreme Court edict) to advise the man with the smoking revolver:

"1. You don't have to say anything.

"2. Anything you do say may be used against you.

"3. You have a right to an attorney before I ask you anything.

"4. If you can't afford an attorney, one will be provided free.

"If police abuses had necessitated clarification of the Fifth Amendment, there might be some justification for a Supreme Court decree, but the fact is that confessions under duress have long since been ruled unacceptable.

"Further, with our crime rate increasing five times faster than our population is increasing—youth crimes seven times faster—this is a most inopportune time to further shackle our law enforcers.

"With street rioting an increasing menace, much of it doubtless spawned by the leniency of our courts, it should appear to any objective observer that we have gone quite far enough in protecting the rights of the criminal; now we'd better give some attention to the rights of the law-abiding citizen who is presently terrified in the asphalt jungle, avoiding the streets, cowering behind locked doors and shuttered windows.

"Henceforth, any crime with no witnesses will be virtually unsolvable.

"My heart bleeds today for the lawmen whom we bind with red tape, then say, 'Stand there and shield us from the lawless.'

"If the police forces of our nation become forceless—if pretty soon nobody will take that thankless job except a sadist on the muscle or a fink on the take or a thug on the make—

"If our police become what police already are in many Latin American nations—hired two-hat lackeys for precinct lawbreakers—

"It will have been because we made the task of a conscientious cop so desperately difficult that no decent, dedicated man will volunteer anymore."

If the Supreme Court is so concerned with protecting the rights of a criminal when he runs afoul of the law, why should it not also be equally concerned with protecting the rights of individuals to walk safely on the streets or to live securely within the walls of their own homes?

The pendulum has swung too far to the left! Let's get it going back the other way for a change!

---

[From the Rock County Star-Herald]

HANDCUFFING THE COPS BUT NOT THE CRIMINALS

(By Alan C. McIntosh)

The recipe for destruction of a nation is not terribly complicated. (It's always easier to destroy a nation from within rather than by force because there are always so many gullible who don't see what is being done to them.)

First of all you poison a nation's soul, by corrupting its personal and national moral and spiritual standards.

Then you put out the poison bait in the form of "free money" that "somebody else will get if we don't get ours while the getting's good."

When the moral fibers have, as a result, rotted enough then you move in for the kill by destroying respect for the courts and the police.

England is now short 6,500 "Bobbies" and the undermanned law enforcement agencies there can't begin to cope with a rising crime wave.

We will eventually see the same thing here. Anybody who wants to be a cop nowdays is just plain out of his mind. Why should any man want to take the spittle, the rocks, the bullets, the foul abuse for which police are prime targets today? There are easier, safer ways to make a living.

Frankly—we have always been a "cop lover." We've known some noble, dedicated men—officers who were willing always to risk their lives to protect society in the line of duty.

(We'd rather have six cops for pallbearers than six millionaires. The millionaires might steal the handles off the coffin on the way to the grave.)

We have always recoiled in disgust at the lunatic fringe of rightists who scream "impeach Earl Warren." They can trace for you the strangest ties connecting the chief justice and sinister forces. Which is so much bunkum.

However—we will say that when President Eisenhower yielded to political pressure and named Earl Warren as chief justice of the Supreme Court he made one of his greatest and most tragic blunders.

Warren never was and never will be a student of the law. We wouldn't be surprised if his law clerk couldn't write a better opinion.

America's future is being reshaped due to the fuzzy wuzzy thinking of the "liberal" wing of the court. But what has been done in stripping the people of protection from the criminal is beyond belief. Giving the chief justice his majority of one in his recent decision was Justice Abe Fortas. He was the "fixer" when Lyndon Johnson got into deep trouble politically when his election hung by a thread of 87 fraudulent votes in his Texas senatorial campaign.

The most recent decision regarding police work the whole monstrosity is like letting a ten year old run the atomic plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The Mapes vs. Ohio decision was bad enough. Even tho you saw a criminal with a million dollars of loot in his possession it would be illegal search and seizure to arrest him.

Now—you can't question a criminal without advising him right off the bat that he can have an attorney . . . and you can't question him against his wishes.

What we are doing is handcuffing the cops but not the crooks.

The protection of society has never entered into the thinking of the court.

Thru the years we've known a lot of law enforcement officers. A few were oafs. A very, very few were bullies who liked to throw their weight around. Some were sadists. But—ninety seven per cent of all those cops were dedicated men, courageous men, men willing to risk their lives to protect the innocent, men that were truly heroes.

Some mighty good cops have actually wept to me over what has now been done to law enforcement and how helpless society is in the face of the onslaught of vicious criminals.

The cops are fed up and we don't blame them. Many are eager to quit.

As to the opinion itself some of the most distinguished jurists in America are aghast at the court's latest opinion. The rambling, woozy, fuzzy, wuzzy opinion written by Chief Justice Warren, say the jurists, is shocking. If it had been written by a law school senior he would have been flunked out of school, they say.

Justice Warren had made it a physical impossibility for police authorities to cope with criminals. To gain a conviction now you will have to have an eye witness for every crime.

We don't want Justice Warren impeached.

But we do think that the Congress and the citizenry should re-evaluate the court.

## THE FARMER IS NOT THE CAUSE OF INFLATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Al McIntosh, editor of the Rock County Star-Herald in Luverne, Minn., did a fine job recently in setting the record straight as to the position of the American farmer in our economy. In his editorial, Mr. McIntosh refers to efforts earlier this year by the Administration to make the farmer the fall-guy for the inflation in our economy and goes on to prove how ridiculous this assumption actually is.

I include the editorial at this point in my remarks.

WILL THE REAL VILLAIN PLEASE STAND UP?

Maybe President Johnson did the American farmer a favor when he tried to paint him as causing the inflation spiral of living costs.

It started a lot of farmers thinking.

Thinking about the fact that the farm parity figure has dwindled to 79.

Spokesmen for industry and government would have you believe that the farmer is having it rosy.

In reality the farmer is having it tough.

In truth he is entitled to raise a little piuperfect hell since we are now in the era of pressure tactics.

Let's look at the facts.

For every dollar spent for food last year by the American public American farmer's "take" was 39 cents.

In 1947–1949 the farmer got a half dollar out of every food dollar.

He is getting seven per cent less from the farm food market basket (according to the National Commission on food marketing) than he did 20 years ago.

And the prices of what the farmer pays . . . have they gone up? You can say that again.

On your 21 cent loaf of bread the farmer's share was 2.7 cents.

On that 47 cent half gallon of milk the farmer's share was 29 cents.

For every dollar you spent on beef the farmer's share was 59 cents.

The farmer's share of the 9 cent box of corn flakes was only 2.6 cents.

Food costs to the consumer have gone up 28 percent but that is nothing compared to the 50% increase in rentals and the 77% increase in medical care costs.

The administration and the public tend to low rate the importance of this American farmer who only got $409 out of the $1,042 the average family spent for food in 1965.

The public and the government forget that three out of every 10 jobs in private employment are geared directly to agriculture.

They forget that 30.3 billions is spent each year for goods and services by farmers to produce crops and livestock.

They forget that the farmer also spends 12 billions for consumer goods . . . to say nothing of the 4.7 billions he spent for tractors and other equipment plus the 3.3 billions he spent for repairs.

The farmer is not the one to blame for the inflationary spiral even tho a lot of people are trying to make him look like the culprit.

"Will the real villain please stand up?"

## SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on October 2, 1964, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an aggressively moral and uniquely incisive speech by Dr. Charles H. Malik, distinguished philosopher, educator, diplomat, theologian, writer, and lecturer and President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, 1958–59. Decorated by 12 governments and the recipient of honorary degrees from 36 colleges, Dr. Malik was Ambassador of Lebanon to the United States, and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon, in addition to serving as President of the U.N. General Assembly. Because of his extensive experience in the field of world affairs, his views in this area certainly merit serious consideration. In this address, delivered at the commencement exercises of Seattle University in June 1961, Dr. Malik referred to the contest between the free and Communist worlds as perhaps the most decisive battle in history, and recommended:

It is most important, therefore to develop and execute policies and actions that will put the Communists and their friends historically on the defensive. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, must therefore, pass to the offensive, not only of thought and conviction, but of that real, decisive, historical action which shall cause the Communists to take to their heels.

In no area is there at present a more urgent need for taking the initiative than in the case of the captive nations. While we have, to a certain degree, taken the offensive in helping the people of South Vietnam preserve their freedom, and rightfully so, the cause of freedom for the peoples of the enslaved nations has been almost forgotten. A listing of those nations now under Communist domination will serve to remind us of the enormity of this issue:

| Country and people: | *Year of Communist domination* |
|---|---|
| Armenia | 1920 |
| Azerbaijan | 1920 |
| Byleorussia | 1920 |
| Cossackia | 1920 |
| Georgia | 1920 |
| Idel-Ural | 1920 |
| North Caucasia | 1920 |
| Ukraine | 1920 |
| Far Eastern Republic | 1922 |
| Turkestan | 1922 |
| Mongolian People's Republic | 1924 |
| Estonia | 1940 |
| Latvia | 1940 |
| Lithuania | 1940 |
| Albania | 1946 |
| Bulgaria | 1946 |
| Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, etc., in Yugoslavia | 1946 |
| Poland | 1947 |
| Rumania | 1947 |
| Czechoslovakia | 1948 |
| North Korea | 1948 |
| Hungary | 1949 |
| East Germany | 1949 |
| Mainland China | 1949 |
| Tibet | 1951 |
| North Vietnam | 1954 |
| Cuba | 1960 |

We might well profit from the manner in which the Soviet Union takes the offensive at every opportunity. For instance, at the Tricontinental Conference in Cuba in January of this year, representatives from 83 pro-Communist, anti-American groups heard Sharaf Rashidovich Rashidov, of the Soviet Union, declare:

In Asia, the piratical policies of imperialism have been especially vividly expressed in the criminal aggressive war waged by the U.S.A. against the heroic people of Vietnam. The United States is subjecting the cities and villages of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to barbaric air raids, destroying the civilian population, burning the crops, destroying industrial enterprises and communications.

Notice that the Soviet Union is not at all bashful in naming the United States as the aggressor in Vietnam. But, although the United States has on occasion referred to Soviet aggression against the captive peoples, it appears that of late more reliance is being placed on increased trade and cultural relations and other forms of peaceful coexistence with the Soviets and the other Communist-bloc nations. Perhaps it is reasoned that a show of friendship will entice the Soviets to remove their missile sites from North Vietnam, or persuade the Red Chinese from supplying Ho Chi Minh with armaments, or cajole Czechoslovakian representatives in the United States into never again attempting to bug our State Department.

At least in 1959 and 1960, the Presidential proclamations on Captive Nations Week made no bones about specifically naming the primary source of world aggression, the Soviet Union. A

comparison of the Presidential proclamation of 1960 and that of 1966 will illustrate the point:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1960—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*Whereas* many nations throughout the world have been made captive by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Soviet communism; and

*Whereas* the peoples of the Soviet-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

*Whereas* the citizens of the United States are linked by bonds of family and principle to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

*Whereas* it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

*Whereas* by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress has authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July, 1959, as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world:

*Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower,* President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1960, as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

*In witness whereof,* I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

*Done* at the city of Washington this 18th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960, and the independence of the United States of America the 185th.

(Seal) DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
*Secretary of State.*

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1966—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas freedom and justice are the inalienable rights of all peoples; and

Whereas these basic rights are presently denied to many peoples throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States of America, from its founding as a nation, has firmly subscribed to the principles of national independence and human liberty; and

Whereas, in keeping with this tradition, it remains an essential purpose and a fundamental policy of the United States of America to sustain these principles and to encourage their realization by all peoples:

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 17, 1966 as Captive Nations Week.

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this 8th day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

By the President:

SECRETARY OF STATE.

But more is required in addition to denouncing aggression and the aggressor—as we have found out in Vietnam. What is further required, as Dr. Malik states it, is "that real, decisive, historical action which shall cause the Communists to take to their heels."

A more direct and specific means of interceding in behalf of the enslaved peoples has been proposed in the past, but to date no action has been taken. Other Members, along with myself, have proposed taking the initiative by placing the issue of self-determination for the Captive Nations on the agenda of the United Nations for consideration.

On March 23, 1965, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 367 which called for, among other things, that the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations be instructed to take steps to have this issue placed on the U.N. agenda. I requested a report from the State Department appraising the merit of this recommendation. The State Department replied in part:

The Department of State believes that in the United Nations Soviet imperialism is most effectively exposed by timely and pertinent statements that relate Soviet imperialistic activities to a concrete issue being discussed before a major United Nations forum. United States representatives have delivered forceful and detailed attacks on Soviet imperialism during debates on the general question of colonialism. On numerous occasions they have also called attention to Soviet imperial practice by linking a specific Soviet act or policy of repression with an individual item being discussed before a United Nations body.

The essential problem facing the United States is to adapt existing capabilities most realistically and effectively to serve the interest of the United States in opposing and combatting Soviet imperialism. The proposed resolution, in the judgment of the Department of State, would not further this objective.

As I stated above, it is certainly true that the United States has in the past spoken out against Soviet repression in the United Nations. But I believe that more decisive action is required. In the recent case of Rhodesia, and although I disagreed with the policy followed by the United States, it should be noted that this Nation did not hesitate to join Great Britain in advocating the use of force in stopping oil shipments en route to Rhodesia. This was real, decisive action on the part of the United States of the severest nature, and certainly more extreme than the proposal to put the issue of self-determination for the captive nations on the United Nations agenda. When it is remembered that the admission of the bandit regime of Red China to the United Nations has been deemed worthy of placement on the agenda a number of times in the past, surely in all fairness the captive nations should be accorded equal treatment.

In conclusion, I believe the closing remarks by Dr. Malik to the students of Seattle University in 1961 are especially pertinent in dealing with the restoration to the captive nations of their God-given rights:

In your own lives trust God despite all your frailities. He will serve you in the end. You have seen great visions and you have dreamed great dreams. I beg you to remain faithful to the deepest you have known. In its own day it will lead you to the rock of certainty that can never be moved. And when you have run your course, may it be said of you that you overcame the powers of darkness, and may your heart be profoundly grateful.

## BILL TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I think we would all agree that there are few human ailments more catastrophic than blindness—the inability to see. It is for this reason that I have today introduced a bill which would establish a National Eye Institute within the National Institutes of Health.

The passage of this bill, and the establishment of a National Eye Institute, could well be the single most important step ever taken in its long history to rid mankind of this dread affliction. Its passage will mean that Congress recognizes its responsibility not only to those who are now blind but to those who may be born blind, or go blind, in the future. It will mean that we do not accept loss of vision as a calamity of nature and, who knows, we may end it by virtually eliminating it.

Most humans, when they stop to think, have a horrible fear of blindness. Yet, until or unless, their sight begins to fail, they think seldom about it. Perhaps as a result, there are 1 million Americans who are functionally blind; this means they cannot read ordinary newspaper type even with glasses. Another 1½ million are blind in one eye. And in the world at large there are 10 million people totally blind.

Yet we have not attacked this problem thoroughly in the way made possible by today's science. The truth is that a recent Gallup poll showed that less than half our people can even identify glaucoma as an eye disease; yet more than a million Americans over 40 have glaucoma which can cause blindness and do not know it. Officials report that incidence of cataract among people of 60 runs nearly 60 percent. The Gallup survey showed that not one in five Americans know what a cataract, which causes blindness, is. Moreover, no accepted way has yet been found to dissolve or prevent cataracts.

This Gallup survey shows that blindness ranks next to cancer as the affliction most feared by the American people, feared above heart disease, polio and tuberculosis upon which so much research is currently being done. Add to this, when you consider my bill, the fact that an estimated 90 million Americans suffer from some ocular malfunction. And more than four-fifths of all blindness in this country results from diseases whose causes are unknown to science.

I state flatly that passage of a bill such as I have introduced is vital to the people of our Nation. Not to act would be to turn our backs on those twin synonyms for the United States of America—progress and humanity.

The text of my bill is as follows:

H.R. 16455

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., ch. 6A, subch. III) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART F—NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

"ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

"SEC. 451. The Surgeon General is authorized, with the approval of the Secretary, to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for the conduct and support of research and training relating to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders, including research and training in the special health problems and requirements of the blind and in the basic sciences relating to the mechanism of sight and visual function.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 452. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized, with the approval of the Secretary, to establish an advisory council to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Surgeon General on matters relating to the activities of the National Eye Institute.

"(b) The provisions relating to the composition, terms of office of members, and reappointment of members of advisory councils under section 432(a) shall be applicable to the council established under this section, except that the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary, may include on such council established under this section such additional ex officio members as he deems necessary.

"(c) Upon appointment of such council, it shall assume all or such part as the Surgeon General may, with the approval of the Secretary, specify of the duties, functions, and powers of the National Advisory Health Council relating to the research or training projects with which such council established under this part is concerned and such portion as the Surgeon General may specify (with such approval) of the duties, functions, and powers of any other advisory council established under this Act relating to such projects.

"FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 453. The Surgeon General shall, through the National Eye Institute established under this part, carry out the purposes of section 301 with respect to the conduct and support of research with respect to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders, including the special health problems and requirements of the blind and the mechanism of sight and visual function, except that the Surgeon General shall, with the approval of the Secretary, determine the areas in which and the extent to which he will carry out such purposes of section 301 through such Institute or an institute established by or under other provisions of this Act, or both of them, when both such institutes have functions with respect to the same subject matter. The Surgeon General is also authorized to provide training and instruction and establish and maintain traineeships and fellowships, in the National Eye Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of blinding eye diseases and visual disorders with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for trainees and fellows as he deems necessary, and, in addition, provide for such training, instruction, and traineeships and for such fellowships through grants to public or other nonprofit institutions."

## RESOLUTION RELATING TO CAPTIVE U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL IN VIETNAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe every American would agree that the trial by North Vietnam of the captured American pilots would be indefensible. Not only would such trials be in violations of the Geneva Convention of 1949, to which North Vietnam is signatory, but they would violate every tenet of human decency. The men are prisoners of war and are entitled to treatment as such under terms of international law.

The only way all Americans can express themselves on this vital issue is through the Congress of the United States. I have, therefore, introduced the following House concurrent resolution authorizing—actually urging—the President to convey these views to the Communist regime in North Vietnam as the sense of the Congress. I hope the Congress will act speedily on this resolution.

The text follows:

H. CON. RES. 864

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress:

(a) that all United States military personnel held captive in Vietnam are prisoners of war entitled to all the benefits of the Geneva Conventions of 1949;

(b) that the trial, punishment or execution of any such personnel by the Communist regime in North Vietnam would be contrary to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, accepted concepts of international law and standards of international behavior;

(c) that any such action undertaken by the Communist regime in North Vietnam in regard to United States military personnel would be an inhumanitarian act and a reprehensible offense against the peoples of the world and would be contrary to the interests of North Vietnam;

(d) that the trial, punishment or execution of such United States personnel by the Communist regime in North Vietnam would seriously diminish the opportunity for the achievement of a just and secure peace in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, which is the objective of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is hereby requested to convey the sense of the Congress expressed in this resolution to the Communist regime in North Vietnam, to the participating states of the Geneva Conferences of 1954 and 1962, to the states adhering to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and to the member states of the United Nations.

## BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. The purpose of the Commission would be to make a full and complete review and study of the statutory and case law of the United States which constitutes the Federal system of criminal justice, for the purpose of formulating and recommending to the Congress legislation which would improve that system. The Commission would be composed of three Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, three members from private life appointed by the President of the United States, and one U.S. circuit judge and two U.S. district judges appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

The bill would also establish a committee of 15 lawyers and legal experts to advise and consult with the Commission. This committee would be known as the Advisory Committee on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws.

It is imperative that we note that crime is growing at such a fantastic rate that measures will have to be considered at all levels of government to better cope with this immense problem. A recent Gallup poll particularly impressed me when it cited the fact that a majority of Americans list crime as one of our most serious domestic issues, and also note that it has grown much worse over the past 5 years.

This indicates to me that a crisis in public confidence and security is developing, and, that we must take steps immediately to curb this situation. One of the ways that we can do this is by setting up a commission both to study the procedures and statutes of the past, and to propose new Federal action to better meet this growing menace to our societal well-being.

There is no domestic issue which harbors more potential danger to all of our citizens than rampant crime. We have to get ourselves off the notion that society, and not the individual, is responsible for every criminal act and, instead, begin to devote our energies to investigating possible solutions and improvements of the Federal criminal statutes now on the books.

Although the massive problem of crime cannot be legislated away, nor dismissed by rhetoric or by any one commission at one level of government, I am at least hopeful that the adoption of this bill will be a step in the right direction for the Federal Government. A National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws has the potential of making a sizable dent in the progress of crime—and we can ill afford not to make the effort while the opportunity is still with us.

## LEGISLATION TO COMBAT OBSCENE MATERIALS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to establish a special Presidential commission to recommend steps to combat distribution of obscene materials. I urge consideration at the earliest possible date of this legislation by the Committee on Education and Labor.

I have contacted Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL to request that the full committee schedule this subject as soon as possible. A bill for this purpose sponsored by Senator MUNDT has already passed the Senate, and I am extremely hopeful that House action can be completed this session.

A contributing cause of crime and immorality is the onslaught being made on the minds of our youth by the sale and distribution of pornographic material. This legislation is long overdue to combat the traffic in filthy and obscene literature which is continuing to flourish.

## EXTEND HILL-BURTON ACT TO INCLUDE ANCILLARY FACILITIES FOR HEALTH CENTERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, everybody talks about rising hospital costs and, until recently, like the weather, nobody has done anything about it.

I have just learned of one city where there is a real effort being made to reduce hospital costs.

Hospitals, for March of this year, describes a new approach at Barnes Hospital in St. Louis. There is thought for the patient. There is thought for the family. Barnes has put in rooms where a patient can have all of the hospital facilities necessary for diagnosis but where he may walk to a restaurant in the hospital to get his food and may walk directly into the hospital for the laboratory and other facilities. He does not have to occupy a regular hospital room for these diagnostic purposes. The hospital room is freed for occupancy by another person whose need for its special facilities is acute. Similarly, there are rooms in which his family can stay. These rooms are relatively inexpensive, costing far less than rooms with health care facilities such as oxygen piped in and attended by nurses.

We are now embarked on a new era of health care in the United States. We have progressed far in establishing hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act. Under that act as administered, doctors offices, restaurants, and other auxiliary services have been take for granted.

More and more hospitals are becoming what Jack C. Haldeman, M.D., former Assistant Surgeon General of the United States and now president of the Hospital Review and Planning Council of Southern New York, calls "health centers."

The practice of medicine centering in the cities requires a patient with a more complicated or extreme illness to leave his home. Unless there is a motellike room for him in the hospital where he has been sent for diagnosis, he occupies a nursing bed which are now becoming scarce. If his family is with him, there is no place for them to stay.

If Hill-Burton money was needed to build hospitals and other health care facilities, those funds are needed to provide the sort of facilities that have been built into Barnes Hospital. It would seem obvious that communities which relied upon Hill-Burton funds to build a hospital should be encouraged to build these facilities which will stop the spiraling cost of hospital care.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 16446 for the purpose of amending the Hill-Burton Act to make funds available to provide self-care rooms and dining facilities for ambulatory patients and for diagnostic patients, and housing and dining facilities for families of patients in hostipals or clinics.

With the pressure for medical facilities now upon us, we cannot wait until private funds can be raised for these ventures. They are likely to come no faster than those for hospital buildings themselves, which was the reason for enactment of Hill-Burton in the first place. The need is urgent. The time for action is now. I urge the prompt consideration and passage of H.R. 16446.

## BASEBALL GLOVE IMPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced legislation which would limit the quantity of baseball and softball gloves and mitts which may be imported into the United States.

Due to the imports of baseball gloves from Japan and other countries, the American baseball glove manufacturing industry finds itself in a steadily deteriorating position. Unless Congress enacts legislation that would curtail such imports, the industry may be forced out of business entirely.

Until 1956, when domestic producers were selling over 3,300,000 baseball gloves, imports of such gloves did not appear in any significant numbers. By 1960, however, imports accounted for 47.3 percent of the 5 million annual consumption of baseball gloves.

Today, these imports account for well over 60 percent of the business, and, if allowed to go uncontrolled, could result in the expiration of the American baseball glove industry within a few years. Imported gloves offer comparable quality for one-half the price of domestic gloves. This is due to the low wages paid to workers in foreign nations.

The U.S. Tariff Commission in 1960 initiated an investigation under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 to determine whether injury to the American baseball glove industry had occurred as a result of cheap imports. On May 1, 1961, the Commission found unanimously that imports were entering the United States in such increased quantities that they threatened serious damage to the domestic glove industry. The Commission recommended an increase in the tariff from the 15 percent then in effect up to 30 percent.

After having asked for certain supplemental information from the Tariff Commission, then President John F. Kennedy on March 19, 1962, decided not to follow the Commission's recommendation with regard to baseball gloves, partly because Japan, the principal supplier, had recently established voluntary quotas on exports of baseball gloves. The voluntary annual quota established by Japan at that time was 1,900,000 gloves.

Imports of Japanese gloves have never been held to the 1,900,000 figure which was promised by Japan. That nation unilaterally increased its self-imposed quota from 1,900,000 during the quota year April 1, 1961, to March 31, 1962, in various stages, to 2,500,000 in the quota year April 1, 1965, to March 31, 1966, without any consultation with the United States.

The following tabulation shows how this increase took place:

| Quota-year: | *Quota* | *Actual* |
|---|---|---|
| 1961–62 | 1,900,000 | 2,800,000 |
| 1962–63 | 2,100,000 | 3,200,000 |
| 1963–64 | 2,300,000 | 2,800,000 |
| 1964–65 | 2,500,000 | 2,700,000 |
| 1965–66 | 2,500,000 | 3,000,000 |

When the Tariff Commission made its unanimous decision in 1961, foreign imports amounted to about 50 percent of the American market, up from about zero in 1956. Under the terms of my bill, the Commission would determine whether imports have indeed exceeded 1,900,000 units annually during the last several years, and whether injury to the American industry still persists.

Should the Tariff Commission's determination be affirmative in both respects, my bill would instruct the Presi-

dent to set a quota of approximately 2,300,000 units of imported baseball gloves annually. This would amount to about 50 percent of the present-day sales. My bill allows for a growth factor to preserve this 50-percent share.

Congress should not stand idly by while imports increase from year to year until they finally destroy our domestic industries.

The American baseball glove manufacturing industry was founded a century ago. It has spent substantial sums of money in developing the game of baseball in America and in preserving it as our national pastime.

Its contributions to the little leagues, Babe Ruth Leagues, and Pony—"Protect Our Nation's Youth"—Leagues, together with its aid to high schools, colleges, and universities, have been a positive contribution to the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, baseball is not only a peculiarly American game, it is an American institution. Why, then, should not the equipment which its participants use be American made? It is ironic indeed that many of the gloves used by American baseball players, professional, semiprofessional, and amateur, come from 10,000 miles away, when American firms have been making excellent gloves for a hundred years.

## HANOI SHOULD ABIDE BY ARTICLE 2 OF GENEVA CONVENTION OF 1949

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced—along with Congressman BRAD MORSE, of Massachusetts, a concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam. It is our hope that this resolution will have the widest bipartisan support.

We have written all Members of the House and Senate, after consultation with the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, urging their consideration of the introduction of this resolution.

It is imperative, in our judgment, to make clear to the leaders of North Vietnam that the people of the United States are united in opposition to the trial, punishment, or execution of U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam.

The Congress, as the people's representatives, should speak now and with one voice.

It is clear that if the North Vietnamese regime chooses to follow the reckless course which it reportedly is considering, the task of achieving the just and secure peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia—which is the objective of the people of the United States—will be made far more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, it is plain from article 2 of the Geneva conventions of 1949 that the provisions of the conventions "shall apply to all cases of declared war or of any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the high contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them."

Following the Senate's advice and consent on July 6, 1955, the ratification of the conventions by President Eisenhower on July 14, 1955, the conventions went into force for the United States on February 2, 1956. The Communist regime of North Vietnam adhered to the conventions on June 28. 1957.

It is clear, therefore, that our military personnel in North Vietnam are explicitly covered by the Geneva conventions of 1949 and that North Vietnam has adhered to the conventions. No nation including North Vietnam has reserved the right to nullify these conventions simply on the basis of accusing military personnel of war crimes.

Hanoi's reservation to article 85 of the conventions in no sense relieves Hanoi of its obligations under the conventions as a whole. Article 85 is the provision which extends certain benefits to prisoners after conviction during the period they are serving their sentences. This reservation does not provide any basis for war crimes trials of prisoners of war and in any event does not take effect until after a trial and conviction in accordance with standards imposed by the conventions.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a turning point, and I deeply hope that Hanoi will reconsider its projected action. Should they proceed with the war crimes trials, it will not only be a mockery of justice and in clear contravention of the Geneva conventions of 1949, it will be a serious step which would unite this country and which could make more difficult the achievement of that just and secure peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia which is the objective of the people of the United States.

It is my earnest hope that the Congress may act promptly and indeed unanimously on this matter so that the voice of the American people through the Congress will be clearly heard in Hanoi. Hanoi has a chance to turn back from an inhumanitarian act and adhere to the accepted concepts of international law and the Geneva conventions. Let us hope that Hanoi will understand our firmness, our convicton, and our concern for our men on this vital question.

## CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this week America celebrates Captive Nations Week, in accordance with Public Law 86-90, and the proclamation of President Dwight Eisenhower, issued in 1959. It is the eighth time we have set aside this third week in July to focus renewed attention on the problems and plight of the freedom-loving, God-fearing peoples held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

And while our concern and deep sympathy for these peoples continues unabated, it is a fitting time to renew our dedication to the proposition underlying this observance—that constant reassurance and reaffirmation of our commitment to the liberation of the captive nations and the restoration of free, democratic governments.

It is true that our hopes have been high in recent years for a greater degree of understanding between East and West. Because of a handful of favorable straws on the wind, we have hoped that greater understanding would lead to a relaxation of tensions, to a lowering of the barriers, and to a restoration of the freedoms wrested away from these people by their Communist captors.

But our hopes have not been upheld in the year since our last observance of Captive Nations Week. We have indeed had tragic reminders that the Red regime is no more interested in freedom and understanding, in fairplay and justice, than it ever was.

The incident involving a young textbook salesman from Sheffield, Mass., last winter made this all too clear.

The callousness and insensitive treatment by the Soviets of this innocent victim of his own naivete and enthusiasm, coupled with the even more shocking attitude of the Russian authorities following the still unexplained circumstances of the death of Newcomb Mott, leave little doubt in anyone's mind that no chinks have yet appeared in the stoic armor of the Communist dictatorship in Eastern Europe.

The repeated evidence of Communist harassment of religious officials and worshipping masses in connection with the millennium of Christianity in Poland this year is further evidence of the enforced supremacy of the Red regime.

The time is not yet arrived when we can lower our guard, when we can confidently anticipate freedom and self-determination for the people of Armenia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and all the rest. We must instead reaffirm our support of these people in their quest for freedom. We must reassure them of our friendship and interest. We must continue to maintain the channels of communication and to continue to seek the means of their liberation.

The Soviets have attempted to make propaganda capital from our annual observance of Captive Nations Week. We hear the shopworn bleatings of their official spokesmen, charging the United States with imperialism and calling us in this body the ruling class and the chieftains.

So be it. If I am to be called a chieftain in the fight to liberate all men from the yoke of tyranny and oppression, then I accept the title proudly. If our policy is one of imperialism, then it is imperialism of freedom, of liberty, and self-determination. These alone are the "evils" we would impose on the voiceless masses, the disenfranchised citizens of

the captive nations. I am proud to associate myself wholeheartedly with that kind of imperialism.

We must continue to hurl back the lies and half truths of the Soviet propagandists. We must continue to hold out the truth and to keep open our side of the curtain so these captive millions will know that they are not forgotten or forsaken. We must continue to hold up the torch of liberty and freedom for the whole world to see. It is as important today as it has ever been.

## WASHINGTON STAR APPLAUDS THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star of July 13, 1966, voices high praise of President Johnson's address to the American Alumni Council on our responsibilities in Asia.

In his remarks, the Star says, the President eloquently reaffirmed the country's desire to bring about a decent peace that would benefit all of Asia.

Despite the Russians' hard line of late, the newspaper says, they should be receptive to such a development—regardless of what Peking may say or do.

Discussing the President's speech the Star editorially states that the President made an excellent summation of our desire for peace and determination to make victory impossible for the aggressors.

The Communists hold the key to peace, the President said. They have only to turn it. If Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow fail to grasp the meaning of what the President said, the Star suggests, they are worse than fools.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the Star editorial in full:

HANOI HAS THE KEY

As if to counter the shrill and persistent Chinese Communist charge that it is "colluding" with the United States all over the world, the Kremlin in recent days has been giving voice to an increasingly hard anti-American line.

Last week, for example, at the Bucharest meeting of the seven-nation Warsaw Pact, the Russians took the lead in drafting a bitterly worded declaration against us. It denounced our country for "aggression" and offered to send "volunteers" to fight on the side of the Viet Cong and Ho Chi Minh's North Vietnamese regulars.

This now has been followed by a Moscow announcement that there will be a step-up in Soviet aid (still only vaguely defined) to Ho's forces. There also has been an outcropping of rumors, presumably inspired by the fear-promoting sector of the Kremlin's propaganda machine, that Russian-directed East German military forces may soon send some fighting units to Viet Nam.

To top it all off with a touch of comic opera, finally, we have the case of the distressed Soviet athletes. They have announced that they will not fly to Los Angeles for a scheduled track-and-field meet. As they have put it, in the inimitable Communist style, "Our hatred for the American military, who are perpetrating atrocities in Viet Nam, and our solidarity with the people of Viet Nam, who are fighting for their freedom and independence, do not permit us to take part in a match with athletes of a country from which this aggression comes."

So what?

So the hard line against the United States seems fashionable once again in the USSR. There is reason to wonder, however, whether the sound and fury of the thing really signify very much beyond a Russian propagandistic effort to offset Peking's accusations. What is interesting, in any case, is that Soviet officials are reported to believe that the Vietnamese war has put the world on the razor's edge of grave danger. Surely, if that is their view, they should be interested in trying to cool off the situation rather than heat it up; they should wholeheartedly welcome this week's visits of Prime Ministers Gandhi of India and Wilson of Britain, both of whom are anxious to promote peace in Viet Nam by having the Kremlin join in reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indo-China.

President Johnson, in his remarks last night to the American Alumni Council, has eloquently reaffirmed his desire for such action. He wants it, and so does the country at large, in order to bring about honest negotiations for a decent peace that would benefit the whole of Asia, on both sides of the Bamboo Curtain. The Kremlin, despite its tough talk, should be receptive to this, whatever Peking may say or do.

As for the Communists of Hanoi, the President has made things clear enough: "First, victory for your armies is impossible. . . . Second, the minute you realize that a military victory is out of the question, and turn from the use of force, you will find us ready to reciprocate. We want to end the fighting . . . We want an honorable peace. . . . In your hands is the key to that peace. You have only to turn it."

This is an excellent summation of the matter. If Hanoi and Peking, not to mention Moscow, fail to grasp the meaning of it, they are worse than fools.

## INVESTIGATION OF THE U.S. MILITARY, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL COMMITMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, recently four Republicans were honored by selection on the group chosen to go to southeast Asia to investigate the U.S. military, economic and political commitments, and among these four were the Honorable HASTINGS KEITH of Massachusetts; the Honorable JOHN B. ANDERSON of Illinois; and the Honorable ED GURNEY of Florida.

The Honorable HASTINGS KEITH was a major on the G-3 staff of President Eisenhower. He received a battle star, the Army Commendation Ribbon and other decorations. He has both a distinguished military and legislative career. He is now a colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve.

The Honorable JOHN B. ANDERSON served in the Field Artillery in World War II. He received four battle stars and other decorations. Certainly he was a superior soldier. In 1952 he became a member of the U.S. State Department's career diplomatic service and was stationed in West Berlin for 2½ years as an adviser on the staff of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany. It should be stated also that his legislative ability is outstanding.

The Honorable ED GURNEY served in the Army in World War II as a battalion commander in the 8th Armored Division, and he attained the rank of lieutenant colonel. He received the Purple Heart and the Silver Star for heroic action above and beyond the call of duty. He is one of the highly decorated veterans in Congress. He is also one of our most effective, distinguished legislators.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his remarks. It was a pleasure for me to serve with him on our inspection tour of Vietnam. I would like to point out to the House that the gentleman served as a captain in the Medical Corps of the 38th "Cyclone" Infantry Division during the Second World War. He cared for hundreds of wounded soldiers under enemy fire. The gentleman is the holder of the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Ribbon, the Philippines Liberation Ribbon, the Bronze Star, the Combat Medical Badge, and three battle stars.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the congressional tour of Vietnam. No one can doubt that the war in that unfortunate country is of primary importance to all Americans. I therefore welcomed the opportunity to visit Vietnam and see the situation firsthand.

However, the Republican Members feel that we would have been much better prepared to study the problem and would have been able to assist the House more meaningfully in its deliberations upon this vital issue if we had been advised earlier about the trip, if we had been able to take staff assistants along with us, and if we had been briefed about about the war sooner. With these objections, and the short duration of our stay, in mind, I would like to make a few observations about our trip.

For military purposes, there are four distinct areas in Vietnam: The northern coastal area, the northern and central mountains and plains, the capital city of Saigon and its immediate vicinity, and, finally, the swampy Mekong Delta to the south.

The northern coastal area is relatively populous and accessible. With the construction of the gigantic new port at Cam Ranh Bay and the stationing of the 7th Fleet off the shore, we have this region pretty well in hand.

The mountainous, forested region to the west of the coast is much more sparsely populated. The people live in small, isolated hamlets. Our Army has been fairly successful in seeking out and largely destroying the enemy, both North Vietnamese troops and Vietcong guerrilla forces, in this region. Our Air Force, operating largely from bases we have constructed along the coast, has worked together with the aircraft assigned to our ground forces to provide close-in support for our troops. This has

enabled us, literally and figuratively, to stay on top of the enemy in this area.

In addition, the Air Force B-52's from Guam and the Navy are playing a major role. They are used in close-in support and often they attack real or suspected troop concentrations throughout the countryside—particularly on the routes of approach from Laos which lies to the west.

The third region is the city of Saigon and its immediate surroundings. Our massive military presence and half-billion dollar aid program combine to give us for the present at least, a relatively tranquil city. It is impossible to root out all Communist terrorists, but the strong hand of Premier Ky and economic prosperity give this area, at the moment, a stability which is essential to the supply of our forces and the smooth operation of the city's economic, political, and social structure.

Lastly, we have the area of the Mekong Delta, to the south. In this low-lying, swampy riceland, the enemy is much more active, and much harder to find, fix, and destroy. The South Vietnamese Army has handled the bulk of the fighting in the delta. As yet there are no Americans stationed there other than advisers. The Communists are still in control of much of this region.

WHAT KIND OF WAR IS THIS, AND WHO IS FIGHTING IT?

The Communists are waging two kinds of war in Vietnam. The first is guerrilla warfare: the hit-and-run tactics of assassination, ambush, and terrorism. Guerrilla forces are small and are constantly on the move to avoid detection. They avoid pitched battles with large Government forces, but they will ambush, harass, and set booby traps and mines for these forces. Guerrillas will also attack civilian traffic and make the roads of the country unsafe to travel.

And most tragically, guerrillas terrorize the people and disrupt village life by murdering loyal village officials: teachers, doctors, policemen, and mayors. Since 1958, for example, the Communists have methodically murdered over 14,000 village headmen. In the United States, this would be the equivalent of losing nearly a quarter of a million mayors and town selectmen. The object of this slaughter is to destroy local government so that the Communists can establish their own authority over the people.

In the rural countryside, South Vietnam's villages are scattered, isolated, and remote from the control of the central government. If the Communists attack a village, there is often no way to get help in time, or even to call for help, since there are no telephones or telegraphs in these remote regions. Our task here has been to assist the Vietnamese Government in its pacification program. This program, sometimes called the strategic hamlet program, aims at fortifying the villages against attack and setting up self-defense teams. This must be done after the Vietcong have been driven from an area, so that the enemy cannot return. It was my impression that this program is going well in the areas where it has been attempted, but that it is not yet widespread enough.

The second kind of war the Communists are waging in Vietnam is what we read most about in the papers. During the last year or so the Communists have built a large, well-equipped, professional army. They have begun to fight in regiment- and battalion-sized units and to make larger scale attacks on government forces. North Vietnam has also been infiltrating units of its own regular army into the south. The intention of the enemy is to go beyond guerrilla operations and gather his forces for a knockout blow against the government.

The rapid buildup of American forces which began in January 1965 has been successful in defeating this Communist strategy. The Vietcong have suffered a series of defeats in engaging large allied forces. Greater American mobility and firepower have turned the tables on the Communists in this kind of warfare.

We sometimes hear it said that the South Vietnamese forces lack enthusiasm and suffer from desertions. I want to tell you I was impressed with the morale and fighting efficiency of these native troops. Of every five battles fought, four are fought by the South Vietnamese themselves. They have taken tremendous casualties and are making great sacrifices for their country. I certainly think they deserve the greatest praise.

I was also impressed with the morale of our own forces. I talked with many of our young men in the field, some of them from this area of Massachusetts, including Sp4c. Elliott Sylvia, of Nantucket. These men of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines are highly motivated. They know why they are in Vietnam, and they are undaunted by the demonstrations back home. They are confident of the rightness of their cause. Their morale is justifiably high in areas where heavy fighting has driven out the enemy. Our troops are also effective. They are well trained and they know their job. They are superbly equipped and magnificently led. General Westmoreland is to these troops what Eisenhower and MacArthur were to the fighting men in World War II.

I had an opportunity to talk also with some of the men and commanding officers of the Fighting Tiger Division from South Korea. These crack troops were sent by the Korean Government to help defend American installations and to free United States and Vietnamese troops for other combat missions. We watched some of their training exercises—and, believe me, these are some of the most rugged and skillful fighters in the world.

THE BOMBING OF HANOI AND HAIPHONG OIL FACILITIES

All of the military and civilian personnel whom I met in Vietnam were in favor of the bombing of oil facilities outside the cities of Hanoi and Haiphong. Destruction of these storage tanks will slow down the flow of arms by truck to the Vietcong. No civilian areas near the cities were hit.

Many of us had been in favor of striking these installations as early as last December. Bombing of truck convoys and routes of infiltration seemed to us a waste of effort and a needless risk of our pilots' lives when the oil which carried those trucks over the routes could have been destroyed. I felt, therefore, that the airstrikes were long overdue.

Here is one of the points which have caused confusion in the public mind. Only last May, when the press asked Secretary McNamara if there were not other military targets in North Vietnam which could be hit to slow down the enemy, he said:

> There are practically no military targets of that kind in North Vietnam.

Now, after the bombing, it is admitted that these facilities were important. It should be remembered that during the 6 months of hesitating, there were 15,000 American casualties and 2,500 Americans lost their lives.

PORT FACILITIES—CAM RANH BAY

One of the most impressive parts of my trip was our visit to the huge new port which the Army Corps of Engineers is building at Cam Ranh Bay north of Saigon. Supply is half the problem of any war. When the United States began its massive troop buildup, it put soldiers into Vietnam almost faster than we could supply them. Ports were so jammed that ships could not unload supplies.

Cam Ranh Bay, which a few months ago was just a sandy beach, has now been built into a gigantic port which can unload 6,000 tons of cargo for our troops every day. This facility has taken the pressure off Saigon, which used to handle 90 percent of the country's shipping. Cam Ranh, which was built at a cost of $300 million, is now one of the finest harbors in the Far East. Together with Saigon, it can handle all of the support supplies American troops will need.

PREDICTIONS FOR THE WAR—WE ARE WINNING

To sum up the military situation in Vietnam, I think that we can be guardedly optimistic. The tide of the war has definitely turned against the Communists, but this does not mean that all fighting will be over soon. During the past months, nearly everywhere that a Communist unit has engaged an American unit, the Communists have been beaten.

It is mainly against the Vietcong regular army, augmented by North Vietnam's experienced professional units, however, that we have been successful. As Ambassador Lodge told us in Saigon, we have yet to lick the problem of terrorism. We have yet to construct a net in the provinces which can catch the murderers, saboteurs, and arsonists who terrorize the countryside.

To counter the total Communist threat in Vietnam, then, two things must be done. We must defeat the regular Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army forces militarily. This is what we are now doing successfully.

Second, we must destroy the Communist terrorist apparatus. This requires a much greater effort in the pacification and development program. We need more fortified villages, more instructors to teach village defense, and we need better police training in such things as criminal identification. In the long run, our military successes will bear fruit only if the villages and hamlets of Vietnam

can be protected from Communist terrorism.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE WAR

First. Military success, however, is not our only goal. The war in Vietnam is also being fought on an economic front. In World War II and Korea, the problem with the economic situation was left until the war was over. Our Government has correctly determined that the economic battle in Vietnam must not be left—cannot be left—until the military battle has been won. Vietnam was ruled by China for a thousand years. It was controlled by the French for a hundred years. The Vietnamese have not had much experience running a national government. Where the French fought to save a colony, we must fight to create and save a country.

American and South Vietnamese troops can win battle after battle and skirmish after skirmish. But unless the people in the cities and the villages can look to the same national government to provide the sound economy, stable political system and services they need, there will be no lasting peace, no true victory.

Second. What is being done on the economic front? One of the most interesting and encouraging aspects is the rural pacification and development program. This program has been devised to combat the lack of communication and weak lines of control between the national government and the villages, as I pointed out earlier. Under this program, which is run by the South Vietnamese Government with our help, community action teams of 59 men each are trained to give out medical supplies, set up schools, give crop-growing advice and build defense in villages which the Vietcong have been forced to abandon. Two centers for training these men have been set up. Each center is now turning out 5,500 men every 13 weeks. These teams seem to be quite successful in helping develop their villages and in helping bring the villages closer to the national government. As a result of their efforts, 68 percent of the country's elementary school aged children are now in school.

The job of these teams is very important. For the first time in their lives, the war-weary peasants are learning that their Government does care for them. They have never had simple medical supplies or Government help in public health. While these services must be provided by the South Vietnamese themselves, our troops have assisted wherever they go.

These films were taken in a coastal area of Vietnam where U.S. marines and South Vietnamese forces had recently driven out the Vietcong. The marines shown here are sharing their rations and medical supplies with the villagers. These pills can save lives that would have been lost for lack of basic medicines.

This Navy doctor, with the assistance of native translators, is treating pneumonia patients with modern techniques. This treatment is far different from the simple native remedies which these people have always used.

The children are usually first to accept the American doctors and corpsmen. Frightened at first, they soon come in droves to have their injuries treated. A simple scratch or infection, if uncleaned and untreated, could lead to loss of a limb or even death.

Many people in the villages suffer from malnutrition. Their diet often lacks the proper nutritional elements, and this can lead to bad teeth—or no teeth at all.

These children are orphans. They have lost their parents to the warfare which Vietnam has suffered for so long. The dolls being given to these little girls are probably the only toys they have ever had. The simple happiness of the child is shared by the young American who is able to give a gift of friendship.

Soap and a bucket of clean water are miracles to people who have never known them. Water from a well dug by U.S. marines—water and a little soap—can prevent disease and promote the basic hygiene which government programs must eventually bring to all the people of the countryside.

In a village which as yet has no teacher, a marine is teaching a child to count. A marine here is teaching a child new words of English. These, too, are functions which local village governments will eventually perform, with assistance and training from Saigon.

Third. Our AID mission in Vietnam is also doing a good job. The director of the program, Charles A. Mann, has served 22 years as a career Foreign Service officer. He has 842 people on his staff. AID in Vietnam is responsible for about $700 million appropriated by Congress—$420 million of this is earmarked for stabilizing the government and economy in newly liberated areas. It is used for such things as medical facilities and supplies, waterworks, education, agriculture, electric power, and transportation.

Fourth. Can we improve our economic aid program in any way? On my trip, I noticed a serious lack of doctors. A village may have a clinic or infirmary staffed only by a midwife and perhaps one or two technicians. Often, the drugs they have to give out are labeled only in English, a language they do not understand. There are less than 1,000 doctors for 14 million people and an even greater shortage of medical technicians. If we had the same percentage of doctors in New Bedford as in Vietnam, we would have only 7 instead of the 146 we do have. And Vietnam is a country at war.

I suggest that we help the Vietnamese Government set up more specialized schools to train medical technicians to administer first aid, dispense drugs, and provide basic public health services, such as water purification. We must not lag on the economic and social front. If we do, our efforts on the military front will have been in vain.

CONCLUSIONS

WHEN THE WAR WILL END—THE ROLE OF NEGOTIATIONS

Many people are asking when this war will be over. They want to know when our massive commitment in Vietnam will begin to show conclusive results. Will there ever be peace in Vietnam?

My answer is that, the main body of the enemy's organized opposition could be defeated within a year. Barring intervention from Red China, I believe that the Vietcong's regular army could be completely broken up by some time next year. I strongly doubt that the Vietcong will ever come to the conference table, and therefore I do not visualize the war as necessarily ending in formal negotiations.

As our military strength is built up and the pacification program is perfected, I believe that the Communist opposition will dwindle and gradually fade away. Terrorism will still continue to be a problem, and outbreaks of fighting will still occur in some regions. But hopefully large-scale fighting will disappear.

Pressure for negotiations, of course, has recently reached a very high level. I do not believe, however, that negotiations should be seen as an easy way out of our commitment in Vietnam. Our commitment is, after all, to the people of Vietnam and in support of their efforts to build a secure and peaceful nation.

The United States should be careful not to negotiate a withdrawal in such a way as to leave this young nation alone, facing a Communist threat, weak and disunified. If the objectives of our fight are just, then we should be sure that we do not sacrifice them in premature negotiations.

The fighting now appears to be going our way, and our massive aid program is beginning to bear fruit in building a sound Vietnamese nation. We must not give up these advantages, and we must not prematurely withdraw the vital military support for Vietnam's nation building process. The United States has always been willing to negotiate an end to the fighting, but our basic commitment to helping the Vietnamese people cannot be negotiated away.

Second. One thing which I think might speed the close of this war is closer cooperation with our allies in southeast Asia. Countries such as Thailand, the Philippines, Korea, New Zealand, and Australia have not been asked to participate as fully as they might. All of these countries have a vital interest in the Vietnam situation and two of them have troops fighting there. It is important to make these nations full partners in the defense of their part of the world.

Loose coordination among our SEATO and other allies could bring about in our Asian defense alliances the same kind of disarray which now exists in the NATO alliance in Europe. This is certainly not the time to let relations with our Asian allies deteriorate. This is not the time to take major actions without proper consultation with the allies who are similarly involved. It would be wise for the United States to hold regular meetings with our SEATO allies—formal or informal—to consult on the progress of the Vietnam war. This should be done to prevent the loss of communication and divergence of purpose which now plague the NATO alliance in Europe.

Third. If all shipping by Western nations to North Vietnam were stopped, this, too, might hasten the end of the war. Supplies vital to the enemy effort are now being shipped to North Vietnamese ports for transferral to the south

to support North Vietnamese regular units and Vietcong terrorists. But even our closest ally, Great Britain, persists in allowing its merchant marine to trade with the North. And yet Britain asked us, and we agreed, to stop our ships from trading with Rhodesia. I suggest that we consider instituting a blockade. This measure could be held in reserve as an additional weapon should North Vietnam persist in its campaign of aggression against the South.

Fourth. A fourth problem which I think is extremely important is the image Americans present to the people of Vietnam. We have all heard talk about the ugly American, but I am afraid not enough is being done about the problem. Our congressional delegation was met at the Saigon airport by seven large Chevrolets, enough to carry two Congressmen per car. We proceeded by police escort to the Embassy—sirens screamed and people scattered. What sort of impression did that make? On the surface, American-South Vietnamese relations appear to be very good. But these people are naturally extremely polite. Do we know what they really think of us? A large foreign military establishment always chafes against the native population, but are we doing as much to relieve the situation as we can? Should we really encourage our servicemen to mix as much as possible with the Vietnamese civilians? One of the foremost values of a Vietnamese is humility. I think our military command there might give a little more thought to public relations to tone down the brashness of our image.

Fifth. Ten days was not a very long time to study the Vietnamese war—it is a long and complex problem. We were able to get a good, helpful, overall view of the situation, but I suggest that Congress return for an in depth study. This return trip should be made during the congressional recess at the close of this session and should last about 30 days. The delegation should be provided with Vietnamese-speaking guides and have complete authority to travel throughout Vietnam and study all phases of the war effort. This new tour would enable us to check on progress made since our trip, as well as provide Congress with experts and a detailed body of information to help it in its deliberations on this extremely vital issue.

Sixth. No withdrawal. Finally—and most importantly—my trip has convinced me that there can be no withdrawal from Vietnam. More is involved in this vital effort than just "face" or prestige. At stake is the credibility of America's word in defending her allies against aggression. If we should fail in Vietnam or desert our allies before the fight is won, other nations in Asia will cease to trust us and will be forced to live on Red China's terms. The future of freedom in this part of the world is in our hands.

Some advocates of peace at any price have argued that Red China is destined to be the predominant power in Asia in any case, and that the United States should withdraw and let this natural pattern of tyranny prevail. We know this cannot be done. Germany was the predominant power in Europe in 1939—but we fought to defend freedom. Soviet Russia was the predominant power in Europe in 1949—but we joined with our allies in NATO to defend freedom again. I do not believe that this Nation—which has fought so unselfishly before to defend the cause of liberty—will let this great cause fail in southeast Asia today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as 1 of the 14 Members of Congress to visit South Vietnam during the recent congressional recess, I should like to report some of my own observations and perhaps offer a few conclusions concerning my visit to this strategically important area of the globe. I should also mention at the outset that before proceeding to Vietnam we had a delay of approximately 1 day en route at the headquarters of CINCPAC at Hickam Field, Hawaii, where we received a comprehensive situation report and background briefing from the staff of Admiral Sharp, the commander of U.S. Forces in the Pacific as well as from senior officers from the important components of his command. I was personally highly impressed with the professional competence of the military and naval personnel who have the job of conducting the oversight of the war from our base and headquarters in Hawaii. As we will have occasion to relate further on in this report, I can best summarize their prognosis of the war as one of cautious and carefully restrained optimism combined with a quiet confidence in our ability to get the job done if we do not abandon our goals. Here as elsewhere whenever the question of the recent bombing of POL dumps in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong was raised, it was the unanimous consensus on the part of these highly trained and highly knowledgeable senior military men that this step was not only completely warranted from their professional military point of view, but was indeed a step that should have been taken some time ago to thwart enemy efforts at dispersal of his supplies.

Our refueling stop at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippine Islands was spent on a tour of that base and a briefing on the role that it plays in supporting our war effort in Vietnam. As the headquarters of the 13th Air Force, this base is an extremely important logistical link in the chain of supply that fuels our fighting forces in southeast Asia. New construction work is proceeding that will enable this base to play an even more important role.

Perhaps one of the most poignant hours on this trip was the hour or so spent visiting Americans who have been wounded in the fighting and evacuated—very often—in a matter of just a few hours from the battle zones. For the most part these young lads seemed to evince a quiet stoicism about their personal involvement in the war. One lad expressed bitterness about draft card burners and said they would make good targets for the Vietcong. In most cases they expressed a wish to be sent to a hospital near their homes when they are sent on for further treatment. The stark tragedy of mutilated bodies and amputated limbs was a grim reminder that we are paying a price in young manhood on the battlefields of Vietnam.

Upon our arrival in Saigon we were first briefed on the overall situation by Ambassador Lodge who expressed great satisfaction that "we had come to see for ourselves." He emphasized time and again the completely unconventional nature of this war and the large role played not by the marching and countermarching of divisions and armies but by individual acts of terrorism, sabotage and assassination. He believes that if and as conventional warfare abates the tempo of such terrorism will increase. He said:

> I can leave this Embassy and in a 3 minute walk from here I can find someone who will kill anyone in Vietnam for $5.

We need to construct a fine mesh net to catch these saboteurs and terrorists. We do not have it now. In a recent month, May 1966, 115 village officials were assassinated by Vietcong. At present about 54 percent of the total population is under government control, 24 percent is under Vietcong control and control over the balance is shifting sometimes to one side, sometimes to the other. When asked, when will it be over, Lodge became extremely cautious and would only say:

> A year from now—by July of 1967, I believe we will be on the verge of breaking the military back of the North Vietnamese.

Note he said "military back." This obviously does not mean terror by Vietcong will automatically cease. He is, I gathered, personally in favor of hitting all legitimate military targets in North Vietnam like powerplants and machine tool factories. He was also asked:

> What about a blockade?
>
> Well, that would involve confrontation with the U.S.S.R. I think we can do the job without a blockade.

Lodge believes one of the most important phases of the war is the pacification program. Last year some 26,000 cadre were graduated from training schools. It is hoped that 40,000 a year can be trained—in 59-man teams—to help protect and keep order in villages reclaimed from Vietcong terror.

Deputy Ambassador Porter believes we are making progress on three fronts: First, military; second, toward representative government based on free elections; and third, economic development and reconstruction of the countryside.

Our economic aid program for Vietnam is the largest for any country in the world. In fiscal 1966 it amounted to $650 million. One must remember that two-thirds of this or $420 million is to finance imports. South Vietnam to put it quite bluntly is broke. AID has 842 personnel in Vietnam. One-half of them are in the field and one-half in Saigon. This figure obviously does not include contract personnel. Out of a 55-billion piaster budget the United States furnishes 33 billion or more than half. The country is suffering from staggering problems because of deficiencies in trained personnel. To cite just one example, there are only 209 civilian

doctors for the whole country. We visited a program where until recently there was only one 220-bed hospital and only 1 civilian doctor for 550,000 people. There are a half million refugees still in temporary shelters.

In agriculture 4 out of 5 AID people were said to be in the field and implementing plans in strengthening agricultural co-ops and establishing means of providing agricultural credits.

In the field of education, 6,000 classrooms have been completed in various hamlets since 1962. By 1968 it is hoped 14 million textbooks will be available for primary grades. On the secondary level the goal is 8 million texts. Last year 1,200 elementary school teachers were trained. Out of 2.5 million eligible schoolchildren, 1.7 or 66 percent are in primary schools. Out of those eligible for high school only 21 percent are in school or 320,000.

If we needed any reassurance as to the validity of our visit to Vietnam we received it from the opening words of our briefings by General Westmoreland who said:

> The situation here is so complex you have to be on the scene to understand the multiple facets of the situation.

We are faced with two jobs—one to win a war—the other to build a nation wherein the Vietnamese people can defend their hard bought freedom. On the military side, we see no foreseeable change in the present systems of twin or parallel commands. Battlefield conduct and behavior of American troops has been a source of great pride to General Westmoreland. He said we will need more troops to finish the job.

As has been said on many different occasions the war in Vietnam is far from being merely a military conflict. It is also a struggle to build a viable nation. In many respects I feel that our task here is even more difficult than it is in the military sphere. South Vietnam is an underdeveloped country in every sense of the word. In the central highland region there are many hamlets and villages which remain extremely primitive. There is not only a lack of any identification with the national government, but also very little understanding, if any, of the basic fundamentals of a democratic society. I was extremely encouraged to learn that the South Vietnamese with our urging and support are undertaking an extensive project to remedy this situation.

At the training school at Vung Tau, a few miles southeast of Saigon 59 main teams are being trained to go back to their respective villages and hamlets to establish the basic infrastructure of our government. We were told it is planned to introduce approximately 40,000 graduates of this program into the countryside during the coming year. As is well known because of the campaign of terror and assassination carried out by the Vietcong there is a desperate scarcity of trained public administrators. The program being conducted at Vung Tau carries considerable promise of overcoming this shortage of local officials. At this point, I have a recommendation to make based on conversations which I held with some of our own people who have been in Vietnam for a number of years. They believe that our Government has a tendency to shift too quickly from one program to another.

In other words, it is absolutely essential that we elect to follow a particular program and then stick with it. For example, back in 1963 we were pursuing the idea of strategic or fortified hamlets. Indeed, in one speech delivered in that year by the Secretary of State, he made a very optimistic prognosis with respect to this program, and said that it represented a solution to the problem of maintaining government control in the countryside. However, it was not long until we abandoned that program as a failure. I had one of our people in Vietnam tell me that it was his honest opinion that the strategic hamlet program would have worked if we had been consistent and tenacious in our support of this particular approach. I realize the necessity for a certain flexibility; nevertheless some of our past failures can be traced to the fact that we have substituted flexibility for firmness.

One of the extremely interesting programs which I had an opportunity to observe is the Chieu Hoi or open arms program. This program is a systematic effort to encourage and induce defection from the Vietcong. In 1965 there were little over 11,000 defections reported. In the first half of 1966 over 9,200 Quy Chanhs or returnees have come in under this program. While we were in Vietnam I spent a portion of one day in the delta region in Vinh Long Province. One of the Chieu Hoi camps is located here, and I had an opportunity to interview some of the defectors. One young lad, who was only 12 years old, said that he had served as a liaison man between his village and a Vietcong. It was obvious to me from my questioning of him that he was motivated entirely by fear for his own safety, and that he served the Vietcong for this reason and not because of any ideological attachment to communism. I interviewed another defector who said that he had been a member of the political cadre of the Vietcong. When I queried him about marxism he portrayed a total ignorance of basic tenets. This again indicated to me that the average Vietcong is not a hard core Communist, but rather as Ambassador Lodge put it a simple peasant who has been impressed into the service of the Vietcong our of fear. Indeed, I asked this particular defector why he had not sooner deserted from the Vietcong and returned to a village under government control. He said that he was afraid that if he deserted to the government that his family who were living in a Vietcong controlled village, would be killed. The Chieu Hoi program seems to be having some success among these so called "ralliers" or defectors, and it does have the support and cooperation of our Government.

In the aforementioned trip to the delta region we were briefed rather extensively by the Province Chief, Colonel Diep, on the so-called revolutionary development program being carried out in the province in areas reclaimed from Vietcong control. The province chief took obvious pride in their accomplishments to date in building such facilities as schools, a water purification plant, a village market, and so forth. The job of reconstruction and rehabilitation of the shattered and war-torn countryside is a task of enormous proportions; however, I was impressed at the resiliency demonstrated by these people who have suffered so much during more than 20 years of war.

In this same province we also visited a provincial hospital. I think that another recommendation that I would make relates to this area of public health. It is my understanding that the current U.S. AID budget and public health activities amounts to only $27 million. In view of the appallingly low standards of public health and sanitation, I think we could well afford to increase the budget for public health activities. I can think of no better way to win the hearts and minds of these people than to provide them with the medical care they so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, because the economic and social phases of the struggle now going on in South Vietnam are so important I have undertaken in the following section of my report on my trip to that country to summarize some of the material that was made available to me on some of the Agency for International Development—AID—programs that are being conducted in South Vietnam by the U.S. Government:

USAID PROGRAMS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Through the cooperation of the United States Agency for International Development, South Vietnam is beginning to alleviate many of the problems, both military and public, which plague the country. The USAID is working in various areas of Vietnam, and helping with various aspects of the economy and helping also to build the necessary governmental infrastructure required in any self-governing country. From public health and education to public safety, the USAID is offering supplies and advice to the Vietnamese as they themselves undertake the tremendous task of nation-building.

The area of Public Safety, is one area with major problems, from the top administrative level all the way down to the lowest staff position. The country has a very complex system of law enforcement with much overlapping, and at the same time much specialization. There are no local law enforcement agencies as such, but only the National Police, or the Directorate General of National Police. There are six NP Regional Directorates in addition to the Saigon Municipal Police Directorate (SMPD). The Regions are divided into Provinces, the Provinces into Districts. In each of these divisions there is one top administrator. The Assistant Director of USAID for Public Safety is the chief adviser to the Director General.

In mid-1964 there were 22,000 in the NP. This reached 52,000 by the end of 1965. Even so, they are still behind their goal of 72,000 by the end of this year to try to do their job adequately.

In addition to the regular tasks assigned to law enforcement agencies, the NP must assist in counter-insurgency against the Viet Cong. They assist the military in gathering information on Viet Cong operations. However, because of the lack of manpower, the NP are not able to fulfill this task effectively. They help in the regulation of movement of

selected resources, both human and material, and to restrict support for the Viet Cong. Some of the specific objectives of the Public Safety program of the USAID are: (1) to assist the NP in training and equipping new recruits, (2) to help the NP train a tactical field force of highly-mobile, lightly-armed units, (3) to improve records systems for the NP, (4) to establish a country-wide system of communications to serve the NP and other civil security, (5) to assist the NP in training police in civil disturbance control, (6) to help the Saigon Municipal Police, Customs Service and Prison Rehabilitation in their programs.

Under this Public Safety program, the USAID is assisting the NP materially, financially and technically to strengthen the overall economic policy. They have furnished countless weapons, vehicles and clothes to these agencies. In addition, they have assisted in fortifying police installations throughout the country. USAID has undertaken a study of regulations and procedures of the police which should be completed in January of 1967, and should lead to a new code of procedures and standing orders for the NP.

Because approximately 90 percent of all operations are in the field, most of the support is in this area. The USAID plans to station a Public Safety Adviser in each Regional Province and in each city headquarters. As of April of this year there was an adviser in each of the six Regional Headquarters and 31 advisers in the 43 Provinces and autonomous cities. Efforts are now being concentrated on improving office facilities, which are very poor. Basic office machines are missing, filing systems are inadequate and space is limited due to the recent increase in manpower.

USAID is giving extensive aid to the Police Field Forces with the belief that these forces will help in the pacification of the country. These Field Forces, or PFF, overlap the work of the National Police and the ARVN in the pacification of the country. It is their responsibility to defend the villages between the time the ARVN moves out and the National Police can move in. Often there is a considerable time gap between these moves, and many villages have been terrorized by Viet Cong during this time. The PFF are trained in both counter-insurgency and police work, and are thus able to do the jobs of both the ARVN and the NP until that time when the NP can safely move in.

Deployment could be described in terms of a large ring, with the Viet Cong on the outer edges, the ARVN on the middle section and the NP in the inner area. The PFF would occupy the overlapping area between the ARVN and the NP. Looking at a typical province, it is probable that in the six districts, one would be controlled by the Viet Cong, one by the NP and the other three by PFF.

At present there is one training center at Trai Mat, near Dalat, Tuyen Duc Province, from which five companies have graduated and six were undergoing training. The training period is twelve weeks. The total strength is 3,000 men, with an authorized strength of 8,500.

The USAID has supplied 15 advisers, though only 8 have been assigned at this time. They have also provided arms, ammunition, most of the equipment and some clothing and rations to the PFF.

Besides defense of these Village-Hamlets, the USAID is working with the NP to break communications between the Viet Cong and the people. Because guerrilla forces cannot survive without the support of the people, the NP have initiated a series of checkpoints to seal the information leaks between the people and the Viet Cong. They are beginning a complete program of identification of individuals and families to better cope with this problem.

Methods for keeping records in South Viet Nam are far outmoded, as are the present records with which the NP are working. A standard procedure is now being outlined which will help the NP maintain a more complete system of records. USAID is supplying filing cabinets and other needed equipment for this project.

Another area where there are serious problems is that of civil disturbance control. This is handled by the Order Police, of which there are two units of 1,000 men each. Both are stationed in Saigon. The problem facing these units is the lack of training. Administrators hope to initiate a program of rotational training which will give all policemen some training in control of civil disorders.

The USAID is also assisting the Saigon Municipal Police Directorate in building a force. They have given many supplies to the SMPD and are also helping with the training program by providing men, money and materials.

There are several branch organizations of the National Police which the USAID is assisting. In such agencies as the Harbor Police, the Internal Affairs Division, the Judicial Police Service and the Special Police Branch they are acting in an advisory capacity, helping with problems of administration and operation.

USAID has also been partially responsible for the establishment of an integrated system of country-wide communications for all government agencies. There is a major effort underway to support the Village-Hamlet Radio system with some 12,000 radios involved. They have also given some $200,000 in commodities to the Prison Rehabilitation Program.

Public health is another area where USAID is working to help build programs adequate for the country's needs. There are five projects which they have undertaken to help alleviate the trouble. MEDCAP uses military forces to provide medical care for civilians, with most of the assistance insuring ample supplies of various drugs. Project Vietnam allows Americans to volunteer for a two-month service tour of the country in which they offer aid and assistance.

There are 33 Health Service Teams in Vietnam at the present, with an eventual goal of one in every province. These teams provide medical care and health care, and help in administering a program of public health. In addition to these teams, there will be nearly 100 General Duty Nurses in the country by the end of the year which will augment the nursing capabilities of the fixed teams. Through the Logistics Program, the USAID provides the major source of commodities to the Ministry of Health.

Long range plans call for better medical education, in which the USAID will assist in building a Medical Science building for the Medical School and will plan the curriculum, design and faculty for nursing education. They will also assist in paramedical training and rehabilitation. Moreover, because of the great shortage of hospitals and beds, a hospital construction survey will be made to find where these shortages are most critical. They are also initiating preventive programs in three areas: (1) Maternal-Child Health. (2) Communicable Diseases. (3) Malaria.

In the area of agriculture, there are 6,300 trained workers concentrating 75 percent of their efforts toward farmer support activities. Through their assistance, such programs as plant protection, rodent control and vaccination have been accomplished. This has increased income by VN$1.5 billion. Nearly $258 million has been loaned to the farmers and USAID is increasing the number of on-board advisers from 25 to 120 in an effort to better accomplish their goals. In 1966–67 they hope to initiate new land reforms, strengthen the credit system of Vietnam; encourage commercial credit; develop the Mekong Delta area; and offer technical assistance to assure a sound economic policy.

Perhaps the other major problem area lies in the educational system of the country. There are numerous projects underway to strengthen all parts of the system, from the lowest levels to the professional schools. Because people in the rural areas expressed a wish for better educational facilities for their children, the Hamlet Schools Project was initiated in 1963. This has helped Vietnamese officials to administer a developing program of general education and to establish a broad base of literacy essential to all facets of the country's needs.

The Southern Illinois University Project was initiated to upgrade the level of the elementary teachers and to modernize the teaching system. After a 1960 survey team observed that nearly one-third of all children had no educational opportunity, and that there was only one Normal school, the project was started. The team further reported that the basic aim of the educational system had been to eliminate the majority of students from further education, which created an elite but small core of educated persons. Since that time they have built two more Normal schools and plan to increase enrollment in the next few years.

The Technical-Vocational Education Project hopes to train skilled workers, technicians and teachers to aid in economic development. The goal is for 10,000 students in the program. The belief is that by improving the economy they can provide employment for all. They have established Polytechnical schools in Danang, Qui Nhon, Vinh Long and Phu Tho (Saigon), with six more Rural Trade Schools in the planning stage.

To upgrade the scientific skills of the nation, the Science Project has been started. This project concentrates at the elementary level, realizing that few students will go on to higher education. They have completed 38 new laboratories and 21 workshops in science education, along with writing a new, basic textbook.

The Higher Education Project is attempting to eliminate the gap between what the universities are teaching and the country's true needs. They have picked the key faculties and are concentrating on them, rather than spreading the program over a large number of faculties. Facilities are being improved and expanded because they are overcrowded due to the great increase in enrollment.

To improve the overall picture of the educational system the Instruction Materials Project is attempting to rewrite many of the textbooks and to distribute an adequate number throughout the country. A major problem still facing the people is the shortage of printers in Vietnam. They are unable to keep up with the demand for new books and there is no other way to produce them at the present. The project, however, has been responsible for 37 new titles of elementary texts in 10 areas. They have shipped 6,500,000 books to the schools with the same number in production for later delivery. They have also made taped presentations of classes and lectures to be distributed to the schools.

The other major goal of those upgrading the educational system is to teach the English language to the people. With so much written material available in English it is important that these people learn the language to take advantage of these books. It is a known fact that much of the literature being sent to Vietnam is not being read because so few people can translate it. Thus, there are two programs which handle this teaching. The International Volunteer Service works in science education as well as

English education. These volunteers teach about 25 hours a week, more than the average for the Vietnamese teachers, and hold special classes in the evenings for those interested. The other program, Teaching of English, is not only teaching the language to the people, but is upgrading the libraries as well. The program concentrates on specialized groups, such as the doctors or lawyers, for their instruction.

For all these programs, we are supplying aid and assistance in all forms. We have given textbooks, money, men, and many other related materials to aid in this development.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion, that although I returned from South Vietnam sobered by a new realization of the tremendous task we face in winning a victory for decency, order, security, and social justice in that beleaguered country, I did not come back downhearted, defeated, or dismayed. Unless we lose courage we can defeat the Vietcong and North Vietnamese militarily. This may require additional effort. If such is needed, we should be careful to give priority to those areas like seapower and airpower where our strength is so overwhelming and where the enemy is correspondingly weak. We should not suffer the delusion that the enemy will soon or easily abandon his goal of a Vietnam united by force from the North and subservient to a Communist-led dictatorship in Hanoi. We should be only too aware of this by now. Therefore, to continue to do as we have done in the past and as Hanson W. Baldwin, the military expert for the New York Times put it this week in one of his columns—"the administration is still playing Vietnam by ear" is not my idea of the most efficient way to assess the enemy and the threat that he poses.

The notes and the music have been written for this encounter by the enemy, and the melody is plain. There is no need to read his intentions and then react as if we were playing this by ear. The President must and should let the American people know what our total national security expenditures and requirements—and I refer to both men and materiel—are going to be for the year ahead. Let us truly make the successful prosecution and completion of this war our number one and most urgent national priority. As long as American boys are bleeding and dying on battlefields more than 10,000 miles from their homeland, there cannot possibly be any more pressing business on our national agenda.

When the President has communicated this message in unmistakable terms to the American people, then they too must rise to the occasion and with a single mind and purpose concentrate on the task that confronts us. The other side thinks we are going to falter and finally quit. I have faith that this particular enemy is just as wrong in that assessment as he could possibly be.

## SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order previously granted the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMERON] for July 25, be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

## THE EFFECT OF THE TIGHT MONEY SQUEEZE

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, evidently the President has not yet awakened to the critical nature of the tight money situation and its effect on every community in this country. In yesterday's press conference, President Johnson's inadequate and evasive answer to the excellent question posed by Sarah McClendon of the El Paso Times on the effects of the tight money squeeze in housing revealed his lack of understanding of the impending recession in homebuilding and lumber. In his reply, the President referred solely to the inadequate legislation now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, which by itself will never reverse the tight money problem.

The latest figures, available in yesterday's press, portend a deepening crisis in homebuilding and lumber production. I recommend that those who dismiss lightly my comment of last Thursday that "we are on the verge of a lumber and building industries recession" consider carefully the June data on housing starts and building permits. A failure affecting the Nation's second largest labor force will surely multiply throughout the economy and be felt in every congressional district in this country.

Housing starts are at the lowest levels in 5 years, building permits skidded another 14 percent since last month, and the Federal Housing Administration's mortgage insurance activity declined again in June. The Commerce Department reports that June's seasonally adjusted annual rate of housing starts fell to 1,288,000 from a May rate of 1,295,000. This followed an enormous 307,000-unit drop in May's rate from April. There has been a 17 percent decline from the June 1965 pace of 1,566,000 units. The June figures, just announced are the lowest since May 1961.

I appreciate the difficulty of those unfamiliar with these figures in interpreting their importance. In the housing industry new construction is tabulated in terms of a rate which, if continued unchanged throughout the year, would indicate the number of homes built, rather than raw monthly totals. Further adjustments are made for seasonal differences. In addition, one must consider that the housing market involves long-range commitments, and is therefore slow in reflecting changes in the economic picture. As a result, new housing starts remained at normal levels through the first 4 months following the Federal Reserve Board's unwarranted discount rate hike of last December. The interest rate war which is raging in the financial community as a direct result of the Reserve Board's action first showed up in the March figures. The new housing starts have continued to plunge since the March statistics were available.

The significance of these statistics is evident when one considers that a recent survey reports that housing contractors expect a cutback of 35 percent in home construction in 1966. The National Association of Home Builders predicts that the annual rate of 1.5 million new starts of December 1965 will skid to only 1.1 million new starts at the end of this year, if financial conditions do not improve. A drop of 400,000 units in home construction means a loss of 800,000 jobs. A drop in homebuilding of this magnitude would cost the lumber market almost 5 billion board feet of sales.

Another indicator of homebuilding, the pace at which building permits are issued, showed a 14 percent drop in June, twice as severe as a May decline. A sharp drop in permits foreshadows a still greater decrease in housing starts for the future. Additionally, in light of the tight money situation, many of the permits will fail to materialize as starts. Compared with the June 1965 totals, housing permits have dropped 25 percent from a year ago.

As might be expected, the decline in the housing industry is most marked for the middle and lower income purchasers who are bearing the brunt of the interest rate competition.

Permits for new single-family dwellings nationally fell to a 574,000 annual rate in June from May's downward revised 596,000 and 698,000 a year earlier. Permits for units in buildings housing five or more families are running at a rate which is only 67 percent of the June 1965 amount. Permits for units in buildings housing two to four families declined in June to a 58,000 annual rate from a May rate of 68,000; the June 1965 rate was 85,000.

A further indication of the severity of the situation is the Federal Housing Administration's figures indicating their participation in the mortgage market. Starts of new houses under FHA mortgage insurance dropped to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 121,000 from May's 128,000 and April's 151,000. In June 1965 there were 154,000 applications for FHA-insured mortgages, on a seasonally adjusted annual rate.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence is now clear—we are beginning a recession in the homebuilding and lumber industries—and there is no reason to expect an improvement. Commitments made prior to the current money market conditions have helped to sustain building construction to this point, but, as housing permit figures make abundantly clear, the false security of home construction statistics in the first quarter of 1966 is fast disappearing.

The plight of the homebuilding and lumber industries is inextricably connected with the imbalance in the money markets. Savings and loan associations, which account for 44 percent of the outstanding home mortgage loans in the

country, have no money to lend to home builders or home purchasers as a result of the drain on their deposits in recent months. The pattern of savings and loan withdrawals, initiated last December by the Federal Reserve Board's permission to commercial banks to offer 5½ percent interest on time deposits, reached the level of a $1.1 billion loss to the associations in April. Most savings and loans cannot justify interest rates of over 4½ or 4¾ percent. In July, likewise a dividend month, similar losses are expected.

The May figures, the most recent available, show a 28-percent decline from a year ago in savings and loan association mortgage loans for home construction. Home purchase loans sponsored by the thrift institutions suffered a 12-percent decline from the June 1965 figures. Total loan commitments by savings and loans fell from $3.1 billion in April to about $2.4 billion in June, indicating a further decline in housing later this year.

Interest rate escalation in other areas of the financial community is hurting the home builder and home purchaser. Conventional mortgage interest rates are now well above 6 percent. Over 55 percent of the Nation's builders are now forced to pay over 4 points for FHA financing on the homes they sell.

On a $15,000 FHA mortgage, a home will cost $1,725 more than was required last September in many areas of the country. The average increase in interest rates on 30-year mortgages of one-half of 1 percent will cost the buyer $1,125. The six additional points now being added to FHA-sponsored mortgages account for an extra $600.

The high interest rate policies pursued by the Federal Reserve Board and adopted by the big financial interests are threatening to destroy the opportunity for homeownership to millions of Americans. The imbalance resulting in the money markets from the interest rate competition is, in effect, forcing a reversal of national housing policy. For the past generation, national policy provided an appropriate and adequate climate for financing homebuilding and for the growth of savings institutions which provided the bulk of home construction funds. Now, by the unilateral action of one institution, the Federal Reserve Board, a sudden reversal of this policy has taken place.

As I have stated in two recent letters to the White House, President Johnson must take the responsibility for immediate action in this domestic crisis. The administration must formulate fiscal policies to combat the growing imbalance in the money markets and reverse the disaster facing the homebuilding and lumber industries.

The recent announcement by the Federal Reserve Board that it would limit multiple maturity time deposits to 5 percent, is an insignificant effort in correcting the monetary imbalance when the situation demands immediate attention by the administration, the Congress, and the Federal Reserve. We are not limited to fighting the monetary crisis with slingshots when we have a whole arsenal available at our command.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I called upon the President to convene an emergency high-level conference to discuss the problems of money imbalance and the crisis in the homebuilding and lumber industries. The conference would involve officials from the administration, Members of the Congress, the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, and representatives of the housing and financial communities, and would formulate a coordinated program using a wide variety of tools.

Unilateral action by one agency of government or another will not restore the balance to our economy. Lowering of discount rates, increasing reserve requirements, and Open Market Committee purchases would come under the Federal Reserve Board jurisdiction. Stoppage of all sales participation offerings should be considered by the Treasury. Immediate suspension of the investment tax credit, passage of an excess profits tax, and restrictions on installment buying should be considered by the Congress. In the Tuesday meeting with members of the Appropriations Committee, President Johnson recognized the growing need for restraint in Federal expenditures.

I submit that a combination of these and other measures would check inflationary pressures in the economy while restoring the health of the lumber and homebuilding industries.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, I am concerned not only as an advocate of the "new economics" and as a Representative of the Nation's leading lumber-producing State. I am concerned as an American. If we do not reverse the tight money situation and the disastrous effect it is having in the lumber and homebuilding industries, we are threatened with a recession that will spread to other segments of our economy. Once more I call upon the President to treat the problem before its malignancy destroys the gains of the "new economics." Let us launch a coordinated and imaginative effort to stabilize the unprecedented economic growth of the sixties.

## NATIONWIDE SYSTEM OF SCENIC TRAILS

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in our increasingly urbanized world it becomes more difficult every year to find a quiet, relaxing refuge near the centers of our noisy, rushing cities. As the population of our urban areas grows, so does the use of land for commerce and housing.

We need to act now to protect what recreational land is left to us. For this reason I am introducing H.R. 16419, a bill that would establish a nationwide system of scenic trails. My bill is identical to H.R. 14289, introduced April 5 by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] and similar to H.R. 14222, introduced March 31 by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

My bill would designate the existing Appalachian Trail as a national scenic trail. The bill calls for a feasibility and desirability study of 13 others that would, I hope, become national trails. One of these 13 would be designated the Mississippi River Trail. It would extend from the mouth of the river in Louisiana to its headwaters in northern Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I spent an unforgettable part of my boyhood scrambling up and down the steep banks of the Mississippi River in Minneapolis, near the University of Minnesota. Nobody who has shared this experience, or who has walked along the bluffs overlooking the Mississippi, is likely to forget the magnificence of the huge river. But I have often reflected on a missing element that would make the Mississippi even more magnificent than it already is. The missing element is a trail.

We from Minneapolis are fortunate to have a city of such natural beauty, with so many lakes, parks, and recreation areas. Yet these areas are rapidly becoming inadequate for the needs of our burgeoning metropolitan area. We need more such areas. What could make more sense than a scenic, well-maintained trail along the Mississippi, mightiest of all the Nation's waterways?

The feasibility study, including costs and benefits, would be conducted by the Secretary of the Interior. Where lands administered by him were involved, the Secretary of Agriculture would participate. Assisting the Federal Government would be both governmental and private interstate, state and local organizations. Recommendations from this joint study would be made to the President.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the people, not only of Minneapolis but of the other 12 regions in all parts of the United States that are included in my bill, have an unequaled opportunity to make use of some of our most beautiful and historic assets—for comparatively few dollars.

## PROPOSAL SUBMITTED TO RESTORE MISSING PROVISIONS TO COLD WAR GI BILL

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and worthwhile pieces of legislation passed by this session of the 89th Congress is the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, Public Law 89-358. But this law, called the cold war GI bill, contains some major omissions.

In an effort to correct some of these omissions, I am introducing an amendment, H.R. 16420. My bill is identical to

S. 3303, introduced in the other body May 3 by Senator YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and 27 of his colleagues. The omissions were included in H.R. 11791, which I introduced last October, but were removed from the bill that became law March 3.

Although the 1966 law extends numerous benefits to veterans who have served since the Korean war, Mr. Speaker, it falls short of the Korean benefits in these ways:

It does not include on-the-job training, on-the-farm training or flight training. Despite rising living costs, its educational assistance benefits are lower than those of the Korean bill. It allows only 1 day of education for each day of active duty instead of the 1½ days of education for each day of active duty allowed under the Korean bill. And it does not include the previous provision for payment of $1 per month per veteran-student to schools for helping defray the expenses of preparing and submitting reports and certifications on such students.

My amendment would restore these missing provisions to the cold war GI bill.

All the Federal programs in our hard-fought war on poverty stress the need for on-the-job training. It is ridiculous to omit this important program from the new law. My amendment would allow, for full-time on-the-job training, $70 a month for a veteran with no dependents, $85 for one dependent, and $105 for more than one dependent. The amounts would be scaled down after 4 months. The total of allowance and salary could not exceed $310 a month.

We need to do everything possible to train qualified American farmers to cope with the world food crisis. My amendment for full-time on-the-farm training would allow $95 a month for no dependents, $110 for one dependent, and $130 for more than one. Allowances would be scaled down after 9 months.

The United States is confronted by an increasingly critical shortage of qualified commercial pilots. My amendment would pay 75 percent of tuition costs for flight training.

Under the present law, post-Korea veterans attending colleges and universities are eligible for $100 a month allowance if they are single, $125 if they are married, and $150 if they have two or more dependents. This is hardly fair, since the allowances under the law passed for Korean veterans in 1952 were $110, $135, and $160. My amendment would increase the allowances to their previous levels.

Mr. Speaker, ours is a wealthier Nation now than it was during the Korean war. The military service of the men and women in our Armed Forces today, in Vietnam and other world trouble spots, requires no less dedication than was required then. What excuse can we find for doing less for today's veterans?

The answer is clear that there is no excuse. Congress should take corrective action before this session ends.

---

## HANOI JEOPARDIZES WORLD PEACE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in the bipartisan resolution sponsored by my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. REID] and Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] expressing the grave concern of the U.S. Congress over the outrageous threats of the North Vietnamese Government to try American airmen as war criminals.

Two weeks ago, the North Vietnamese Government marched American airmen through the streets of Hanoi. This in itself was a violation of the rules of war and an offense against common decency, but Hanoi has gone even further by threatening to try these men as "war criminals."

This could represent a very grave turn in the war in Vietnam. Many American soldiers are being held as prisoners in the north today. We are not sure of the number, because the North Vietnamese will not tell us. They have refused to disclose their names, refused to let the International Red Cross see them, and refused to let mail or packages through to where they are being held.

These young Americans are not war criminals by any stretch of the imagination. They were following the orders of superior officers in attacking designated military targets. They were doing their duty for their country, just as the soldiers of North Vietnam are acting in accordance with their duty, as defined by their leaders. This is the oldest tradition of war.

The rules of war specifically forbid the trials the North Vietnamese have threatened. Article 13 of the Geneva Convention, which the government of Hanoi signed in 1957, provides that prisoners of war should be protected against reprisal for acts performed in the line of duty.

If the North Vietnamese act—in violation of international law and in violation of the solemn covenant that they themselves signed at Geneva scarcely 9 years ago—the gravest consequences could result. I hope they think very carefully indeed before taking this barbaric action.

At the same time, we will continue to make sure that our allies observe the prisoner of war conventions. In the past, there have been disturbing reports out of South Vietnam that Communist prisoners have received brutal treatment from the South Vietnamese.

In recent months, however, we are told that the South Vietnamese are observing the prisoner of war conventions, and allowing the Red Cross to use its good offices to help captured soldiers.

I hope that the North Vietnamese will not do the dangerous, desperate thing they are contemplating. They should be wise enough to know that it could exhaust the last remnant of tolerance of the American people and foreclose the last hope for a peaceful settlement.

## CULVER CALLS FOR END TO AIRLINE STRIKE

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the continuation of the present airline strike, which is now in its 14th day, poses increasing threats to the economy and security of our Nation, and it is critical that normal air service be resumed as quickly as possible.

The interruption of vital transportation and communication networks caused by the strike has gone beyond mere nuisance, and is particularly serious in view of the critical situation in Vietnam. The economic interdependence of all sections of the country and all segments of the population require the efficient movement of personnel and materials within the United States, yet 60 percent of all passengers and 70 percent of all airmail is dependent upon the five airlines which are not now operating. The strike is costing an estimated $7 million a day, and total losses are already approaching the $100 million mark.

Negotiations began in this airline labor dispute almost a year ago, in August 1965. When no agreement could be reached through regular channels, the President appointed an Emergency Mediation Board to find the facts in the case and make recommendations for a settlement.

On the basis of subsequent hearings, that Board recommended an increase which would bring wages for airline mechanics in the coming year to $3.64 an hour or $650 a month without overtime—well above the wages in manufacturing or retail trade.

The carriers accepted the emergency board recommendations and went above them in offering a contract to the union. The union, however, is holding out for higher wages which, if granted, would trigger an inflationary wage-price spiral with harmful economic consequences for all, including members of other labor unions. At the same time, the machinists are protecting themselves against this inflation by insisting upon a one-way escalator clause.

The International Association of Machinists is asking for wages almost 5 times greater than the administration's anti-inflationary guidelines, and Mr. Walter Heller, the former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers who was instrumental in establishing these guidelines, has called the union's demands "injurious to the national interest."

No one sector of the economy can be individually blamed for present inflationary pressures. I opposed statements by spokesmen of the administration which could be construed as placing such responsibility on the American farmer, and I am equally opposed to suggestions

that the American workingman is responsible for high prices. However, when one union makes demands as excessive as those being proposed and insisted upon by the IAM, then the floodgate is opened wide and the economic stability of the Nation is clearly at stake.

I have, therefore, contacted the president of the IAM, P. L. Siemiller, urging him to call off the strike and return to work so that further mediation can proceed in a calm and reasoned manner. I have further urged that the leadership of the union modify its wage demands to avoid the inflationary consequences which would inevitably occur.

Basic responsibility to the public in this matter rests with the union and the airlines, and I am hopeful that they will demonstrate the necessary industrial statesmanship to settle the dispute within the system of free collective bargaining, so as to avoid the necessity of forced inflationary as well as labor-management controls to protect the national interest and maintain a healthy and stable economy.

I do not favor compulsory arbitration, but some means of assuring a fair settlement without damage to the public interest must be found. Earlier this week, I urged President Johnson to use his good offices to settle the strike.

Last January, in his state of the Union message, President Johnson told us that he would submit recommendations to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest. Such action can no longer be delayed, and I have urged the President to submit his proposals now, so that the Congress can examine the possibilities for legislation in this critical area this year.

## WAGE BOARD BILL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for the purpose of bringing uniformity into the method of determining rates of pay for the so-called blue-collar workers of the Federal Government. This uniformity would be accomplished by the establishment of a Federal Wage Board, to be known as the Federal Departmental Wage Board, which would develop and maintain a uniform system of surveying pay rates for comparable jobs in private industry. Employee organizations would be represented at every level of responsibility in the wage determination system proposed in this bill.

My bill represents a need for legislation of this type; a need which has come about because of inequities in rates in different Federal agencies. These inequities have been increasingly emphasized by the lack of uniformity which would provide fair and equal compensation for skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled manual positions throughout the Federal service. It is impossible to remove these inequities because each Government agency which administers its own wage-fixing program believes it to be the one that is appropriate for its needs. As a result the analysis of wage-rate data obtained from private industry is made on different assumptions and by varying methods which have resulted in some instances in sizable differentials in rates for the same positions existing in different Government agencies.

It is evident that if all employees, particularly within given geographic areas, are to be equitably compensated regardless of the employing agency, a uniform wage board program must be created, and such a program must function on a Government-wide basis.

Development of a system of fixing wage rates for these blue-collar positions has a long history which begins with legislation enacted in 1862 to authorize the Navy Department to establish pay rates for the various crafts and trades in the navy yards. That system was based upon the principle of fixing rates in relation to the prevailing rates for comparable work in private industry in the geographic area in which a navy yard was situated.

The responsibility of Federal departments and agencies for determining these rates was broadened in 1955 when a considerable number of these positions, formerly subject to the Classification Act, were required to be compensated on the bases of administrative wage determinations. During the subsequent 11 years the inequities in wage rates for these jobs have been increased so that employees performing identical duties in different agencies in the same geographic area receive 50 or 60 cents an hour more or less than their fellow employees in another agency in the same area.

The bill which I have introduced would insure uniformity in the governmental wage-fixing procedure, first by the establishment of a Federal departmental Wage Board composed of five members to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor. Two of the five members would represent bona fide employee organizations having substantial membership in the Federal Civil Service. Wage review committees having an equal representation of leading Federal agencies and labor organizations would supplement the functioning of the Departmental Wage Board by adjudicating appeals from disputes referred to the wage board for determination. These committees would also make the final determination of wage rates. There would also be an Employee Advisory Committee, designated by the Secretary of Labor, which would include members holding nonsupervisory wage board positions as well as members representing bona fide employee organizations.

The departmental wage board would have the paramount responsibility for developing and maintaining a uniform system of wage determination. In so doing the board would prepare, with the advice of the departments, systems for placing positions in the proper grades, and would develop a job evaluation plan to determine the relative value of the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of each wage board position.

Wage survey data would be obtained by means of wage surveys conducted by the wage board and from surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wage surveys would be required to be made at least every 12 months. Wage surveys would ordinarily be conducted by one survey team in each wage board district. Each wage board district would comprise an area sufficiently large to obtain adequate wage data which would represent large-scale industries or conditions which are more nearly comparable to employment in the Federal service. Each survey team is to include at least one member representing one or more employee organization affected by the survey.

When each wage survey has been completed, the wage data are to be reviewed for accuracy and then forwarded to the wage board in Washington for suitable analysis and to determine adjustments which may be required in wage rate schedules.

Wage board employees would be given assurance of uniform application of a differential for night work. Uniform provision also is to be made for proper compensation for hazardous duties in formulating wage board determinations and would also include uniform application of an overtime rate of 1½ times the hourly rate for work required in excess of 8 hours in a day. Work on a holiday would be compensated at the rate of 2½ times the regular hourly rates.

## ALLIES OF POOR

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is worthy of notation that among the hundreds of communities participating in the struggle against poverty under the Office of Economic Opportunity, Dallas shares in the integrity shown in a recent audit that not one instance of unlawful use of funds by a local community action agency in the State of Texas has been discovered. Such a fine record is further noted in the entire five-State Southwest region. This is an achievement which all Texans can point to with pride.

Furthermore, the program for legal aid for Dallas, conducted by Southern Methodist University has gained the complete cooperation of all bar groups in the city. Leaders of the Dallas bar, the junior bar, and the criminal bar—in addition to the representatives of the areas and groups served—will participate on the governing board of the program.

The Dallas County Community Action Committee's board of directors is, indeed, made up of some of the most outstanding citizens and leaders of Dallas, which promotes the record of achievement and integrity already established.

An editorial in the Dallas Times Herald recently stated the cornerstone of the antipoverty is the development of self-reliant individuals who can become full-fledged participants in the good life of America. Only as we enable deprived citizens to have pride, hope, and dignity can we bury the Communist agitators, the newspaper declares.

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities Committee, I know for a fact that a basic Communist doctrine is appeal to the underprivileged. Here in America, the land of plenty, we have the resources that all may share "the good life." While I have opposed parts of the war on poverty because I believe that the State and local authorities are best able to handle the problems of the underprivileged, I must support the theory that each and every human being on this earth deserves to learn how to provide for himself. It is in the interest of all free peoples and our greatest defense against Communist aggression.

The editorial referred to follows:

ALLIES OF POOR

The cornerstone of the War on Poverty is the development of responsible, self-reliant individuals who, through education, training, counseling and a helping hand, can become full-fledged participants in the good life of America.

It is a distortion to say, as some in our midst do, that the War on Poverty is helping destroy the very traits it promotes. The easy way to attack the problem of the poor is to give them just enough of a dole to subsist on and hope they will go away.

The development of economic opportunity programs is a great experiment in humanitarianism. One recent speaker said, "You have to take the poverty out of the man, not the man out of poverty." That, of course, is exactly what the many projects under the War on Poverty banner are trying to do.

The charge made here and there that Communist agitators rather than civil rights movements are the primary causes of riots and unrest undoubtedly has some truth in it.

But the War on Poverty is an ally in the war on communism. Only as we enable our reprived citizens to have pride, hope and dignity can we bury the Communist agitators who offer glib solutions. Even in Russia, the increasing pressures from the educated and freedom-sniffing masses have brought some softening of communism's harsh totalitarianism.

## NATIONAL TRAFFIC SAFETY AGENCY

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of the Traffic Safety Act of 1966 by this 89th Congress will bring an end to a long period of neglectful indifference to the daily occurrence of death, injury, and agony experienced by the American people of all ages, in all walks of life and throughout our land.

Since this Congress convened on January 9, 1965, more than 70,000 men, women, and children have died violent deaths in traffic accidents. The enormity of this loss is awesome and awful.

Committee work has been completed on four bills which deal with the three main elements of the legislation: Federal motor vehicle safety performance standards; comprehensive research as to the causes of accidents and resulting deaths and injuries; and grant-in-aid programs aimed at constructing a more uniform and safer traffic environment throughout the Nation.

Yet unresolved is the question of what office or agency of the National Government will be assigned explicit responsibility to properly execute the Traffic Safety Act of 1966.

Thirty-one Members of this House and 15 Members of the Senate have sponsored legislation which would establish a National Traffic Safety Agency. Such an agency would logically be provided in a Department of Transportation. In the event such a department is not created then a National Traffic Safety Agency would be appropriate in the Department of Commerce.

The following article clearly discloses how critically important it is that explicit responsibility be assigned:

[From Christian Science Monitor, July 2, 1966]

STOP SIGN: TRAFFIC-SAFETY PROGRAMS IN U.S. HOBBLED BY SHORTAGE OF DATA

(Brian Justin Hoel)

Traffic accident research in the United States, a basic step in coping with mounting highway-safety problems, is menaced by disorganization and disagreement on methods.

This despite millions of federal, state, and local dollars flowing into accident study and prevention programs.

In addition, The Christian Science Monitor has found that:

There are far too few trained safety researchers;

Too few accidents are thoroughly researched from all possible aspects;

Interstate and intrastate cooperation on highway safety is seriously lagging;

Numerous states have yet to adopt even elemenetary safety standards.

To gather this information, 112 questionnaires were sent to state, federal, and private authorities in the field. Complete background data on accident causes, and age groups affected was sought.

In addition, the National Safety Council, the President's Committee for Traffic Safety, and the United States Bureau of Public Roads were quizzed on the safety measures instituted across the nation.

No questionnaire was completely filled out. Only nine questionnaires were returned with minimal data. No fewer than 53 questionnaires were sent back blank with apologies from the source—most pointing out the complexities of accidents and the problems of complete investigation. Fifty questionnaires were not returned.

Almost all of the 33 states that replied sent what data they did have—usually the Standard Summary of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents upon which the National Safety Council bases its annual national summary.

However, Fred W. Hurd, director of Yale University's Bureau of Highway Traffic, said "those who are experienced in the traffic-accident prevention field would have little confidence in the summary."

Even the states which reported their own findings were not satisfied with them. Vern L. Hill, director of the Oregon Department of Motor Vehicles, said, "So few of all traffic accidents are investigated by police. For that reason, we place very little credence on the 'prime causative factor' table included in this summary. . . . Too much of our accident statistics are of little significance."

This dearth of information must be viewed against rising public concern stirred by recent auto-safety hearings in Washington.

COORDINATION LACKING

Just last March President Johnson introduced a $700 million traffic safety bill. It calls for six years of research to make automobiles and highways safer. Passed by the Senate and now before the House, the bill is further evidence that the federal government considers it must provide leadership in this crucial field.

"The toll of Americans killed . . . [in highway accidents] since the introduction of the automobile is truly unbelievable," said Mr. Johnson. "It is 1.5 million—more than all the combat deaths suffered in all our wars."

Last year, he said, 49,000 Americans were killed in automobile accidents.

"The carnage on the highways must be arrested," said Mr. Johnson.

"The weakness of our present highway safety program must be corrected:

"Our knowledge of causes is grossly inadequate. Expert opinion is frequently contradictory and confusing.

"Existing safety programs are widely dispersed. Government and private efforts proceed separately, without effective coordination.

"There is no clear assignment of responsibility at the federal level.

"The allocation of our resources to highway safety is inadequate.

"Neither private industry nor government officials concerned with automotive transportation have made safety first among their priorities. Yet we know that expensive freeways, powerful engines, and smooth exteriors will not stop the massacre on our roads."

Says Mr. Hurd of Yale:

"One of the most frustrating problems we have in solving the highway safety problem is the lack of accurate information on the principal causes of accidents. Those who investigate accidents attempt to indicate the cause [or causes] on the report form but in most cases this is a matter of opinion and is often prejudiced."

INVESTIGATION TEAMS

Mr. Hurd does not blame present methods of traffic-accident reporting by police.

"The truth of the matter," he says, "is that accident causes are a very complex combination of failures and events. The driver is usually blamed because he is in command of the situation. At the same time, a slightly different vehicle-operating characteristic or elimination of the physical cause of the collision may have permitted a driver to avoid an accident."

It was to combat the deficiency in gathering data on accidents that President Johnson in March ordered the Department of Commerce to establish accident investigation teams to "bring us a new understanding of highway accident and their causes."

These teams have not yet been organized, and it has not been decided how they will go about collecting the data, says Paul Sitton, director of the department's office of transportation programs.

PERSONNEL SHORTAGE

He says, however, that there will be no "crash program" and that two or three teams will be established first to develop reporting techniques.

He hopes the team approach will show results within three or four years. But private researchers are skeptical that sufficient meaningful information can be gathered in that time.

J. Stannard Baker, director of research and development for Northwestern University's Traffic Institute, finds a basic lack of people

sufficiently trained to carry out thorough traffic-accident investigations.

A college course, Mr. Baker says, must be developed to train investigators. He says they must have some understanding of engineering, medicine, psychology, and sociology. And, he says, they must have time to gain experience. He estimates it will take at least 25 years to glean meaningful results through the use of these teams.

BASIC COMPONENTS

In the meantime, the National Safety Council and most of the others contacted felt the nation and the states must push forward with those safety programs on which there already is agreement.

The President's Committee for Traffic Safety, formed in 1946 to enlist specific public support in this campaign, spotlights the driver:

"The basic components of the traffic system are the driver, the vehicle, and the environment. In any given situation, the vehicle and environment are relatively fixed.

"In the seconds before an accident, there is no way to change the steering characteristics of the vehicle or the grade of the road.

"Only the driver, as the plastic element of the three, may be able to compensate for existing deficiencies in the vehicle or the environment and in the actions of other drivers who may be contributing to the accident situation."

For this reason, most researchers said that in addition to the need for research there must be immediate, rigid enforcement of existing state laws—especially those against excessive speed and drunken driving.

Several said there is a great need for universal adoption of implied consent laws, which enable police to test for drunkenness.

ENFORCEMENT PROBLEM

Art Richardson of the Mississippi Department of Public Safety said: "We feel that traffic accidents and fatalities can best be reduced by more stringent application of enforcement, and a better quality of enforcement.

"Unfortunately," he added, "tighter enforcement of traffic laws is not a very salable commodity to the driving public."

The breadth of the problem is another facet of the challenge. Says Mr. Sitoth: "It is very difficult to get 50 states to agree and coordinate on a subject filled with so much misinformation. It is a federal, not a state, problem."

Mr. Sitton asserts that "there is a natural reluctance on the part of state legislatures to enact strict laws against drinking. Too much of the evidence against drinking is felt by them to be hearsay.

"And then the liquor industry has a strong lobby. Legislators don't like to buck it. This is why we need federal leadership. We need to give them overwhelming documentation which they can point to. This will take the pressure off the legislators, and we will get better laws and enforcement."

ALCOHOL LINKS TRACED

There is near complete agreement by safety experts that alcohol is a prime factor in accidents. The National Safety Council, a national clearing house for much of the available statistical information on driving, says state reports, submitted to it show alcohol to be a factor in 12.8 percent of all fatal accidents and 7.4 percent of all accidents.

The council notes, however, that police officers often fail to report the use of alcohol unless they have enough evidence to convict. The council and many researchers who have done autopsy studies say at least 50 percent of all fatal accidents involve the use of alcohol.

Some studies indicate that as many as eight of every 10 drivers involved in accidents have been drinking.

There is agreement, too, that speed is the other key factor in highway accidents. It is at least partly to blame in 37.4 percent of all fatal accidents, according to the National Safety Council, often along with the use of alcohol.

Many safety standards have been proposed and outlined for the nation and the states, but many have been or are being bypassed.

Only 16 states, for example, have passed implied consent laws.

Only 32 states require seat belts to be installed in new cars. And only 20 states require annual motor vehicle inspection.

In safety legislation now before Congress, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to set interim safety standards for automobiles by Jan. 31, 1967. One year later he must spell out the nation's first permanent safety rules, to be revised and modernized every two years thereafter.

Detailed vehicle regulations being considered range from lap and shoulder safety belt anchors, recessed instrument panels, collapsible steering columns, safety door latches and hinges, flasher signals, safety glass, to standards for tire safety.

The President's committee has also targeted human factors—underscoring the dangers not only of alcohol but of drugs such as tranquilizers, antihistamines, and sedatives, which threaten alertness and performance.

Some researchers even raise the question of smoking's effect on driving safety, citing as one factor the drugging effects of tobacco's nicotine.

AGE FACTOR EXAMINED

Age is another element frequently raised in highway safety discussions. Some sources, without documentation, charge older drivers with hazardous driving. But statistics from the National Safety Council and the World Health Organization dispute such contentions.

For instance, the National Safety Council in its latest issue of Accident Facts reports that drivers under 25 are responsible for 30.7 percent of all accidents—some 35 accidents annually per 100 drivers in this age group.

By comparison, however, these data show drivers 70 and over accounting for only 4.7 percent of all accidents—or 14 per 100 drivers per year. In fact, those in this age bracket have the lowest accident rate of any age group.

Meanwhile, the need for upgrading research and information assessment persists, if only gradually recognized by public and private agencies.

The National Safety Council for one is upgrading its system of reporting. A draft Model Traffic Accident Reporting System was completed in May and is being discussed by traffic experts.

DETAILED FORMS

The system will include certain basic information on all investigated accidents along with additional facts from smaller samples. Patrolmen will carry very detailed forms to complete at the accident scene.

"The choice is ours to make," said the President.

"We build the cars, the trains, the planes, the ships, the roads, and the airports. We can, if we will, plan their safe and efficient use in the decades ahead to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

"Much—much more—remains to be done. The people of America deserve an aggressive highway safety program."

---

## REFORM ELECTION AND CAMPAIGN PROCEDURES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to reform our election and campaign procedures. This legislation has been drafted by the administration and was the subject of a Presidential message to the Congress on May 26 of this year.

In that message, the President argued:

> Public confidence in the election process is the foundation of public confidence in government. There is no higher duty of a democratic government than to insure that confidence.

For some years, spokesmen in the press and in public life have urged electoral reform. The soaring costs of campaigns, the need for wider political participation, and the importance of campaign finance disclosures have gained more and more attention. The President feels, and I agree fully, that there is wide agreement in this country on the need to revise many of our electoral practices. The legislation I am sponsoring today moves in that direction.

The most important provisions in this measure deal with political campaigns. Campaigns are not merely recurring subjects for gossip and controversy. They are a principal source of public education. We are all aware, however, of the degree to which the vitality of this democratic practice is being undercut by the realities of wealth. Forty-one years ago Congress passed the Federal Corrupt Practice Act. Fifteen years later, it passed the Hatch Act. These measures sought to limit the total amount of allotment for campaign expenditures. They attempted to arouse disclosure of funds. They also tried to fix limits on contributions. The legal structure established by these measures, however, is riddled with loopholes.

Thus, under present law, a national committee can raise and spend no more than $3 million in any year. But the law does not limit the number of committees. Likewise, present law restricts senatorial candidate expenditures to $25,000 and House expenditures to $5,000. But again, the number of committees that can work on behalf of candidates is unlimited. These loopholes, and others, must be closed. I believe this measure moves boldly in that direction.

It would, for example, require wide disclosures of campaign expenditures. All committees supporting candidates would be required to report contributions and expenses over $100. This provision, incidentally, would include, for the first time, candidates for President and Vice President. Coverage of this law would be extended to primaries. All gifts to Members of the legislative branch over $100 would have to be disclosed under threat of criminal sanction for failure to comply. This provision moves in the direction of the strict control presently exercised on members of the executive branch by the recent Executive Order 11222 of May 8, 1965.

The law would also limit to $5,000 the total amount of any single source contribution to a political campaign. Likewise, we must extend our present prohibition against political contributions by Government contractors to include corporate contractors. Presently, corporations with Government contracts can make contributions at the State and local level. This loophole must be closed.

As we seek to curtail the political power of big money, we must also magnify the powers of small contributions. My bill, therefore, would permit a special tax deduction for contributions up to $100 in any election at any level of government. This single provision can expand the democratic base of our electoral precedence and can dramatically widen the margins of public participation in national politics.

I believe this measure represents a giant step forward in the quest for electoral reform. I also believe we can seek steps beyond this legislation. I think, for example, that electoral reform should be followed by efforts to devise a congressional code of ethics and to require disclosures by Members of Congress of all financial assets and sources of income. We must also seek means to limit effectively the total amount of expenditure permissible in a single campaign.

But this is the first step in what can be a crusade to purify our democracy and render our institutions more representative of our aspirations than of our weaknesses.

## DOCTORS FOR RURAL AREAS

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, traveling through the rural areas of my district, I meet with the people I represent to discuss their needs and thoughts. I talk with them to determine how I can best help them. Again and again, I find that the response is the same—"Help us to get a doctor." In west Texas, and in rural areas across the country, people cannot receive adequate medical care without traveling many miles. In emergency situations, help may simply be too late. Lack of proper diagnosis of serious illness may result in a fatal or disabling condition which could have been prevented by proper care early in the illness.

In rural areas, the absence of a doctor presents a grave threat to the way of life which is so basic to our country. Being near a physician is vital to families, and can be the difference between strong bodies and life itself or pain, suffering and tragedy. Little wonder that lack of a doctor is often a reason for moving to an urban area. Thus we can identify a very real factor in the immigration to our cities. Under every rule of fairness and just treatment it is vital to our country that we provide our rural areas, the backbone of America, with a chance to survive and grow. The great productive capacity of our country as food and fiber producer rests in the hands of people who choose to live away from urban centers. The spirit of self-reliance still thrives in these areas, but we must give these people an equal chance to prosper and to preserve our heritage.

The people in rural communities in my district deeply concerned with this problem had demonstrated, before coming to me, that an adequate income for a doctor was available, and that the community would construct whatever facilities were needed. Yet each had failed to attract physicians. This is a condition existing over all the United States. It is such a dire condition that if not resolved soon, the people will demand some formal Federal program to place physicians in the field. I personally believe that there are many dedicated physicians who can be motivated to serve rural America on a private practice basis. I for one prefer that private enterprise show that it can solve this distrubing deficiency.

Before the pressures of this neglect become so great that the public demand produces some less desirable alternative, I propose a solution now, based on private enterprise. I advocate a solution deferring to local and State government, with the Federal Government acting only as a catalyst or partner to initiate this venture in private practice and service. I do not advocate a large bureau, or a corps of Federal employees.

In facing this problem, we can be as ostriches and ignore the growing pressures, or we can meet our responsibilities with intelligence and prevention. We can in a sense practice preventive medicine, recognizing the problem, and exercising a solution now along the lines of American principles of private enterprise, rather than wait until the ultimate stress of the problem overwhelms us.

Today I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, will help relieve this shortage problem in rural areas with a low-cost program. It will enable young physicians to practice in these areas and follow their ancient role of ministering to all people. I am confident that this plan will be a benefit to the medical profession as well as to rural areas.

This bill is called the Rural Medical Corps Act of 1966. It will enable young doctors to practice in these areas completely free from Government direction or control, but with equipment and facilities provided by the community and the Public Health Service. Through a joint agreement between the State and the community, the doctor will be guaranteed an annual gross income, and should his actual earnings fall below that level the State and local people will each supply one-half of the difference.

The doctor will contract with the Surgeon General as agent for the local and State governments for a 2-year period of service, and will be provided with surplus Government equipment. He will be a private practitioner and not subject to control by the Government in any way. At the end of the 2-year period, the doctor may purchase the equipment he has used if he decides to remain in the area.

I believe that this legislation appears at a critical time in the history of medical care in our country. Such a program at this time will help to forestall a crisis.

Many of the Members of this House face this same problem in their districts, and I welcome suggestions from my colleagues and from others concerned with this issue. I urge prompt action by the House to put this plan into effect.

## THE AIRLINE STRIKE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the reports from the strike front are discouraging.

The machinists union leaders are lined up on one side, and confronting them are the airlines, the administration and the press.

They apparently have the solid support of the 35,000 striking mechanics, baggage handlers, ramp service agents, cleaners, storers, and inspectors.

It might be a fair guess to say that the Nation's 197 million people, minus the 35,000 on strike, would urge the union to accept the President's Emergency Board recommendation that would give the union a very generous settlement.

Instead of reexamining their position, the union leaders are resorting to subterfuge, which has become their hallmark. With the heavy power to ground the Nation's airliners, the union leaders believe they can keep the entire Nation at bay until their demands are met down to the last penny.

The leaders of this strike are going to their union members for a vote, but with no recommendation from them. This strategy is transparent. The union vote will be negative because in effect that is the way the leaders are telling them to vote. A negative vote becomes a vote of confidence in the union leadership. This would serve as a signal to the administration that blocking a settlement is a militant membership rather than a stubborn union leadership.

That union leaders have agreed to conduct the vote as quickly as possible. They express the hope that it can be done in 3 days. But realistically, the balloting must be arranged in 231 cities and some union sources say this might take a full week.

This means that two-thirds of the Nation's domestic airliners remain in their hangars; this means that 150,000 travelers every day will continue to be affected. And beyond that week, there is still little hope of getting approval from the union for any kind of settlement short of the one they have dictated, with their own commas and periods—and dollar signs.

I say that we should act now. It is better to act now than to react later when we reel under the inflationary impact of a settlement on the union's terms.

## A PRICE-WAGE ROCKET

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to the shameful situation created by a few willful men who can be likened to dynamiters preparing to blow up a dam high above a sleeping town of trusting people.

I refer to the leaders of the International Association of Machinists who are making excessive demands on the airlines, are ignoring the pleas of the President of the United States, and the needs of our men in Vietnam. They are ignoring the needs of hundreds of thousands of travelers and countless businesses throughout the Nation.

If this union, whose 35,000 striking members are already among the best paid wage earners in the Nation, continues to press its demands, we might as well forget about price-wage stability. It will not be a price-wage spiral—it will be a price-wage rocket.

Airline workers perform a public service. They have contributed to making the U.S. airline industry the most efficient, the safest and the most economical in the world.

Yet, for 2 weeks, two-thirds of this domestic airline capacity in our great Nation have been grounded, an industry crippled by a few men who put their own interests above those of the rest of the Nation.

These men must not forget that while they are enjoying a standard of living second to none, American fighting men in Vietnam, second to none, are defending our way of life—and those men in uniform did not inquire in advance about pensions or fringe benefits or ask for any written guarantees against escalation.

I want to point out that in my opinion, the International Association of Machinists has been acting in bad faith from the very beginning. When President Johnson appointed a three-man Emergency Board, the president of the union sent a telegram to the White House which said that the Board would be a "total waste" of time and taxpayers' money. The union representative stated that in all probability any recommendations that were to be made by the Board to the President would be rejected by the union. This was a rather startling attitude even to some of the oldtimers in labor. Here was a suggestion from the representative of the union that the decision which had not even been written yet, would in all probability be rejected by the union.

I firmly believe the leaders of this union wanted a strike. I firmly believe the union does not intend to end this strike, except on its own terms, down to the last decimal point, down to the last dotted "i," down to the last crossed "t," as dictated by them. Period.

This is sheer irresponsibility. It is a manifest lack of compassion or concern for our country.

I warn these men that their stubborn, vacuumlike position is a direct invitation to enact new legislation that will prevent the kind of intolerable situation we are faced with today.

If the IAM demands were to be met, we could not continue to ask for restraint and moderation from workers in other industries. If the IAM demands were to be met and they were matched by others, do you realize what would happen to the cost of living of the American people? I ask these men to think, to reason, to rise above the demands and to emerge as statesmen of labor.

The time to subordinate their interests to those of the American economy is now—before the strike goes any further.

Now is the time to end this crippling strike.

Now is the time for the IAM to show our men in Vietnam that the union places the national welfare first.

And now is the time to restore vital airline services for thousands of travelers and businesses throughout our Nation.

Time is running out and so is the patience of the American people. Our President has done all he can under existing law. It is becoming increasingly clear that it now falls to us—the legislative branch of the Federal Government—to go beyond the existing law and broaden the President's power to enable him to cope forcefully with the present strike situation.

Congress must move, the President must move, the country must move.

## AN UNJUSTIFIED AIRLINE STRIKE

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, for 2 weeks the United States has been hobbled by an unjustified airline strike.

Hundreds of thousands of travelers have been inconvenienced. Thousands of workers have been involuntarily idled. The national economy is being severely damaged. Many individual businesses have suffered disastrous losses. Our ability to carry out essential military functions has been placed in jeopardy.

I have received telegrams and letters from many public officials and citizens of North Carolina expressing concern about the situation. I share their concern about the serious and harmful effect the strike is having on North Carolina and the Nation.

A three-member Presidential Emergency Board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, has recommended a settlement of the wage dispute between the airlines and the union which would represent an estimated $76 million cost to the airlines. Under the recommended settlement, an airline mechanic would make $3.64 per hour during the coming year—about $650 per month without any overtime.

The airlines have agreed to accept the recommendations of the Presidential Board. According to press reports, the union negotiators have refused to accept the Board's recommendations and have been unwilling to agree to a temporary truce so that negotiations can continue without further harm to the country's economy.

The President has already exhausted the limited legal authority presently available to him for dealing with the airline strike. The public is growing impatient and the hour is growing late.

Congress cannot and will not allow this situation to continue. If this crippling strike cannot be resolved through voluntary means, then additional legal authority must and will be provided to protect the public interest.

## ANOTHER CRISIS IN THE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, today we are faced with another crisis in the transportation industry as a result of the crippling and paralyzing airline strike now in progress. The President yesterday told the Nation that the administration is working on possible proposals to submit to Congress that could be used in cases of emergencies that vitally affect the public interest. I truly hope that a reasonable proposal will be forthcoming promptly from the White House.

The laws of this country allow for collective bargaining. I favor collective bargaining. This fundamental right must be preserved, but there is not now and never has been, and never should be, the right to strike against the public interest.

Under the present laws, however, the Government has no power to order the workers to return to their respective posts of duty. Almost 100 Senators and Congressmen, several Governors and scores of mayors have urged the President to do something about the airline strike. The President appears to be doing all that the law now permits. Thus, it is incumbent upon the Congress to act, and to act with dispatch.

This critical situation must be dealt with firmly and resolutely.

The union is plainly stalling. It has proposed recessing immediately for a week while a membership vote is taken. This procedure is pointless and is unquestionably a delaying tactic. The price

to the public is intolerable. There is no agreement to be voted upon. Such procedures make a farce of collective bargaining. This is nothing but an effort on the part of the union tyrants to terrify and frighten the public into demanding of the airplane companies a settlement on the terms laid down by these ruthless and heartless czars.

Despite the fundamental principles involved in collective bargaining, the right to strike is not absolute. Those who accept employment in public utilities assume and owe an obligation to the public to continue in their employment until suitable relief can be obtained. They have no right to recklessly cut off public utilities such as power, light, transportation, and services of that nature which are essential to the general welfare and to the health, happiness, and safety, if not indeed the very lives, of our people.

This is a sound doctrine and it is not new to me. I faced a similar situation during my term as chief executive of the Commonwealth of Virginia. On one occasion, I found it necessary in the public interest to call into immediate service the unorganized State militia of the Commonwealth in order to continue the generation of electricity by a large power company serving three-fourths of our State. I found that my action in so doing was not only pleasing to an overwhelming majority of the people, but even the union members themselves for the most part showed a willingness to cooperate because they realized that they, as individual members, did not want to be a party to human suffering and inconvenience.

After this crisis was solved, I called the General Assembly of Virginia into extraordinary session and laid before them a recommendation which resulted in the enactment of Virginia's present public utilities labor relations act. This law has worked very satisfactorily, and Virginia did not, during that 4-year period, suffer 1 minute's interruption of service of any public utility.

In the current airline strike, these union leaders clearly appear to have come to the conference table in bad faith. They deserve and no doubt will receive the condemnation of the enraged public, who have become tired of these union shenanigans and who will rise up in righteous indignation and demand that those responsible for this situation be brought before the bar of the courts, as well as the bar of public opinion. These machinist union leaders will some day have to answer to their own brethren for their faults and misdeeds.

If these men are deaf to reason, they must be made to look at the realities. As Members of the Congress, we cannot remain mute and silent while the country suffers. We must meet this responsibility and our voices must be heard with clearly worded legislation that will make known to all our intentions as public servants.

---

## THE AIRLINE STRIKE

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

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concern about the increasing gravity of the airline strike.

I have been contacted by various civic and business leaders from across New Mexico, and especially from Albuquerque. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, my State has many defense installations which play a vital role in the security of this great Nation. And our situation is somewhat unique inasmuch as my State is served by only one transcontinental airline company. Over the past several years, I have worked with New Mexico leaders in an effort to get additional flights into and out of Albuquerque, but thus far have been unsuccessful. I think the current adverse conditions point to the need of increased flights into my State.

This is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that New Mexico has been left completely without air service, but it has been only through the concern for the public welfare exhibited by the other airline's officials and employees which has kept my State and its economy from becoming a complete shambles and I commend them for their cooperation.

But to focus on the more immediate problem, Mr. Speaker, this strike is having a serious impact on the New Mexico economy, and is obstructing the work being done on vital Government contracts which affect our military preparedness. I have contacted both the President and Secretary of Labor Wirtz. I have urged that they use all the power and prestige of their respective offices to bring about a quick settlement of this strike. They have assured me that they have done so and would continue in their efforts. I am confident that they are doing their best. The President has appointed a special commission to make recommendations within his expressed guidelines of 3.2 percent and what is needed now, Mr. Speaker, is cooperation and a sense of public responsibility by the contesting parties to accept a settlement within that framework.

I am a firm believer in the process of collective bargaining, but when either of the parties displays a lack of regard for the public interest, and such action creates a national emergency, I say that party is not living up to its responsibility. When such a situation exists and the President is forced to take actions which would not be warranted under collective bargaining in good faith, I say that such an action is a direct consequence of their lack of public responsibility.

I realize that—as has been pointed out by some of my distinguished colleagues—this strike once again points to the need for new strike legislation which would give the President more effective means than he presently has for settling such disputes. But such proposals are not going to settle the present strike; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I once again respectfully urge the President to use the power and prestige of his office to bring about a quick and equitable settlement to this crippling strike.

## GOVERNMENTAL PRESSURE ON PRICES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recently, an editorial in the New York Times, July 15, 1966, brought out very forcefully some of the points I have tried to make in the past about wage-price guidelines and applied them to the recent molybdenum price increase. This increase of approximately 5 percent in the price of molybdenum, an important metal in the steelmaking process, was rescinded by the industry in the face of administration pressure. This action raises weighty questions of both procedure and substance in the application of the guidelines which deserve more consideration than they have received.

First, I will discuss how the price of molybdenum was kept down, saving until later the consideration of whether the price should have been frozen. From the point of view of those of us on both sides of the aisle who are interested in fair and equitable procedures, this incident is very disturbing. For one thing, the guideposts have never been authorized by either House of Congress. They are an invention of the Federal bureaucracy enforced totally without legislative sanction. They are designed as a temporary stopgap measure to give the impression to the American public that the administration is sincere in its attempt to hold back inflation. This is nothing but image building. If this administration were really interested in fighting inflation, it could have reduced nonessential civilian expenditures and avoided priming the pump of an already overheated economy by increasing the cash deficit from $1.5 billion in the third quarter of 1965 to $4.2 billion in the first quarter of 1966. Instead of cutting nonessential Federal expenditures, this administration preferred to aim sporadic blows at selected industries who had dared respond to the pressures of excess demand generated by Federal spending.

Here is the real problem which the Congress should investigate. If the Congress should ever decide to authorize such intervention of the Federal Government in business decisions, and I sincerely hope we will not, there is a need for proper procedures, so that both sides get their "day in court." At the present time, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers can utilize the press resources of the Executive Office of the President to present the Government's case to the American people. A business executive could not hope to duplicate the coverage that any member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers gets when attacking business leadership. This imbalance must be corrected by the establishment of a public forum where charges and countercharges about prices can receive proper attention. Let me make this clear—I

do not think the Government has any business interfering with private economic decisionmaking, except to establish and maintain essentials of a market system—fair weights and measures, and workable competition in the market. But if the Government must interfere, orderly procedures for such intervention must be established in order to avoid complete chaos.

Did the administration follow fair procedures in dealing with the molybdenum producers? The answer to this question is cloudy, to say the least. Gardner Ackley publicly condemned American Metal Climax Co. for raising prices. After the price increase was rescinded, A. A. Sawyer, Jr., the president of the Molybdenum Division of American Metal Climax Co., stated:

> The company continues to believe an increase in molybdenum prices is justified, and, in fact, is necessary to assure adequate future supplies to meet rapidly growing requirements. (Wall Street Journal, July 14, 1966.)

Why then did he rescind the price increase, Mr. Speaker? What forms of pressure were brought to bear by the administration? Was it the threat of stockpile dumping, or antitrust action, or Internal Revenue audit, or what, that rolled back the price increase? Mr. Speaker, I think the Congress has the right to know how the administration convinced the molybdenum industry that the "public interest" would be served if the price increase were rescinded.

There is an undertone to this which I find even more disturbing. Evidently, the reason that the administration began a public outcry about the price increase was that it had not been notified of the increase in advance. It is bad enough when the Executive Office of the President publicly intervenes in economic decisionmaking. But I must protest when economic decisions are made according to political criteria behind closed doors, without any of the safeguards that open discussion and debate can provide. It is regrettable that even these safeguards were not always present in the recent price confrontations. If the guidelines are to be enforced without statutory authorization, at least let them be enforced in public. The advent of joint industry-business planning on prices is a dangerous step toward totalitarianism, that is the concentration of political and economic power in the same hands, and a step which every Member of this body should resist.

Mr. Speaker, we have examined the question of how the molybdenum price increase was retracted, and concluded that the matter deserves a great deal more investigation by appropriate congressional committees than it has so far received. We have overlooked until now the question of whether molybdenum's price should have been frozen by administration pressure. The problem of molybdenum was simply that present supply is inadequate for the high level of demand—stimulated in large part by excessive Federal spending. This administration has short circuited the signals provided by the market to direct investment into the most productive endeavors. When a commodity is in short supply, its price should rise—to ration available supplies among various users, to encourage low-priority users to turn to substitutes for the commodity, and to encourage additional output and investment in the industry. By keeping the price down, the administration has made it seem unnecessary to invest in molybdenum production or conserve the supplies of this scarce metal. This is a political interference with the allocative function of prices that can only perpetuate the existing shortage of molybdenum.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would ask, as this editorial does, "Why Molybdenum?" Was the increase of the wholesale price index of 3.7 percent from April 1965 to April 1966 due entirely to molybdenum? The answer is an obvious "No." Why was this price increase singled out for condemnation by the administration? Why not sulfur, coal, or tires? The answer suggested by this editorial is an ominous one. Molybdenum was chosen as a target because the administration wanted to convince labor of its sincerity about the guideposts, and the molybdenum price increase was a timely opportunity to give this impression. The inequity of this procedure should need no explanation. When political considerations of this sort influence what should be an economic decision, the economic results can be disastrous.

It is my hope that my colleagues will be willing to have this matter looked into more closely by the appropriate congressional committees. The problems of procedure, efficiency, and equity raised by the extralegal enforcement of these guidelines cannot be made to disappear by the rambling invocation of the "public interest" which have become so fashionable in Washington these days. By unanimous consent, I would like to submit the editorial for the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, July 15, 1966]

ROLLBACK ON MOLYBDENUM

In forcing the cancellation of a 5 percent price increase posted by producers of molybdenum, the Administration has served notice that it does not intend to abandon the controversial wage-price guideposts in its war against inflation.

Over the past few months there had been considerable confusion about the Administration's position. Prices have been increased in several areas—in shoes, coal, sulphur and tires—without so much as a murmur of criticism. In May, Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor let it be known that the Administration would no longer engage in "public confrontation" with industry of the sort that created so much resentment and uncertainty last year.

Instead, Government officials took to holding private consultations with businessmen, convinced that it was easier to persuade industry to exercise moderation before raising prices than to use pressure to force a rollback after prices have been raised.

The successful and publicized effort against the molybdenum producers removes the suspicion that the Administration was weakening in its adherence to the guideposts. But its action raises fresh questions about fairness in applying them as well as about their effectiveness in curbing inflation.

Chairman Gardner Ackley of the Council of Economic Advisers publicly attacked American Metal Climax for raising the price of molybdenum without informing the Government, suggesting that prior consultation might have resulted in a partial increase rather than a complete rollback. And Administration officials freely admit that they brought pressure on the molybdenum price increase to impress labor; but they remain conspicuously reluctant to impress business by combating unjustified wage demands.

This arbitrary and capricious use of the guideposts stems largely from the Administration's failure to take more direct action to curb mounting inflationary pressure. In the absence of a tax increase, the guideposts, which are of real value in stressing the importance of considering the public interest in private price and wage decisions, have been called upon to act as a disguised form of wage and price control. The Administration may make use of them to score occasional victories, as it has in molybdenum. But the rise of industrial prices to date and the prospect of large-scale increase in wage demands makes them an inadequate weapon for fighting inflation.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. BETTS), for Monday, July 25, and Tuesday, July 26; on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, Monday, July 25; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. MCEWEN), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and all Members may have 2 legislative days to extend their remarks on the same subject matter.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CORMAN, for 40 minutes, July 25; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCEWEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOW.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. THOMAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY in two instances.

Mr. LOVE.

Mr. BOLAND.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3523. An act to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to undertake a comprehensive study of high-speed ground transportation to Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2948. An act to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

## BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 318. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 25, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2578. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2579. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the 18th annual report of the Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2580. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting supplemental information regarding anticipated participation by foreign countries and by private industries at the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in Dade County, Fla., pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-355; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2581. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of activities carried on by the Geological Survey during the period January 1 to June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 87-626; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2582. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 20, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Yale water supply facilities, Keystone Reservoir, Okla., in final response to an item in section 209 of the Flood Control Act approved October 23, 1962; to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PIRNIE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 7973. A bill to amend section 4339 of title 10, United States Code (Rept. No. 1750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOORE: Committee, on the Judiciary. H.R. 3671. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Restivo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7671. A bill for the relief of Miss Zofia Suchecka; with amendment (Rept. No. 1752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10656. A bill for the relief of Kimberly Ann Yang; with amendment (Rept. No. 1753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11347. A bill for the relief of Maria Anna Piotrowski, formerly Czeslawa Marek; with amendment (Rept. No. 1754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11844. A bill for the relief of Maria Guiseppina Innalfo Feole; with amendment (Rept. No. 1755). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 146. An act for the relief of Delma S. Pozas (Rept. No. 1756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 196. An act for the relief of Georges Fraise; with amendment (Rept. No. 1757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 642. An act for the relief of Chung K. Won; with amendment (Rept. No. 1758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens (Rept. No. 1759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 16413. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 16414. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 16415. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 16416. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16417. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 16418. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for cost-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 16419. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 16420. A bill to authorize on-the-job training programs, on-the-farm training programs, and certain flight training under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the educational assistance allowances paid under such chapter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 16421. A bill to provide for a more conservative capitalization of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 16422. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 16423. A bill to amend the tort claims procedure contained in title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the United States shall be immune from suits for tort claims by individuals confined in Federal penal or correctional institutions arising out of acts or omissions of Government employees in the operation or management of such institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 16424. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 16425. A bill to establish the Channel Islands National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 16426. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 16427. A bill to improve the safety of railroad transportation under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 16428. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 16429. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 16430. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make the educational assistance program under that title as broad as the program provided for Korean conflict veterans, to increase the allowances payable to veterans participating in such program, to make educational assistance available to the children of veterans having service-connected disabilities rated at 50 percent or more, and to provide for compensatory payments to certain veterans who obtained their education before the educational assistance program of title 38 became effective; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 16431. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 16432. A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the reinstatement and renewal of term policies of national service and U.S. Government life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 16433. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income under that section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 16434. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act by adding a new title X thereto which will establish a program to provide doctors in rural areas of need; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 16435. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 16436. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 16437. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 16438. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 16439. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 16440. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 16441. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 16442. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 16443. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 16444. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 16445. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to strengthen the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 16446. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit grants under title VI of that act to be used for self-care facilities in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 16447. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new beds and related facilities in order to meet the demands for service resulting from new and expanded Federal programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 16448. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of an aid and attendance allowance to certain individuals with severe service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 16449. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 16450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 16451. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 16452. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 16453. A bill to establish a National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16454. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 16455. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.J. Res. 1217. Joint resolution to delete the interest rate limitation on debentures issued by Federal intermediate credit banks; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 1218. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the first week in September of each year as "National Voter Registration Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 846. Concurrent resolution to provide for a permanent United Nations peacekeeping force; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H. Con. Res. 847. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H. Con. Res. 848. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the holding of elections in South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. Con. Res. 849. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 850. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Con. Res. 851. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 852. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 853. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 854. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 855. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDADE:

H. Con. Res. 856. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Con. Res. 857. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MIZE:

H. Con. Res. 858. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 859. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 860. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive

in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. Con. Res. 861. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER:

H. Con. Res. 862. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H. Con. Res. 863. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 864. Concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H. Res. 924. Resolution to establish a select committee, and an advisory commission, to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Res. 925. Resolution to establish a select committee, and an advisory commission, to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Res. 926. Resolution to establish a select committee, and an advisory commission, to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. Res. 927. Resolution to establish a select committee, and an advisory commission, to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the national cemetery system; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 16456. A bill for the relief of Dr. Peter H. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16457. A bill for the relief of Calogero Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 16458. A bill for the relief of Khatchadour B. Palandjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we, as a nation, have become more aware of the importance of physical fitness. Industry recognizes its importance by spending over $1 billion for employee recreation programs.

In 1956, President Dwight Eisenhower recognized the need of a coordinated plan for the improvement of the physical fitness of our youth and by Executive order created a Council of Youth Fitness. In 1961, President John Kennedy reorganized this Council so that its interest became that of the adult as well as that of youth. Mr. Stan Musial is the present head of the Council.

Now known as the President's Council on Physical Fitness, it has had the full support of President Johnson who has said:

> The fitness of our Nation for the tasks of our times can never be greater than the general physical fitness of our citizens.

In the past, we have concentrated very heavily on the major sports of football and baseball. These are great sports but not all of our citizens can participate in them. I would call your attention to a less publicized athletic activity—the game of squash.

A short time ago, I noted a very interesting squash tournament held at the University Club here in Washington. No one could question that this sport in which people of all ages could play, would add to our physical fitness.

The tournament was organized by Peter Gaynor, Bill Wilson, and the club professional, Henry Goodheart.

I am certain that those young and mature people who watched Charles Ufford, of New York, defeat Deihl Mateer, of Philadelphia, in the finals or watched Blair Sadler defeat Bill Morris in the consolation match, would be encouraged to become players and thus improve their physical fitness.

I mention this as an encouragement to all people to search out some of our less publicized sports so that they might find one that meets their needs. In this way, we can truly be a part of our national physical fitness program.

## Disclosures of the Week—Part X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the usual number of unpleasant news items and other shocking bits of information came to my attention this past week. Among these were the following:

CASE I

Herb Robinson, associate editor of the Seattle Times, revealed a new item of Federal largesse. In his column recently he told of Project Public Information financed by Federal funds involving a mobile study which will travel throughout Alaska and the Pacific Northwest. It will produce documentary films, television news clips and articles to build the image of public schools. Critics call this unit a propaganda wagon. The cost to the taxpayers—$153,000.

CASE II

The Wall Street Journal of July 15, 1966, in a report by Bryce Porter says things are worse than ever in Harlem and getting worse all the time. The poverty program, he says, does far more harm than good.

CASE III

It was disclosed last week that the Department of Justice dismissed an antitrust suit against the Anheuser-Busch Co. of St. Louis less than 30 days after the firm's top executives contributed a total of $10,000 to the President's Club.

CASE IV

Congressman GERALD R. FORD, speaking of the urgent need for reform in the field of political finances said all who are interested in the integrity of the election process will be grieved that Congress is dragging its feet in considering bills to effect long-overdue reforms.

CASE V

Prof. F. Benham of the London School of Economics made a study of underdeveloped nations. He decided that to raise the more than 1 billion inhabitants of backward nations to a modest income level of $200 each per year would require $83 billions of foreign aid a year. This estimate was made in 1961. Writer Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune says the cost today would be $100 billion per year.

CASE VI

According to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States strikes idled more workers during the first quarter of this year than in any similar period over the last 11 years.

CASE VII

The U.S. chamber also says it has analyzed 12 Great Society programs and found spending is up 258 percent since 1964 for these programs.

CASE VIII

Lyn Shepard, staff correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor gave the latest political whodunit. He noted that on July 12, 1966, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY flew to St. Louis in a plane furnished by Anheuser-Busch. President Busch arranged this so the Vice President could throw out the first ball at any all-star baseball game.

He later addressed a luncheon of major party contributors. The head of the Justice Department's antitrust division and son accompanied Mr. HUMPHREY and flew back with him to Washington.

CASE IX

Columnists Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott have pointed out that Sargent Shriver has $2.5 billion to spend in the poverty war.

The columnists' report says it goes without saying that the Democrats will

take the utmost advantage of these funds to improve their uncertain election prospects.

## Address of the Honorable Durward G. Hall, Before the Missouri Rural Letter Carriers Association, Springfield, Mo., July 8, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention and to the attention of the Members of this body, an excellent address by one of our colleagues, the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri. Congressman HALL, who has had a longstanding interest in the welfare of our Government workers, addressed the Missouri Rural Letter Carriers Association in Springfield, Mo. I join with our colleague when he says he is proud of the tremendous job our rural letter carriers are doing.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DURWARD HALL, MISSOURI RURAL LETTER CARRIERS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, JULY 8, 1966, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

It's indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity to address the Missouri Convention of the Missouri Rural Letter Carriers Association, to welcome you not only to Springfield, but also to this 7th Congressional District. I hope you'll come often and stay late to enjoy our Ozarks hospitality. I think particular congratulations are in order to your State president, Harry Thompson, who has the responsibility of presiding over this convention.

We here in the 7th district are especially proud that one of our own, Floyd Huffman, from Flemington, has had the distinction and the honor of serving as national president of your great association.

I had an opportunity to read the June issue of the Missouri Rural Carrier and to read of Floyd's interest throughout his career in the affairs of your State and national organization. The story I read said that this was a proper place to show your appreciation for the long hours, many sleepless nights and thousands of miles traveled by Floyd on your behalf. I can personally vouch for the fact that many of those hours have been spent in my Washington office keeping me informed of the legislative matters in which you have an interest, briefing me on some of your problems, as well as the problems of the Nation in seeing that the mail gets delivered, and always doing these things in his courteous and understanding way that's so typical of Floyd's personality. I don't think your organization could have had a better man to represent you on Capitol Hill.

While Floyd has been briefing me so much, I welcome this opportunity to brief you and to advise you of the status of some of the legislation in which you have an interest. I checked with my office in Washington today, and with the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee just to be sure we were up to date.

I know you're all interested in the pay bill, and let me say here that I think a word of appreciation is due to you and the letter carriers in general, because in your efforts to reach comparability you demonstrated responsibility, and I might even add statesmanship, in recognizing the tremendous demands on the Federal Budget resulting from our involvement in Vietnam, and in tailoring your requests to meet this situation. I'm not a strong exponent of compulsory guidelines, but this certainly is a period when restraint is needed by all segments of the economy, and you have measured up to that need perhaps better than most groups and organizations.

I'm sure you're wondering, along with me, why the pay bill isn't over on the President's desk awaiting his signature.

I'm sure I don't have to tell this knowledgeable group that it takes both the House and the Senate to enact legislation. We've done our part, about 2 months ago, in fact, but there seems to be some kind of delay going on in that other body. As you know, the rules of comity prevail between the House and Senate, and we never say harsh words about the other. I don't know who comes out ahead under this arrangement, but I think maybe they do.

Now, one of the reasons, I understand, for the delay in the other body was a fear that the Bureau of the Budget didn't like the July 1st effective date we inserted in the House. That's the beginning of the fiscal year and we thought it both prudent and wise to do so.

I can report to you that effective date remains July 1 and there was no change made by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I'm advised that the pay bill will be the first order of business when the Senate reconvenes next week.

One of the other provisions of the bill which I'm confident will not be changed permits retirement at age 55 after 30 years of service or age 60 after 20 years service.

Also, for the first time there is a mandatory annual uniform allowance of $125 a year, and an increase in automobile allowances on special delivery calls.

The Rural Letter Carriers Association has always been a working organization, working always to provide a better service to those in the community in which you live. Yours is an honorable career, and I especially concur in the purpose of your organization as published in the National Rural Carrier magazine which comes to my office regularly. . . . . "To improve the methods used by rural mail carriers, to cooperate with the Post Office Department and the public for the good of the service, to promote a fraternal spirit among members of the association, and to benefit their conditions of labor."

You, the rural carriers, have an excellent opportunity to lead the way for all postal employees in the execution of an outstanding customer service program. You are the principal contact and in many instances, the only contact for over one fifth of the country's population with the postal service.

No other position in the postal service can be looked upon in quite the same perspective as a rural carrier. You are both clerk and distributor, carrier and collector, educator and emissary, and I'm sure, in many instances, confidant and postal chaplain to your customers!

I'm sure there isn't a rural carrier who hasn't been unduly detained while a customer expands on his pet theory for the postal service or offers his solution to all the problems facing the postal service.

I know this often presents a problem in trying to maintain your daily schedules and still take the time to discuss a particular problem with one of your constituents—if I can use that term—as it applies not to me but to you.

Yet, I'm sure you know that suggestions and inquiries from patrons are often a forerunner of customer complaints, and occasionally I, too, hear from those who think they know what's needed to speed up the delivery of mail. I'm happy to say that I don't get many such complaints from your routes here in the 7th District.

I think the postal service has found that some of the best suggestions for improved service comes from the carriers themselves, for you're at the grass roots location where the problems are noticed.

We in the legislative branch are also vitally interested in ways to improve service and sometimes we can see that a good suggestion is brought to the attention of those who have the direct responsibility of managing the Post Office Department. I may not always be able to see that your suggestions are followed, but I usually can insure that it will be given serious consideration.

I want to stress again that I'm proud of the work you are doing and the calibre of the people that are here today, good fine patriotic Americans, the salt of the earth, people with a dedication to their country, to their job, and to their fellow man who are so vitally dependent on the service you render.

I find in reviewing the annual report of the Postmaster General for last year that there are in Missouri 1,346 rural routes involving a total mileage of almost 81,000 miles. That's a lot of driving, a lot of walking, and a lot of responsibility, and I know there are a lot of good men here today who will see that it's carried out to the best of their ability. I know you will continue to work together with the Congress for a progressively improved postal service to which our 190 million fellow Americans are justly entitled, and I want you to know that in the future, as in the past, I am always anxious to work with you on every matter in which we have a mutual concern. Thanks for the opportunity to be with you this afternoon, and to show my personal appreciation for the good works you are doing.

## Establishment of Cape Cod National Seashore and Dedication of Salt Pond Visitor Center, May 30, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Cape Cod National Seashore was formally established during impressive Memorial Day exercises on May 30 last at the Salt Pond Visitor Center in Eastham, Mass.

The Cape Cod National Seashore was created to extend to mankind forever the opportunity to enjoy, within this stimulating and inspiring seaside environment, the outstanding scenic, scientific, and historical values found there. Our late beloved President John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who sponsored the authorization bill in 1959 when he was the junior Senator from Massachusetts, signed the Cape Cod National Seashore bill into law on August 7, 1961.

It was with a great deal of pride that I participated in the dedication ceremonies, because I had cosponsored the first comprehensive bills, along with Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, to authorize the Cape Cod National Seashore Park, on May 12, 1958. My bill that year was H.R. 12449. Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of

Massachusetts, had earlier introduced a Cape Cod Park authorization bill. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and the then Senator John F. Kennedy cosponsored the bills in the Senate, and Congressman HASTINGS KEITH, who represents the Cape Cod area, and Congressman SILVIO CONTE joined with us in sponsoring similar bills after they took their seats in Congress in January 1959.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission I include with my remarks in the RECORD, the program for the establishment ceremony and dedication of Salt Pond Visitor Center, Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass., and the speeches by Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall and Director George B. Hartzog of the National Park Service.

ESTABLISHMENT CEREMONY AND DEDICATION OF SALT POND VISITOR CENTER, 2 P.M., MONDAY, MAY 30, 1966

Lemuel A. Garrison, Regional Director, Northeast Region, National Park Service, Presiding.

Musical Selections: Nauset Regional High School Band and Frank James, Director.

Advance of the Colours: United States Coast Guard, Race Point Rescue Life Boat Station, Chatham Coast Guard Station.

Invocation: Rev. William J. McMahon, Pastor, St. Joan of Arc Parish, Orleans.

Welcome to Cape Cod National Seashore: Stanley C. Joseph, Superintendent.

Remarks: Luther Smith, Chairman of Board of Selectmen, Eastham, representing Towns of the Lower Cape.

Introduction of Guests: George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director, National Park Service.

Presentation of Deeds: Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Acceptance of Deeds and Dedication of Visitor Center: George B. Hartzog, Jr.

Remarks: Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

Remarks: Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

Remarks: Representative HASTINGS KEITH.

Musical Selection: Nauset Regional High School Band.

Establishment Address: Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior.

Benediction: Rev. Richard E. Waters, Pastor, Eastham Methodist Church.

Retirement of the Colours: United States Coast Guard.

---

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT DEDICATION OF CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE, CAPE COD, MASS., MAY 30, 1966

Today we dedicate anew one of the lasting landmarks of America.

It was landfall for the Pilgrams, reconnoitering their new homeland. Sea Captains have blessed the guiding glow of Cape Cod's beacons, and intrepid generations of fishermen and whalers have blessed the beckoning anchorage of this beautiful Cape.

These brave people have already given Cape Cod a special place in the American heart. We rededicate it today as another landmark—a gift of untrammeled nature for all the generations of the future.

Each generation has its own rendezvous with the land: the questing seafarers who looked for the headlands of other shores; the settlers who plowed the land and made it prosper.

Now, at a later hour, we turn to this landscape to support and renew other values. We who have chopped and mined and built and machined our way to wealth and power now grope out from our cities, puzzled, yearning, almost wistful, for something we cannot forget. Beyond the noise and the asphalt and ugly architecture we yearn for the long waves and the beach grass; we see white wings on morning air, and, in the afternoon, the shadows cast by the doorways of history.

Cape Cod National Seashore is, in a very real sense, a pioneer park. It marked a turning point in conservation—a reversal of the shortsighted policy of refusing to pay from the public purse to acquire scenic masterpieces for all of the people.

President Johnson described our predicament recently in these words: "The increasing tempo of urbanization is already depriving many Americans of the right to live in decent surroundings. More of our people are growing into cities and being cut off from nature. Cities themselves reach out into the countryside, destroying streams and trees and meadows as they go. A modern highway may wipe out the equivalent of a fifty acre park with every mile. And people move out from the city to get closer to nature only to find that nature has moved farther from them."

The original sponsors of the Cape Cod legislation had deep roots in this Commonwealth and an abiding love for this Cape. Two of them are with us today: LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and HASTINGS KEITH, who represents Cape Code in the House. Americans down the generation will thank them for their foresight.

The third cosponsor is gone—but his spirit burns brightly here. If John F. Kennedy had a special attachment to this continent, it was to its shoreline and marginal sea. He agreed, in his private thoughts, with another New Englander, Henry Thoreau, that "the seashore . . . is a most advantageous point from which to contemplate the world." It was part of his conservation philosophy that a father should be able to show his children—all children—the wonders of nature he himself had known. The marshes, the seascapes, the sea itself should remain inviolate for all time for all men.

"We have been slow as a Nation," he told Congress in introducing the original Cape Cod bill, "to adapt our public policies so as to improve the quality and breadth of recreational experience for the Nation. Yet we are aware of the increasingly narrow margin which still exists—especially in the East—for National Park development . . . we know of no alternative . . . which could provide the citizens of the Commonwealth and the national public with such a rich and varied blend of scenic, recreational and scientific values."

With the passage of the Cape Cod National Seashore bill five years ago, the Nation resolved to open its eyes to need for safeguarding and restoring the beauty of our land. Here began a new era of conservation in America. Since President Kennedy proudly signed this pioneering legislation into law, the Congress has added a record-setting thirty-four new national parks, seashores, and other historic and recreational areas to our National Park System.

The Nation's battle to save the common estate is far from won. In October 1963, President Kennedy warned that, "Our economic standard of living rises but our environmental standard of living—our access to nature and respect for it—deteriorates . . . we must expand the concept of conservation to meet the imperious problems of the new age. We must develop new instruments of foresight and protection and nurture in order to make sure that the national estate we pass on to our multiplying descendants is green and flourishing."

This is our only world; if we care, our duty is to love it.

We commemorate here today a love affair with land. And this piece of land—this masterwork of nature—is now dedicated to the people who shall henceforth call themselves citizens of these United States.

REMARKS OF DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE GEORGE B. HARTZOG, AT DEDICATION OF CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE, CAPE COD, MASS., MAY 30, 1966

Receiving these deeds on behalf of the people of the United States to be administered by the Department of the Interior is a great honor and privilege.

Too few people may appreciate the significance of the transfer of ownership of the Province Lands Reservation. This Reservation is one of the oldest tracts of land in America under continuous public ownership. These dunes and marshes at the tip of Cape Cod were set aside as early as 1670—nearly 300 years ago—by the "Plimoth Colony" in pioneering conservation action. In transferring title of these lands, you, in effect, challenge us to carry out the far-sighted action of those hardy pioneers.

One of the missions of the National Park Service is to provide for the enjoyment of the park areas. It is our belief that enjoyment of these great resources is almost inevitable and that our true mission, in this regard, is to stimulate the visitor to open his eyes to this enjoyment in the fullest sense. Our programs, then, are ones that help the visitor interpret what he sees for himself.

One of the most successful tools if we can call them that, has been visitor centers, like this beautiful building, and the exhibits and orientation programs presented in it. Our National Park people are here to help.

It is to this purpose—assisting you in getting the most meaningful experience out of your visit to Cape Cod—that we dedicate the Salt Pond Visitor Center.

---

## Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, more than 14,100 of my constituents participated in the public opinion poll which I recently conducted. I have conducted such polls by mail during each of my five terms in Congress. The 1966 questionnaire was sent to all of the 146,500 mailing addresses in the 10th Congressional District.

Four of the seven questions asked in the 1966 poll concerned the war in Vietnam. Sixty-eight percent of those who participated in the poll answered "No" to the question, "Should we withdraw all of our Armed Forces, regardless of negotiations?" while 17.8 percent replied in the affirmative, and 14.2 percent were undecided.

To the question, "Should we continue to fight a limited war, not so much with the idea of winning, but to convince the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese that they cannot win?" 16.8 percent answered "Yes," 61.9 percent "No," and 21.3 percent were undecided.

The third question on Vietnam was, "Should we cease all air attacks and call for peace negotiations, the participants to include the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, the Vietcong, and the National Liberation Front?" The responses were: 20.7 percent "Yes," 60.7

percent "No," and 18.6 percent undecided.

To the final question in the Vietnam category, "Should we accelerate bombing, mine the Haiphong harbor, and cut enemy supply lines with the designed purpose of achieving victory?" 66.6 percent said "Yes," 20 percent "No," and 13.3 percent were undecided.

The three remaining questions concerned inflation. Obvious dissatisfaction with huge domestic spending programs was evident, as 72.3 percent voted "Yes" when asked, "Should we curtail spending on domestic programs in order to help meet the costs of defense and war?" "No" replies were given by 19.1 percent and 8.6 percent were undecided.

My constituents, for the most part, do not want their taxes increased, as only 8.2 percent of them gave an affirmative response to the question, "Should we increase taxes so that we can, at the same time, fight the war in Vietnam and carry out the domestic programs of the Great Society?" "No" replies were given by 75.4 percent with 16.4 percent undecided.

The final question in the poll, "Should we impose governmental controls on both prices and wages in order to avoid further inflation?" drew 31.1 percent affirmative votes, 55.2 percent negative, and 13.7 percent undecided.

A complete tabulation of the results of my poll follows:

| | Yes | | No | | Undecided | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| VIETNAM | | | | | | |
| Should we withdraw all of our armed forces, regardless of negotiations? | 2,519 | 17.8 | 9,620 | 68.0 | 2,007 | 14.2 |
| Should we continue to fight a limited war, not so much with the idea of winning, but to convince the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese that they cannot win? | 2,372 | 16.8 | 8,763 | 61.9 | 3,011 | 21.3 |
| Should we cease all air attacks and call for peace negotiations, the participants to include the United States, South Vietnam, North Vietnam, the Vietcong, and the National Liberation Front? | 2,935 | 20.7 | 8,582 | 60.7 | 2,629 | 18.6 |
| Should we accelerate bombing, mine the Haiphong harbor, and cut enemy supply lines with the designed purpose of achieving victory? | 9,427 | 66.6 | 2,831 | 20.0 | 1,888 | 13.3 |
| INFLATION | | | | | | |
| Should we curtail spending on domestic programs in order to help meet the costs of defense and war? | 10,226 | 72.3 | 2,704 | 19.1 | 1,216 | 8.6 |
| Should we increase taxes so that we can, at the same time, fight the war in Vietnam and carry out the domestic programs of the Great Society? | 1,160 | 8.2 | 10,667 | 75.4 | 2,319 | 16.4 |
| Should we impose governmental controls on both prices and wages in order to avoid further inflation? | 4,402 | 31.1 | 7,804 | 55.2 | 1,940 | 13.7 |

## Congressman John E. Fogarty, Brain Research Foundation, Drake Hotel, Chicago, Ill., June 2, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, BRAIN RESEARCH FOUNDATION, DRAKE HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., JUNE 2, 1966

When I received Mr. Linck's invitation to speak to you this evening I was particularly pleased, for several reasons. For one, I hold voluntary health organizations such as yours in very high regard. Over a period of twenty-five years as a Member of Congress, I have shared in the tremendous excitement of the growing medical research movement, and have been in a particularly privileged position to observe the role and importance of voluntary health groups in backing up the Federal side of the program. The tireless efforts of your officers and volunteers, in serving on our advisory committees, testifying as citizens before Congress, promoting the whole national movement in a thousand ways, have had an immense effect in making the Federal medical research program both popular and successful. And from overshadowing your efforts, we have helped you too, as the growth statistics amply show. We are partners in the greatest battle in history—the battle for human health.

Another reason why I was pleased to come was because the occasion offers a chance to meet some of the nation's leaders in brain research, and to think with you for a few minutes about this especially fascinating and challenging part of medical research. The miracle of the brain and nervous system to me exceeds that of any other part of the body.

And the challenge is not so much understanding of the miracle itself, but the goals of brain research—solution of the problems of the neurological and sensory diseases. We are sometimes inclined to relegate neurological diseases to a minor position because of the importance of heart disease and cancer as public health problems. But when we group them together, we find that they are responsible for a major share of all deaths, disability, and suffering.

I would like to dwell this evening on that part of the nation's effort in brain research with which I am most familiar—the Federal program as administered through the National Institutes of Health, and more specifically, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

As many of you know, this Institute has been in existence since 1950; it has grown with the other Institutes at NIH; it has an appropriation in the range of $100 million annually, most of which is devoted to grants and awards for the support of neurological research and research training in universities, hospitals and other institutions throughout the country, with most of the remainder supporting intramural research, both basic and clinical, in Bethesda, Maryland. The Institute has had a strong impact upon the field generally, both in increasing the amount of research going on, and in encouraging people to enter the field, but the needs are still many times what can be accommodated. As a simple example, there are still less than 2,000 neurologists in the United States, with estimates of more than 10,000,000 people suffering from neurological illnesses. There are large areas of the country which remain hundreds of miles from a hospital large enough to have a neurology department. Institute training programs have been steadily increased, they could be doubled and still not meet the need.

There are a number of areas in the NINDB program upon which Dr. Shannon, Dr. Masland, and their staffs are attempting to focus interest and in which activity is being stimulated.

BRAIN INJURY

An important neurological concern that is demanding increasing national attention is the problem of accidental brain injury. We have data showing that accidents are the major cause of death during the productive years from birth to the age of 44. Over 100,000 people are killed annually in accidents. Approximately 70 percent of these deaths are from head injury, according to our best estimates. Hospital records show that approximately 1.3 million people suffer at least temporary disability from head injury, and that 130,000 a year have serious permanent disabilities.

The conflict in Viet Nam and the alarming rise in brain injuries from auto accidents point up the significance of this problem. NINDB is approaching the problem in a number of ways. One of these is the support of research projects such as that of Dr. Joseph P. Evans here at the University of Chicago. Dr. Evans and his group, I understand, are conducting a laboratory and clinical study of head injury which includes an exploration with the electron microscope of the many changes which take place in brain tissue as a result of the internal swelling caused by a blow on the head. They are also evaluating current forms of treatment, and attempting to develop better methods of handling these cases.

Some of you were probably aware of the NIH-supported head injury conference held here in February. This produced a highly valuable set of recommendations outlining needs in the epidemiology, diagnosis, and therapy of head injury, and calling for the creation of clinical research centers patterned after those already in existence in many other problem areas. The conferees were some of the most knowledgeable people in the world in this field, and proceedings, which we had incorporated into the NIH appropriation hearings in March, should be of substantial help in stimulating wider interest.

Our concern here is not limited to the early stages of the head injury reaction, or to adults, but extends also to the effects which are detected later, and to the brain-injured child. Many individuals whose initial injury seems trivial have a subsequent relapse due to swelling of the brain. And in about 10 percent of the cases of mental retardation, the disorder results from some post-natal event. To better coordinate the attack on the problems of the brain-injured child, NINDB has organized three task forces.

One is devoting itself to definition of the problem, which ranges from cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and gross intellectual defect to what is classified as minimal brain dysfunction. A second is studying the medical and educational services needed for these children. This task force is sponsored by the Neurological and Sensory Disease Service Program of the Public Health Service, the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, and the U.S. Office of Education. Task Force III will outline the scientific research necessary for solution of the problem. In addition to the task forces, a collaborative research project is in process of being organized, with the aim of evaluating the effectiveness of various forms of treatment. These efforts at coordination and providing guidance while not as glamorous are, of course, just as essential as the actual scientific work in the laboratories and the training support in the schools.

STROKE

Another major neurological disease area, in which the Federal Government, through NIH, has begun a big "push," is stroke. Coupled with the overall research training program of NINDB, including neurology, neuropathology, neurosurgery, and the many other disciplines needed, there has been a program of research grant support in cerebrovascular disease for many years. This, however, has been pathetically inadequate, considering the extent of the problem, and the program has been accelerated, reflecting the great interest and concern during the last several years of both the Congress and the President.

One of the major developments has been establishments, through grants from NINDB, of a group of broad-based, multidisciplinary research centers where patients can be studied by experts, and various aspects of this complex disease investigated. Three of these stroke research centers, located at Minneapolis, New York City, and Detroit, were begun in 1961; five more, in Miami, Durham, Baltimore, Boston, and Philadelphia, were funded in 1965; and grants for two others, in Rochester, Minnesota, and Winston Salem, were just awarded in March of this year, bringing the total to ten. Each of these centers has a major area of emphasis within the stroke field: examples are mechanisms of blood clotting; dynamics of blood flow; the pathology and chemistry of the cerebral vessels; speech difficulties following a stroke; epidemiology; and general problems of diagnosis and treatment. As you can see, these centers are presently concentrated in the East, for the reason that resources and interest have been rather heavily concentrated there. I understand, however, that a number of grant applications from scientists in midwestern and western population centers have been received, and we are hoping that this distribution can be improved within the next year or two, so that we will have a base for training of research and service personnel throughout the country, as well as a vital research resource. These centers can become an important component of the evolving regional medical programs for heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

In addition to the expansion of the stroke centers program, several new types of training support, both direct and institutional, are now available from NIH, for clinical study. Clinical training grants and clinical traineeships are now providing short term training opportunities to medical practitioners who want to learn from experts the latest developments in stroke diagnosis, prevention, and treatment. Since most physicians cannot leave their practices for very long, some of these traineeships may be awarded for periods as short as six weeks. As soon as the training courses can be set up in the hospitals, these traineeships will begin to move us toward our goal of bringing the latest advances in care to the remotest villages and hamlets of America.

At the apex of the Federal stroke research program is a Joint Council Subcommittee on Cerebrovascular Disease, consisting of members of the national advisory councils of the Heart and Neurology Institutes who have special skills and experience in this field. This subcommittee has to its credit some remarkable achievements, the chief one being coordination of the whole national program through recommendations to the Councils.

EPILEPSY

Epilepsy is another of the major areas of our Federal neurological research program. There are estimated to be between one and two million victims of epilepsy in the United States. There is no known cure and treatment is largely through anticonvulsant drugs. More than 50 percent can now have their seizures controlled through anticonvulsants but for many the answer has not been found. A large part of the program relates to fundamental research on the basic mechanisms. Two epilepsy research centers, similar to those I mentioned in the stroke field, are being supported through grants. In one, at the University of Washington, neurophysiologists, neuroanatomists, neuropharmacologists, and behavioral scientists are pooling their talents in long-term basic studies; in the other, at the University of Wisconsin, new drugs are being evaluated, using electroencephalography, and other approaches. Part of the UCLA Brain Research Institute program is devoted to mechanisms of epilepsy, and at the Neuropharmacology Research Center at the University of Utah, anticonvulsant mechanisms are under scrutiny. In addition to these, there are some 80 other NINDB-supported research projects, as well as an intramural program in Bethesda including patient studies and studies of artificially induced epilepsy in animals.

For purposes of improving national coordination and encouragement of the epilepsy research effort, a Public Health Service Advisory Committee on the Epilepsies was just officially announced by Surgeon General Stewart about three weeks ago. This committee is being chaired by Dr. H. Houston Merritt, dean of Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons, and also codiscoverer of the well-known anticonvulsant drug, Dilantin. Other members are persons of national prominence in the field, and I know they will make an important contribution.

PARKINSON'S DISEASE AND MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Another area in which the NINDB is attempting to focus greater research interest is that of the so-called degenerative diseases of the nervous system, including Parkinson's disease, and multiple sclerosis. There are again afflictions for which medical science has little to offer. In Parkinsonism, drugs, physical therapy, and surgery offer three ways of possibly alleviating some of the crippling symptoms. Drugs can provide 25 to 50 percent control of the rigidity, tremor, and lethargy. Intensive physical therapy can bring patients from 50 percent to 75 percent of normal, under ideal conditions. Surgery, although widely publicized, is a more limited possibility, because only 10 to 12 percent of all victims are suitable subjects, and because, usually, patients over 65 are not helped by surgery. The picture for these people is discouraging, but there are some hopeful developments. One, of course, is the growth of the program, both Federal and voluntary.

The NIH research grant and intramural programs range broadly from clinical studies with patients to basic investigations of the physiology, biochemistry, and metabolism of brain centers and muscle groups involved in motor control. The Neurology Institute's biggest programming effort of the past several years has been establishment and support of a Parkinson's Disease Information and Research Center at Columbia University. Here scientists are making electron microscopic studies of brain tissue from Parkinson patients taken at autopsy, and analyses of the neurohormones, enzymes, and other substances making up the metabolic chain which, when properly functioning, preserve balance in the nervous system, and which appears to be deficient in some cases, in the brain tissues of Parkinson patients.

In multiple sclerosis, there is no effective treatment that can be offered the patient, in spite of an extensive research program for years. This disease produces disintegration of the myelin sheathing nerves in the brain and spinal cord. It afflicts about a quarter of a million Americans between 20 and 40. A good portion of the Federal program in MS is devoted to exploration of the theory that the cause may be a slow virus—one which may be carried for as many as 10 years before the symptoms develop. A particularly interesting research study on this is underway in Israel. It has been known for a long time that the incidence of MS is much greater in colder climates than in warm climates. In fact, the disease is almost non-existent in the tropics. Before the influx of many peoples to Israel, the disease was almost nonexistent there. Now, however, the incidence has risen considerably and the cases are found among those peoples migrating from Europe rather than the Afro-Asian countries. Additionally, it has been found that many do not show symptoms until a number of years after they have come to Israel.

Pursuing the viral theory, NINDB is supporting substantial work at its Patuxent Research Center at Laurel, Maryland, on slow animal viruses causing neurological diseases resembling multiple sclerosis. But this is just one approach; to mention a few others, NIH and grantee scientists are studying autoimmunity, the abnormal process causing the body to reject, or develop antibodies to certain of its own tissues; they are studying the chemistry of demyelination, and, in collaboration with the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, they are treating nerve cell cultures with specimens taken from the blood and and spinal fluid of MS patients to see if these patients carry myelin-destroying substances in their own bodies.

What may be a very important development in slow virus research just took place this year when scientists succeeded in transmitting kuru, a rare neurologic disorder somewhat related to Parkinson's disease and MS, from man to chimpanzees. This opens up tremendous possibilities for the study of processes that could not be observed in human patients.

CONCLUSION

This is far from being a comprehensive summary of the broad Federal program of research in the diseases of the brain and nervous system. I am simply attempting to highlight some of the areas in which progress is being made. We, of course, think in terms of larger sums and programs than is possible for even the largest of the voluntary health organizations, but I would like to stress again that this doesn't make the job you people are doing any less important. It is probably more important, because of the immensely crucial public acceptance you help to secure for the whole movement. Voluntary agencies, such as the Brain Research Foundation and the Federal Government are each concentrating their resources where they will do the most good in a complementary and highly effective effort. There are still oceans to span—and unexplored continents. Most of the neurological diseases are still unconquered. But we have a magnifi-

cent movement underway in this country, and all of us here tonight are part of it. Let us hope that it continues to grow.

## The Ney Memorial Awards Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the House information concerning the Ney Memorial Award's competition which I learned about as a result of a visit from my good friend and constituent, Mr. John C. Smith, formerly an Ohio State senator and presently a member of the Board of County Commissioners of Montgomery County, Ohio.

Mr. Smith and Maj. Walter Pienkowski, retired, another constituent—formerly food service officer for the U.S. Air Force—were the two men most responsible for the Food Service Executive's Association's participation in the Ney Memorial Award, Major Pienkowski having been the gentlemen who created a similar program in the Air Force known as the Hennessy Trophy Award.

Mr. Smith, recently returned from an inspection tour for the Navy, participated in a team evaluation of the nine finalists in this year's competition.

The Secretary of the Navy in 1958 announced the establishment of an all-Navy food service competition to give merited recognition for outstanding accomplishment in the preparation, service and management of food within the Navy.

The Navy has long considered good food as a most important factor in sustaining the high morale of its men on land, at sea and in the air. The establishment of a distinguished award naming the Navy's best feeders to a "Hall of Food Fame," known as the Ney Memorial awards program, has stimulated even greater interest and improvement in the already outstanding food service operation in Navy general messes.

The Ney Memorial awards program commemorates the late Capt. Edward Francis Ney, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, who served with distinction as head of the Subsistence Division of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts during World War II. The Ney program is administered for the Secretary of the Navy by the Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command, an office currently held by Rear Adm. H. J. Goldberg, SC, USN.

From its inception the Ney Memorial awards program has been sponsored by the Food Service Executives Association, since 1901 a national nonprofit organization of food procurement, service, and management executives. Representatives of the winning Navy general messes ashore and afloat will be guests of the association for the special plaque presentation ceremonies at the FSEA 65th National Convention from August 15 to 17 at St. Louis, Mo.

Although our Navy is advancing into the age of missiles and nuclear power, the men and women who man our shore stations, ships, and planes are the key elements in its power. With the exception of leadership, probably no one thing is more important to the health and morale of these men and women than good food service.

When we consider these men and women who man the ramparts during peace and war, we too often consider their morale and well-being in relation to pay and promotion, but another very direct and abiding concern of every military person is his food.

I would like to commend the members of the Food Service Executive Association for all they have done in these past 9 years by presenting these awards to the winning naval facilities for outstanding food service and for gaining the recognition of this all-important factor in the health and morale of our fighting men.

The Ney Memorial awards competition has economic benefits as well. It has dramatically reduced the per man ration cost per day. In every instance, without exception, the finalists in this annual program have reduced their food costs to the Government. The program has been a deciding factor in the creation of more cheerful dining areas for our seamen. It has increased the morale of our seamen and instilled pride in our food service commissarymen. The Pacific Fleet has even included participation in the Ney Memorial award competition a must for inclusion in the "E" for excellence award. It has even encouraged one of this year's winners—U.S.S. *Semmes*—to print a cookbook of the ship's favorite receipes to send home to the ship's personnel, parents, and dependents. This cookbook has even been requested by commercial as well as private interests outside the Navy.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I was glad to know about this competition and am proud of the parents and dependents of our Navy personnel. I am reassured to find that our men are the best fed and I appreciate John Smith's interest in taking his time to make this tour and I commend him and all the finalists in this year's competition.

The winners are:

LARGE MESS AFLOAT

1. U.S.S. *Gridley* (DLG–21) (winner), Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Force, Pacific.
2. U.S.S. *H. W. Gilmore* (AS–16) (first runner-up), Commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic.
3. U.S.S. *Proteus* (AS–19) (second runner-up), Commander, Submarine Force, Pacific.

SMALL MESS AFLOAT

1. U.S.S. *Semmes* (DDG–18) (winner), Commander, Cruiser Destroyer Force, Atlantic.
2. U.S.S. *Aggressive* (MSO–422) (first runner-up), Commander, Mine Force, Atlantic.
3. U.S.S. *Skagit* (AKA–105) (second runner-up), Commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific.

ASHORE MESS

1. NAS, Miramar, Calif. (winner), Commandant, 11th Naval District.
2. NAVCOMMSTA, Sam Miguel, Philippines (first runner-up), Commander, Naval Forces, Philippines.
3. NAVSUPPACT, Naples, Italy (second runner-up), Commander, Naval Forces, Europe.

## American Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the Members of the House an important address by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], on the subject of American seapower. As ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] is an expert in this field whose analysis and warning should be heeded in the agencies of our Government and wherever men and women are concerned about the security of the United States. The address follows:

AMERICAN SEAPOWER—WHERE ARE WE GOING?

The great 17th century Dutch statesman, Jan De Witt, once admonished his fellow countrymen in the following fashion, and I quote:

"Never in time of peace . . . will they take resolution strong enough . . . beforehand . . . unless danger stares them in the face . . . I have to do with people who, liberal to profusion where they ought to economize, are often sparing to avarice where they ought to spend." Well, today, three centuries later, the Johnson Administration is subject to the same reproach. It, too, is liberal to profusion where it ought to economize, yet sparing to the point of folly where it ought to spend.

The even greater irony, however, is that the lopsided priority of the current federal budget allocating our national resources is being accomplished at a time when danger is staring us in the face—the very real danger that, within the time frame of the mid-1970's and beyond, the United States will no longer be a major world sea power, and that we will have abdicated our position of maritime superiority to none other than Soviet Russia. Thus, the title of my remarks—"American Sea Power—Where Are We Going?"—is simply a manifestation of my deep personal concern over the current shocking de-emphasis in our national maritime efforts.

The concept of sea power and its importance to the United States is neither new nor complex. At the turn of this century Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan gave the all time classic statement of the effect of command of the seas upon the destiny of nations. Since then his concepts have been fortified and expanded to a point where today, as at no time in our history, sea power is vital to both our national security and our economic well-being. The misfortune, however, is that nothing that is so readily understood or so blatantly apparent as the importance of sea power seems to concern our policy makers of today!

In its broadest sense, and conceived as an integral whole, sea power is the ability of

a nation to project into the world ocean in times of peace its national sovereignty; in times of war, its military might. It is composed of all those elements enabling a nation to use the oceans advantageously during either peace or war—its navy, its merchant shipping, its shipbuilding, its fishing industry, and its knowledge in the field of marine science and engineering (now usually referred to as oceanography). It is within this frame of reference that the United States, as a world leader with global security commitments, must face-up to the issue of the future sufficiency of its elements of sea power.

We face today and in the future what frequently has been referred to as the new four-ocean challenge. The naval conflict in World War I was a one-ocean war centered about the North Atlantic. World War II was a two-ocean war involving the North Atlantic with the adjacent area of the Mediterranean and the Pacific Ocean. These two ocean areas—the North Atlantic and Pacific—still remain of primary concern, but advances of modern science and the retrenchment of traditional allies have added two new ocean areas. The third is the Arctic Ocean to the north as a result of accessibility gained with nuclear submarines. The fourth is the Afro-Asian Ocean embracing the broad expanse of the South Atlantic and Indian Oceans, extending all the way from New Guinea across to the southern shore of Asia and Africa. The withdrawal of France from Indo-China left us as the only western nation capable of filling the power vacuum in the Asian theatre, a factor which has been further enhanced by Great Britain's announced intention to phase out its fleet air arm and hint of eventual military withdrawal to "West of Suez." Whether we have the requisite national leadership to marshal and direct the national will to meet this expanding challenge at sea, and the foresight to provide adequately for the tools of sea power—fast, modern ships and skilled seamen to man them—is a matter of utmost concern to me.

U.S. NAVY

Despite the absence of any major naval engagements, the U.S. Navy has been playing a significant role in the current conflict in Southeast Asia ever since the Tonkin Gulf incident of August 1964. At that time we had but three attack carriers deployed in the western Pacific, one of these being kept on the line in combat readiness at all times. But, as the need for tactical air strikes increased faster than our ability to construct air fields ashore, additional carriers were called for until today there are five carriers in the western Pacific with three of these on the line at all times, providing about half the air strikes against North Viet Nam, plus tactical support. In addition, U.S. Navy units, augmented by the U.S. Coast Guard, are maintaining patrols in the waters off Viet Nam.

The importance of this ability of the Navy to carry the war to an enemy located more than 8,000 miles from our shores cannot be too strongly emphasized to demonstrate the geographical and tactical mobility of sea power. However, in our praise for the Navy's admirable response to this demand, let us not lose sight of, and fail to capitalize upon, the shortcomings brought to light on this Southeast Asian proving ground. But, in doing so we must assume the risk of being accused by our esteemed Secretary of Defense of taking ". . . pleasure in flailing ourselves with imaginary weaknesses." Or, perhaps we, too, will be favored with the more succinct retort, "Baloney!"

Well, regardless of how Mr. McNamara wishes to slice the baloney on this occasion, the fact is that, great as our Navy was at the end of World War II, it has now reached a critical point in obsolescence both by age and technology. Two-thirds of our naval tonnage consists of vessels designed to meet combat conditions prevailing more than twenty years ago. Some of these ships have been converted and modernized, but there is a practical limit to the process of trying to make silk purses out of sows' ears—a factor which the Department of Defense "whiz kids" frequently seem to forget to crank into the computer. As I stated on the floor of the House of Representatives six years ago, and I quote: "A fleet of ships with limited capability—and such limitations increase with years of service—cannot do the job. * * * To expect World War II ships, even though modified and modernized, to continue to perform reliably after twenty years of strenuous service is absurd; . . . to demand naval fulfillment of present and prospective worldwide commitments with obsolete or obsolescent major vessels is to invite costly operational losses in peacetime and disastrous unreliability in time of combat." So acute has this problem become that the Secretary of the Navy has stated that for the next ten years the Navy's needs call for the building of a ship a week, if we are to keep our position on the seas from deteriorating. Yet, our current rate of construction of nuclear warships is such that professional naval officers point out it will take 200 years to replace our present fleet!

Military hardware, like all machinery, wears out, but this deterioration is further accelerated by the rapidity of technological developments. Obsolescence arising out of technological change is perhaps the gravest threat to the future responsive capabilities of the Navy, since the vessels we design and construct in the immediate future will be those which must serve us into the 21st century. Yet, despite this widely recognized fact, Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover pointed out to the House Committee on Appropriations in May of this year that the President's budget request for fiscal year 1967 for the construction of major surface warships represents only 3% of the total Navy budget and, that for the three prior fiscal years, the Defense Department has not requested the construction of a single major surface warship of either nuclear or conventional propulsion. As a matter of fact, it is only owing to efforts during the Eisenhower Administration that today we have in the fleet three nuclear-powered surface warships—the carrier *Enterprise*, the missile cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*. Moreover, the frigate *Truxtun*, which is the only nuclear-powered surface warship currently under construction, was changed from a conventional oil-fired vessel to nuclear power, not upon the initiative of the current Administration, but rather by Congressional action five years ago.

Notwithstanding the superior operational capabilities of our three nuclear-powered surface warships demonstrated during their recent deployment off Viet Nam in actual combat operations, and the fact that they can withstand the rigors of continuous high speed better than any warship of the past, the Johnson Administration continues to drag its feet in the field of nuclear naval construction. Of course, the Secretary of Defense has tacitly acknowledged the errors of his ways by now requesting a second nuclear aircraft carrier. But, oddly enough, in the same request the Secretary seeks to build conventionally-powered escorts which can only serve as a limiting factor upon the operational capabilities of nuclear carriers. This continuing frustration of the Navy's modernization efforts by the "dead hand" of cost effectiveness and the hesitancy in high places of the Executive to make the transition from oil to nuclear propulsion boldly and unequivocally simply begs the question —Will we meet the future challenge at sea with modern high speed nuclear-powered surface ships?

STRENUOUS DUTY IN VIET NAM

Further aggravating the problem of obsolescence of our naval vessels is the strenuous duty to which they are being subjected in Viet Nam. Units of the Seventh Fleet are being kept in a state of underway combat alert for periods as long as 30 to 40 days at a time, making it next to impossible to conduct routine maintenance. Moreover, it is reported to be commonplace for naval personnel to work 16 to 18 hours a day. The aircraft carrier, *Coral Sea*, for example, was deployed in the western Pacific for a period of 11 months, 8 of them in combat. Ships, like automobiles, if run hard enough and long enough cannot help but wear to the point where there will be a succession of failures until the only economical solution will be new construction. As Admiral A. G. Ward pointed out in November of last year when speaking of the Navy's role in Viet Nam, and I quote: "It would be difficult to continue indefinitely to maintain our current level of deployment without increases in force levels and in manpower."

Bear in mind also that this potential maintenance problem and deferral of routine overhauls is arising in the absence of any major naval conflict to cause battle damage. As Rear Admiral E. J. Fahy, Chief, Bureau of Ships, commented before the House Committee on Appropriations last March, and I quote: "We are really keeping our fingers crossed that we do not come up with something in the way of battle damage." And, on a related subject before our own Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the same time period, Vice Admiral Glynn R. Donaho, Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, stated, and I quote: "We are having difficulty in even keeping the ships up that we are operating in our own fleet." Again, in recent weeks I received a copy of a letter from a young sailor assigned to a fleet oiler operating off Viet Nam, in which he wrote, and I quote: ". . . this ship is run down and falling apart. Forty rivets were leaking when we came into port last week . . . . when we were out by Viet Nam our radar was out, both radios were out, the fathometer was out and one steering engine was out. . . . A guy dropped a hammer in the bilge the other day and it went through the bottom. It's rusted out."

I would surmise, also, that the limited demands of Viet Nam are taking their toll in adversely affecting the Navy's responsive capability in other areas of the world by "robbing Peter to pay Paul." For example, as a result of the decision to take the carrier *Lake Champlain* out of service and to transfer the carrier *Intrepid* to the western Pacific, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral David L. McDonald, testified this year that, and I quote: "Our ASW [antisubmarine warfare] capability as far as the hunter-killer force in the Atlantic is concerned is reduced by two-fifths." Thus, while you cannot get anyone to officially admit it because of Department of Defense "muzzling," I have good reason to be concerned over the general ability of the Atlantic Fleet to meet many demands of its contingency plans.

Viet Nam has served also to raise the question of whether our active fleet contains sufficient non-nuclear fire power to assure the continued success of the Navy in gunfire support missions. Fear has been expressed that since World War II the Navy's gunfire support capability has been allowed to deteriorate in the backwash of more glamorous weaponry to a point where we may have a possible "gun gap." For example, during fiscal year 1966 the Navy found it necessary to reactivate four missile ships for Viet Nam and to retain two heavy-gun cruisers which had been scheduled for deactivation in fiscal 1967–68. It has even been

recommended by Vice Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., that the battleship *Missouri* be reactivated at the earliest date to accommodate General Westmoreland's continuing demands for naval gunfire support. I strongly concur in this recommendation.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

We should be doubly concerned over the direction of American sea power if, as Admiral Mahan states in his "Elements of Sea Power," and I quote: ". . . sea power . . . includes not only the military strength afloat, . . . but also the peaceful commerce and shipping from which alone a military fleet naturally and healthfully springs, and on which it securely rests." The unfortunate truth of the matter is that the general condition of the American Merchant Marine today is deplorable and borders on being a national disgrace. It is obsolete both physically and economically since more than 80% of the ships were constructed during World War II and are destined to reach the end of their economic life within the next five years. Personally, I can think of no unhealthier fountainhead for our Navy to spring from, or no more insecure base on which it should rest! Yet, it is this same American Merchant Marine which has been called upon by the Johnson Administration to go to war in Viet Nam while the rest of our economy remains at peace.

This same American Merchant Marine responded to our country's defense needs in World War II, in Korea, and now in Viet Nam with many of the same ships constructed 20 years or more ago. The only noticeable difference between Viet Nam and the Korean conflict of 16 years ago is that airlift is transporting 2% of the military supplies to Viet Nam, reflecting a splendid increase of 1% over Korea! American-flag shipping today is again demonstrating that the art of war is the art of the logistically feasible. Over a sea route of more than 8,000 miles, all the bulk petroleum requirements of Viet Nam, 98% of all the military equipment and supplies, and two out of every three fighting men are being transported by ship.

Thus, as in the past, the American Merchant Marine is meeting the shipping needs of our Nation's security requirements, but it has been severely taxed to accomplish this end. Several American-flag subsidized ship operators whose ships were the first to be diverted to Viet Nam since they were the most modern, found that they were required to take the unprecedented action of chartering older, foreign-flag ships to maintain commercial services. Still other American-flag ships were chartered from non-subsidized operators. Also, we already have reactivated more than 100 World War II vintage ships from our National Defense Reserve Fleet at an average cost of about $500,000 per ship, and an additional 40 to 70 are scheduled to be reactivated before the end of this year. It is becoming increasingly apparent, therefore, that we are well on our way to the figure of 200 reactivated cargo ships, which I anticipated as early as August of last year in a statement made on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Almost 19 months ago, in his state of the Union message of January 1965, President Johnson promised to submit to the Congress a "new" maritime policy to revitalize our ailing merchant marine. Consistent with the lip-service being paid the American Merchant Marine by the present Administration, we are still waiting for that promise to be fulfilled. Meanwhile, as reported by the Maritime Editor of the Baltimore Sun, and I quote: "Since President Johnson first stated on the floor of Congress that a new maritime policy was forthcoming, the United States has slipped from first to sixth place in size of its active fleet; from sixth to fourteenth (or fifteenth) in ship construction, and literally to rock bottom in the number of new ships being built to fly the stars and stripes."

The Congress has before it today the President's budget request for new merchant ship construction, representing a cut of about one-third below the prior fiscal year's level of actual appropriation. If everything breaks right, this might give us a dozen ships for the Vessel Replacement Program, which even now is about 100 ships behind schedule. This is the replacement program which was started during the Republican Administration in 1958. Yet, under the stewardship of this Democratic Administration there has been an increasing and cumulative slippage in the program, and with almost diabolical precision the American Merchant Marine is today being slowly but surely strangled through budgetary privation.

By way of comparison, the budget request for new merchant ship construction for fiscal year 1967 is about one-half the amount requested by the Republican Administration in fiscal year 1959 at a time when the total federal budget was about 60% of the present level. Thus, there is more than ample merit to the recent characterization of the American Merchant Marine as a "Hero in War—Stepchild in Peace" since today it is truly treated as a stepchild in the Great Society!

U.S. SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP REPAIR

During this same period, American shipyards have been chided by Administration spokesmen for failing to modernize their facilities and become more competitive, yet it is this Administration that is depriving the industry of ship construction support funds necessary to enable our yards to modernize. Then we have these same agencies of the Executive using their own criticisms as a vehicle to advance the cause of building American ships in foreign shipyards.

The Department of Interior, for example, earlier this year was proposing the construction of stern-ramp trawlers in Polish shipyards, yet the same Administration spokesman has testified in the Senate one year earlier that he knows of no one in Government desiring to construct ships abroad. Similarly, only last week the press reported that the Department of Defense is proceeding to award a $17 million contract to a British shipyard for the construction of two survey ships. And, finally, we have had the former Maritime Administrator, the Honorable Nicholas Johnson, stating, and I quote: "We may very well end up sinking our [merchant] fleet in the name of preserving our shipyards." * * * unless we embrace the concept of constructing our ships abroad.

Now, every school child knows of our international balance of payments problem, and the fact that the President has had the Secretary of Commerce out beating the bushes for months urging private American businessmen to reduce their expenditures abroad. Yet, on the matter of ship construction we have not one but several agencies of the Executive actively promoting the blatantly contradictory concept of buying ships abroad. You reconcile the inconsistency of this approach. I am unable to, unless it is "Do as I say, not as I do!"

More importantly, however, this trend to foreign ship construction evidences an ignorance of the importance of American shipyards to American sea power. Shipyards are a defense industry and as much a part of a nation's sea power as its Navy and its merchant shipping, witness the current demands upon our ship construction and repair facilities because of Viet Nam and the present shortages of skilled shipyard personnel.

In the four year period from 1961 to 1965, twelve American shipyards were forced to close, and further threatening to deteriorate the industry by reducing the geographical diversification of our shipyard facilities, we have both the Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration proposing single shipyard contract awards. By far the one promising to have the greatest effect is that of the Department of Defense with its Fast Deployment Logistic ship project valued at $800 million to $1.5 billion to be financed entirely by the taxpayers. Yet, the investment of these same funds under the subsidy provisions of existing federal legislation could reduce the cost to the taxpayer by as much as one-half and yield from two to three times the number of ships now contemplated under this program.

U.S. FISHING INDUSTRY AND OCEANOGRAPHY

No examination of the direction of American sea power would be complete, of course, without consideration of our fishing industry and our efforts in the field of marine science and engineering. As the population of the world increases and our resources on land diminish, we must look to the oceans for food, fresh water, raw materials and power.

Unfortunately, the United States fishing industry is plagued by many of the same problems afflicting our merchant marine and is in a state of relative decline. When the higher labor costs of the American standard of living are combined with antiquated vessels and outmoded equipment, international competition becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. Because of this, roughly every other fish in an American frying pan is imported. Congressional concern over the state of the industry has resulted in some federal assistance to alleviate the situation, but much more remains to be done.

In the field of oceanography, the Federal Government finally stuck its big toe in the water when on the 17th of last month the President signed into law the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. This represented the culmination of seven years of congressional effort, commencing during the Republican Administration in 1959. An earlier congressional effort to coordinate federal activity in this field received a pocket veto by the late President Kennedy following the adjournment of the 87th Congress.

Hopefully, this new federal legislation in the field of oceanography will serve as a catalyst to bring about a unified national effort so as to enable effective exploitation of the promising rewards of this area of so-called "inner space." Our effort heretofore has been disjointed and has been described by one foreign observer in the following terms: "The administration of U.S. oceanography reminds me of a contemporary abstract painting rendered by an ape!"

Our total national oceanographic program budget for each of the past three fiscal years has been at a level of less than 4% of that provided for our "outer" space programs. In the field of education over the last twenty years, only about 50 undergraduate degrees and less than 900 graduate degrees have been conferred by major institutions offering courses in the field.

U.S.S.R.: SEAWARD THRUST

What is really most disturbing about this generally unfavorable direction being taken with American sea power is that while we appear to be "fiddling and declining," Russian sea power is modern and growing at a fantastic pace. Two years ago Hanson W. Baldwin noted in his article, "Red Flag Over the Seven Seas," and I quote: "If to vast Russian land power is added major maritime power, the problem of deterrence becomes formidably difficult. If we lose control of the seas, it becomes impossible." Yet, this is the very real danger that now stares us in the face.

Today Russia has the second largest navy in the world. Its merchant marine is growing at the rate of about one million tons a year. Its fishing industry has invaded every major fishing ground in the world, and she

will soon surpass even Japan as the leading industrial fishing country. Russia's annual catch, for example, is valued at close to four times our balance of payments deficit. And, she has more than 100 oceanographic vessels employed worldwide.

The point is that since World War II the Soviet Navy, like the Soviet merchant marine and fishing fleet, has been transformed from what was formerly a coastal defensive force into a "blue-water" offensive fleet. And, the intensity of this Soviet seaward thrust has not faltered for lack of funds, including the expenditure abroad of scarce "hard" currency.

The British publication "Jane's Fighting Ships" assesses this Soviet drive in the following terms, and I quote:

"The Soviet Union is reaching out with her naval units and infiltrating in a multi-pronged movement into all the seven seas, not only with combatant ships but with intelligence trawlers and research ships in a determined effort to achieve a worldwide naval capability in conjunction with a challenging increase in her merchant fleet and developing a maritime strategy as a major factor in her overall policy of extending her influence throughout the world.

* * * * *

"There is no doubt that the Soviet Navy is growing with the object of challenging U.S. supremacy at sea. The Soviet Union now understands the value of sea power."

CONCLUSION

Even without this growing Soviet threat, the present unfavorable direction of American sea power should be a matter of national concern. Yet, when I add up the negative actions of the past five or six years, in the face of our ever-expanding worldwide military responsibilities and the growing demands of the American industrial complex for raw materials from overseas, I am not overly optimistic. It seems crystal clear that we, unlike Soviet Russia, are sadly lacking in an appreciation of the value of sea power. We appear to be pursuing the idiotic course of sticking our heads in the sand, blithely ignoring this very real threat to our national security and economic well-being in the hope that, like a bad dream, it will go away. But the fact remains that the challenge is real and unless there is a rebirth of national leadership—and soon—we will be aroused from this dream-like state by what Admiral Mahan called, and I quote: "The rude awakening of those who have abandoned their share of the common birthright of all people—the sea."

## Disability: A National Health Problem as Seen From Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 21, 1966*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

DISABILITY: A NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEM AS SEEN FROM CAPITOL HILL

(Remarks of U.S. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at Georgetown University symposium, Washington, D.C., Thursday, June 9, 1966)

I accepted with pleasure this invitation to appear here tonight, because I welcome every opportunity to participate in an activity whose aims is to improve the health of the American people. This seminar today is such an activity.

I have been asked to talk to you this evening on disability, a subject that is of as much concern to me as a legislator as it is to you as physicians and health workers, although from a somewhat different point of view.

Health matters have traditionally been a great concern of law as well as of medicine. The history of health legislation is almost as old as the history of lawmaking itself in this country. Let me go back for just a moment to these earliest efforts on the part of governing bodies to halt the inroads of disease on the citizens of our first colonies. Our earliest health laws were related almost exclusively to the spread of disease through travel, which was originally of special importance in maritime traffic and more recently has become important in air traffic.

In Colonial America, the earliest quarantine restriction, to halt the spread of disease from foreign ships, was enacted in 1647 by the Massachusetts Bay Colony against ships arriving from Barbados, and in 1700 the Province of Pennsylvania enacted legislation "to prevent sickly vessels coming into the government."

Although the original legislative health efforts were directed specifically against communicable diseases entering by sea, governing authorities began to develop broader health concerns as early as 1754 when the Colonial Government of New York imposed a tax on all seamen and passengers entering the port of New York, and with these funds provided not only quarantine hospital accommodations but established the first city dispensaries and provided financial support to the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents.

In 1798 the U.S. Public Health Service, now the principal health agency of our country, was created as a Marine Hospital Service when an act of Congress providing for the relief of sick and injured seamen was signed by President John Adams. Proponents of the Act were not concerned with the humanitarian considerations alone, but argued also that the National defense demanded a National program of direct medical and hospital care for seamen, since the merchant fleet had always been a major element of the Nation's naval defense.

In the more than a century and a half which followed these pieces of legislation, Congress has often demonstrated its continuing interest in the health of the American people. This interest is based upon a conviction that a healthy nation is a productive nation and that a general state of National health is an economic asset and an essential component of defense even if there were no human issues involved. This Congressional concern has been reflected in such laws as these:

Legislation to control a third "killer" disease was enacted in 1833 as the result of a widespread outbreak of cholera, and authorized the use of revenue cutters in enforcing quarantine laws of States and cities.

The world-wide pandemic of influenza in 1918 stimulated Congress to appropriate one million dollars for the Public Health Service to use in suppression of influenza in the United States. In the 20's, the Veterans Bureau, later to become the Veterans Administration, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs were both established by law.

And so it has gone, with each decade bringing new laws relating to health and disease control.

A new dimension of health concern began with the National Health Survey of 1935, the first definitive survey of health to determine the relationship of disease and certain environmental factors such as income, education, and housing conditions. This survey brought together for the first time information that formed a basis for Federal, State, and local action directed toward the prevention and control of the chronic as well as the communicable diseases, and stimulated the development of programs aimed at the bettering of social and economic conditions among the deprived of our Nation.

Beginning with the impact of the findings of the first National Health Survey, and given additional impetus from World War II, there has been a gradual but substantial shift of legislative perspective in regard to health. This has evolved as a response to the changing health needs of a changing society. That our society has changed, few persons would argue.

For example, while by no means entirely eliminated from the health picture, the communicable diseases and the sanitation problems incident to these no longer have a dominant claim on either medical or legislative attention. Just as our society has changed greatly in the past 30 years, so it will no doubt continue to change, at least into the foreseeable future. A glance at the population figures reveals one very basic factor: we are becoming a Nation of the very young and the very old. We have increased our life expectancy to span the decades in which chronic diseases are increasingly common and their crippling effects more disabling.

We have managed to control the great killers of the past—yellow fever, smallpox, cholera—but we have created new killers and cripplers to take their place. Heart disease, cancer, and stroke claim over a million lives every year and disable many more. Vehicles with fatal highway speeds cause mass crippling in the youth of our land. We have acquired great technological skill, but with it a longer life span in which to develop social and economic hardships in the so-called "golden years".

We have, in short, set the stage for disability. For nearly a century we have collected statistics on mortality. Only in recent years have we really begun to realize the vast implications—of chronic and malignant diseases, of injuries and old age—for those who do not appear on our mortality tables because they are not yet dead.

What are some of these implications? In the three great killer diseases I have just mentioned—heart disease, cancer, and stroke—death itself is not the only tragedy. If those individuals we have listed in the statistical tables as "survivors" are merely snatched from the jaws of death to become doomed to a bedfast existence at home or in the back wards of public institutions then the advances merit only limited praise. There is abundant evidence, however, that disability no longer need be accepted as the natural and inevitable aftermath of cancer surgery, or heart disease, or stroke, or old age; evidence that disability can be prevented or minimized; evidence that knowledge already available could be more fully utilized to offer useful and productive years to be lived in dignity by millions of chronically ill and aged persons.

I am referring, of course, to that area of medical care known as medical rehabilitation. For in this portion of comprehensive health care lies our conception of medical science as a tool for health, rather than limiting it to the bare provision of basic bodily survival. We have in the past directed our major medical and legislative efforts toward those activities—from immunization to organ transplant—designed to prevent death. But we have an additional obligation to those whom we have rescued—we must insure that that life is worth living. We must do more than substitute one tragedy for another. And this is where medical rehabilitation comes into focus.

The respect I have for those who cultivate the fields of rehabilitation is profound. I have come to know many of these workers well. Through the work of the appropriations subcommittee which I have chaired for several years, I too have endeavored to serve the disabled people of this country. In these years I have had an opportunity to gain an understanding of the national problem posed by disability and an awareness of the obstacles to delivery of medical rehabilitation services to those who need and could benefit from them. I have come to understand that medical rehabilitation, or disability control, or whatever you choose to call it, has vast potentials, not only in restoring the disabled to a high level of independence, but in preventing disability from developing.

Those of you here today are demonstrating by your presence at this seminar on the management of the chronic disease patient your concern for better care of this segment of the poplation. You and your counterparts in other sessions of this type are seeking to expand the horizons of medical care for this neglected group. You are denying, in effect, the validity of medical attitudes which claim that nothing can be done for those so unfortunate as to be afflicted with chronic diseases and old age. You are attempting to find solutions to the common problems associated with disability. We have learned by now that shutting the disabled out of sight accomplishes nothing. We can never build enough custodial "boxes" even for this. And we should not try.

In the process of gathering information relative to disability and to the need for rehabilitative services throughout the country, I have come to view rehabilitation in its broadest sense—health care concerned with preventing disability and maintaining function, as well as restorative services to those with existing impairments—as the window on the future. I am convinced that health measures enacted by Congress and health services provided by physicians and other health professionals must all take into account the chronicity of many illnesses and conditions. In our fight for life-saving techniques, let us make sure that it is really the whole life we are saving. Let our philosophy be based on reality, and let our goals be based on a belief in the true worth of man.

Workers in public health know that when large numbers of people need health services which in the usual course of events they do not receive, then it becomes a public health problem. When such a need is widespread, then it becomes also a national problem and of concern to legislative authorities. That there has been legislative recognition of such national health problems is evident in such laws as the following:

The Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, which provides for demonstrations of new methods of providing community health services, including a variety of rehabilitation services.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 and the Nurse Training Act of 1964 are both designed to increase professional health manpower, for without sufficient personnel to provide health services, the most desirable and effective medical program falls short of its goal.

The Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke Amendments of 1965 which assigns responsibility to the Public Health Service for encouraging and assisting the establishment of regional cooperative arrangements among medical schools, research institutions and hospitals, designed to forge a closer link between the centers of scientific and academic medicine on the one hand, and community health services on the other. This legislation specifies that this forthright program must not interfere with present patterns of patient care and professional practice, but it is nonetheless a revolutionary piece of legislation. It is designed to develop and disseminate medical knowledge of treatment techniques through cooperative efforts of medical resources in the community.

Nowhere in the legislation, or in the testimony in its support before the Congressional committees, will you find a blueprint for this program—because there is no Federal blueprint and it is not intended that there should be one. The pattern of grants-in-aid, already so well established and so successful in the support of medical research, will also be followed in this new program. These grants will be made in response to local initiative, to facilitate local planning, and to assist local execution of the plans. The emphasis of this program is clearly on bringing this country's proven research capability—as reflected in the medical schools and research hospitals—into a closer relationship with medical practice, as a resource for the practitioner, the local hospital, and the community health services in a wide geographic area.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965, which provide health insurance benefits to the aged and is popularly known as "Medicare." This legislative package evolved out of a recognition that it is one thing to have improved medical service, but quite another thing to pay for it. The rapid and dramatic increase in the costs of hospital care and health services generally is alarming. It is alarming because it means that despite our general prosperity we are still putting some forms of medical care beyond the reach of many of our citizens. This is not a tolerable situation. I am not contending that the charges made for medical services are excessive in relation to costs, or in relation to value but merely that they are still too often excessive in relation to ability to pay. Fear of the doctor's bill or the hospital bill should not be the factor that keeps members of any economic group from availing themselves of medical care.

There is another aspect to this problem of costs which disturbs me. This is the attempt to extend to the field of health services and medical research the concept of cost-benefit economics generated by our defense and space technology. These approaches start off with the assumption that every public act must be weighed in terms of its economic rate of return. This is a concept which we must reject out of hand. It involves a principle which cannot be applied to health.

This is not to say that there are never economic savings as a direct result of medical care. Certainly, the nearly 200,000 vocationally rehabilitated persons each year are returning to the labor market and paying taxes where formerly they contributed only to the costs of medical care, or prevented a family member from being employed. But there are millions of citizens with no employment potential. Those over 40, handicapped and uneducated for other than manual tasks; those with deteriorating chronic diseases; those past retirement. What of these? How do we measure the dollar costs to society of not providing them with necessary health services? And if we could do this, would it be in any way a yardstick of the human values involved?

There will be new advances in medical science in the years to come, and there will be new laws relating to health. Hopefully, breakthroughs in preventing death will lead to enriching human life as well, and emerging legislation will consider the human above the economic values of life. Medicine and law have been partners for generations in this land of ours. I expect this to continue into more and more areas, such as poverty—which goes hand in hand with disease and disability—and old age—which has outlived the killer diseases of youth only to fall heir to the chronic diseases in later years—and ignorance—which prevents the delivery of appropriate health services to all who need them.

Only then, when all men have the opportunity to achieve and to maintain their highest potentials, may we—the health professions and the lawmakers—rest upon our laurels secure in the knowledge that we have done our job faithfully and completely.

---

# SENATE

## FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1966

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. Clair M. Cook, Th. D., Methodist clergyman, and legislative assistant to Senator VANCE HARTKE, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our fathers and of the ages, as day follows day, and night follows night, in the years which stretch to eternity, we in our instabilities of time need to reach up to Thee for the immutable and unchanging verities of timelessness.

Therefore, we come before Thee in this hour that we may seek a higher vantage point of truth and righteousness. From the heights where we find Thee, may we seek to enlarge our too little outlook and to remedy our too large failures of perception.

Our Father, as we turn to the business of this day, make us aware that Thou hast entrusted us with decisions fateful in the lives of other men. Impress upon our consciences the vast responsibilities of the task, so grave that we must doubt our own wisdom and seek Thine own. Give to us the ability to look at our land with clarity, to view our international policies with the eyes of those whose lives they alter, to assess dispassionately and fairly the rights and wrongs of every issue.

As we deal with the lives and welfare of our own and of the rest of the world, keep us aware that we deal not simply with comforts or discomforts, but often with survival or with death. Add to our good will, good judgment; to our political expediency, courage to defy it when right demands; to our words for peace, the will to achieve it.

Thus, for this day and for every day, we ask Thy righteous guidance, Thy compassionate love, and Thy eternal wisdom as companions for the tasks here undertaken. Amen.

---

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 21, 1966, was dispensed with.

---

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, July 22,