and has had to call principally on soybean oil as a major component of the margarine.

It may be necessary for the Department to adopt a similar bridgeover buying of margarine for the school lunch program. If so, soybean oil margarines again will be called upon as "reinforcements" so long as the dairy situation remains as it is.

It makes sense to use an alternate product when it is available to fill a real need that cannot otherwise be met without large additional costs and disruption of commercial markets.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1966

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

Rev. Max L. Stitts, pastor, First Baptist Church, Danville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

O, God and Father of all men, we who speak so often to Thee, and allow ourselves so seldom to hear from Thee, do pray we might have an increased desire to be tuned to hear Thy still small voice. Then, may we echo Thy truth for all the world to see as well as hear. We know Thou hast said: *When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him.* Therefore, we pray that we shall not make peace our highest aim, but that we as individuals and as a nation may live pleasingly before Thee. As the world cries out from all corners to us for help, may we discern the true need from the false and remember Thy word: *He who is kind to the poor lends to the Lord and He will repay him for his deed.* And, Father, help us to walk every step in the print of integrity for You have proclaimed: *He who walks in integrity walks securely.*

O, Lord, let us not hold to half-truths for fear we may hold to the wrong half.

In the name of Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MUSKIE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 27, 1966, was dispensed with.

## 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 26, 1966, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 3150) to make further provision for the retirement of the Comptroller General.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

## INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON FACILITATION OF INTERNATIONAL WATERBORNE TRANSPORTATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the injunction of secrecy from Executive Q, 89th Congress, 2d session, the Inter-American Convention on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation—Convention of Mar del Plata—and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification of the Inter-American Convention on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation—Convention of Mar del Plata—signed for the United States on June 7, 1963, I transmit herewith a certified copy of that convention. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the annex of standards and recommended practices adopted by the First Special Inter-American Port and Harbor Conference at Washington on April 19, 1966. These standards and practices need be observed by the United States only to the extent that they are consistent with our laws and regulations. If we wish to conform to any standard which is inconsistent with existing U.S. law, an amendment to the particular statutory provision will be sought.

The convention is intended to facilitate and expedite the movement of waterborne commerce between ports in the Americas by bringing about simplification and uniformity, as far as practicable, of regulations, standards, and procedures in relation to ships, crews, passengers, cargoes, ports, and auxiliary services. If ratified by the required number of countries, it could mean speedup of port operations, reduced documentary requirements for passengers and shipping lines, and faster turnaround of vessels. The savings to shipping lines and governments alike could be substantial.

In line with our continuing interest in facilitating inter-American transportation and commerce, I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention of Mar del Plata and advise and consent to its ratification.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 28, 1966.*

Enclosures:

1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State.
2. Certified copy of Inter-American Convention on Facilitation of International Waterborne Transportation—Convention of Mar del Plata.
3. Copy of annex.

## REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 3148. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex. (Rept. No. 1417).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 3013. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents (Rept. No. 1418).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 11980. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to donate two obsolete German weapons to the Federal Republic of Germany (Rept. No. 1415).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 12031. An act to authorize the appointment of Col. William W. Watkin, Jr., professor, of the U.S. Military Academy, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1419).

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 13374. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of trophies for the recognition of special accomplishments related to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1416).

## FINAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1414)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, 89th Congress, 1st session, I submit a report entitled "Organization of Congress" and ask unanimous consent that it be printed, together with the supplemental views of

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Senator MUNDT, Representative HECHLER, Senator CASE, Representatives THOMAS B. CURTIS, DURWARD G. HALL, and JAMES C. CLEVELAND, and the additional views of Representative DURWARD G. HALL.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report the nominations of Brig. Gen. Duane L. Corning, South Dakota Air National Guard, for appointment to the grade of major general in the Reserve of the U.S. Air Force; the nomination of Lt. Gen. Maurice A. Preston, USAF, for promotion to general in connection with his assignment as commander in chief, U.S. Air Forces, Europe; the nomination of Lt. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton to be placed on the retired list of the Army in the grade of lieutenant general; and the nomination of Vice Adm. Paul H. Ramsey, U.S. Navy, to be retired as vice admiral. I asked that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

The nominations, placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Brig. Gen. Duane L. Corning, South Dakota Air National Guard, for appointment to the grade of major general in the Reserve of the U.S. Air Force;

Lt. Gen. Maurice A. Preston (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton, Army of the United States (major general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general; and

Vice Adm. Paul H. Ramsey, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably the nomination of 213 officers for promotion in the Navy in the grade of commander and below; 488 officers for appointment in the Regular Army in the grade of colonel and below; and 1,742 officers for promotion, and appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Raymond F. Esparza, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Navy;

Gerald P. Corcoran, and sundry other Naval Reserve officers, for assignment in the U.S. Navy;

Arnold E. Catron, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy;

Adrian T. Doryland (Navy enlisted scientific education program), to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy;

Anderson R. Williams (civilian college graduate), to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy;

Gerald J. Archer, and sundry other Naval Reserve officers, to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy;

Collis O. Marshall, U.S. Navy, retired officer, to be a permanent commander in the line of the Navy;

William D. Sydnor, Jr., for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list;

Kenneth L. Hoffman, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

William H. Abbott, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

John F. Anderson, and sundry other distinguished graduates of the Air Force precommission schools, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

George T. Adams, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. HART, Mr. METCALF, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

S. 3661. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of monthly benefits payable thereunder, to raise the wage base, to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to increase the amount of the benefits payable to widows, to provide for contributions to the social security trust funds from the general revenues, to otherwise extend and improve the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. HART):

S. 3662. A bill to establish a price support level for milk; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 3663. A bill providing for the construction by the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, of a vehicular tunnel under Indiana Harbor Canal, in the vicinity of Canal Street, city of East Chicago, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3664. A bill for the relief of Sabri Patros Shamun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax interest on obligations issued by colleges and universities; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3666. A bill to permit the city of Kansas City, Kans., to count expenditures made for recently constructed board of education's library building and board of public utilities building as local noncash grants-in-aid toward the Kansas City, Kans., urban renewal projects; and

S. 3667. A bill to permit the city of Wichita, Kans., to count expenditures made for its current civil cultural center as local noncash grants-in-aid toward the Wichita urban renewal project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3668. A bill to amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to grant U.S. citizenship at birth to any child born abroad whose father or mother is a citizen of the United States who has served abroad for certain periods of time with a church or missionary organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 3669. A bill to amend section 175 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include expenditures for the installation of tile drains as soil and water conservation expenditures which may be deducted under such section; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BURDICK (by request):

S. 3670. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 3671. A bill to provide for an investigation and study for the feasibility of diverting water from the Missouri and Columbia Rivers to the western part of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

S. 3672. A bill to give certain Indian tribes the right to cut hay on lands, adjacent to certain reservoirs, on which such tribes are permitted to graze stock; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## RESOLUTIONS

### PROPOSED APPROPRIATE ACTION TO BE TAKEN AGAINST ZDENEK PISK, A FOREIGN ESPIONAGE AGENT

Mr. EASTLAND submitted a resolution (S. Res. 291) expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should take or direct appropriate action against Zdenek Pisk, a foreign espionage agent, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under a separate heading.)

## PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY CONVENTION

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. RIBICOFF) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 292) relative to International Motor Vehicle Safety Convention, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MUSKIE, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittee and committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

## SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Senator PROUTY, Senator HART, Senator METCALF, Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator MORSE, Senator NEUBERGER, Senator MCGOVERN, Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Senator CLARK, and Senator MONTOYA, a bill to increase the social security benefits for retired Americans, widows and dependents, and to establish a partial new source of financing for the social security system.

Of the many problems we face in our efforts to assure a decent, dignified retirement to our Nation's elderly, perhaps the most fundamental is what would seem the simplest—the need to provide millions of Americans with the assurance that they will receive an adequate income in retirement.

Social security was designed 30 years ago to help meet this need. Since 1935, we have relied on this system of contributory insurance to provide a measure of economic protection against the loss of wages that retirement brings. It is the primary source of support for millions of older Americans.

But it is no longer adequate. Social security benefits have not kept pace with the times, and the result is that more and more of our elderly simply cannot make ends meet on their pension checks. We have amended the original 1935 act to broaden coverage and to create new kinds of benefits. But we have failed up to now to undertake the basic overhaul of our benefits structure that is needed to lift millions of older Americans out of poverty and into a retirement of dignity and self-respect.

Each change has been of critical importance—survivorship provisions in 1939, payments to the permanently and totally disabled in 1956, and medicare in 1965. And since 1950, there has been a series of extensions to new groups of workers and accompanying liberalizations in eligibility requirements. About 95 million people are now insured under social security. Some 21 million, or 1 out of every 9 Americans, are recipients of monthly benefits, including 14 million retired workers and their dependents. Nevertheless, one crucial fact stands out—some 5 to 7 million retired Americans still live in poverty.

Indeed, the paradox of abject poverty amidst our Nation's staggering affluence is nowhere more clearly observable than among our elderly. The aged constitute between one-fifth and one-fourth of all the poor in the United States. The Bureau of Labor statistics estimates that it costs about $3,000 annually for a retired couple to live at a modest but adequate level in a big city and $2,500 in a smaller community. But in 1964, two out of five aged couples in this country had incomes of less than $3,000. One out of four had incomes of less than $2,000.

For these elderly people, social security has still not lived up to its original promise to avert economic insecurity in retirement. We must now keep that promise. We must now provide adequate benefits, and we can do so with fiscal soundness, to all who are insured. We must explore the full potential of the social security system to serve as a guarantor of the retired years of our people.

The present level of social security benefits has much to do with the widespread poverty among retired Americans. Social security is virtually the sole source of income for its beneficiaries and the major source for just about all. The adequacy of benefits, therefore, is critical in determining how well people will be able to get along in retirement. But in 1966, the benefits paid to retired single individuals average $81 a month—just $972 a year. Benefits for aged couples average $142 monthly—$1,704 annually. Those millions who depend on social security for their entire support live in poverty.

In fact, the increases in benefits provided by past amendments have barely kept up with increases in the cost of living. For example, the 7-percent increase in cash benefits enacted last year actually fell short of restoring the 1954 purchasing power of benefits. Thus, in terms of real purchasing power, the 1965 recipient was less well off than his counterpart 11 years earlier. And the level of benefits was inadequate even in 1954.

In my judgment, these figures compel a thorough reevaluation by Congress of the benefit structure of the social security system. The bill which I introduce today is based on an extensive look at the present structure. It would raise benefits by an average of about 50 percent in 1968, and it would finance these increases by a slight acceleration in the rate of increase of the payroll tax, and by a limited use of general revenue financing. Increases of this magnitude will make a critical difference to millions of older citizens who must now scrape to make ends meet, or who have had to turn to public assistance for help.

This bill is a beginning—a good beginning—a fiscally sound proposal which can serve as the focal point for congressional discussion of the entire problem. It provides what are in my judgment the minimum improvements in social security benefits that are necessary now to respond to the needs of our elderly.

The bill would accomplish the following fundamental changes in the structure of social security benefits, all effective January 1, 1968:

First, it would more than double the minimum benefit payable. Every American who worked enough in his lifetime to qualify for coverage—and whose average monthly earnings were $95 a month or less—could now count on a retirement floor income of $90 a month, $1,080 a year, instead of the present $44 level. If his wife qualifies for marital benefits, they will receive $135 a month, $1,620 a year, as a couple. Thus the floor for individual benefits will exceed the present average—$90 a month as against $80—and the floor for couples will be almost equal to the present average—$135 as against $142. Average benefits will rise to $127 per month for individuals, and $214 for couples—increases of 57 percent and 51 percent, respectively. These are notable advances toward assuring the poorest of retired Americans a significant measure of income that they will receive as a matter of right, based at least partly on their own contributions. It is, correspondingly, a significant step away from reliance on local and State welfare and public assistance which are already heavily burdened.

Second, for those whose lifetime earnings averaged between $1,200 and $3,000 a year, the bill provides a 50-percent increase in benefits. What this will do for the person who earned $3,000 annually—the generally accepted "poverty" level—is a particularly good example of the improvements which the bill would make in the structure of benefits. The $3,000 a year earner now receives $1,220 annually in benefits, $1,830 if his wife is

over 65. Under this bill, he would receive $1,840.80, more than 60 percent of what he received in wages during his productive years.

If his wife qualifies for marital benefits, they will receive $2,761, or more than 90 percent of his average earnings as a worker. As with the increase in the minimum benefit, these increases for the family which skirted poverty throughout the husband's working years will provide a substantial pension to which the retiree has contributed over the years, and an assurance that local welfare and public assistance will have to be resorted to to less often during the years after retirement.

Third, the bill provides slightly smaller benefit increases for those who earned more during their working years—45 percent for the man who earned $4,000 annually, 40 percent for the man who earned $5,000, 39 percent for the man who earned $6,000. In absolute terms, the $4,000 earner would receive $2,090 instead of $1,440; the $5,000 earner, $2,384 instead of $1,692; the $6,000 earner, $2,617 instead of $1,884. If the wife of each qualifies for marital benefits, the new benefits for the couple would be $3,100, almost $3,600, and $3,925 annually respectively.

Fourth, the bill provides for automatic adjustment of benefits geared to the cost of living. As I have indicated, social security benefits have actually fallen in real value because increases have not even kept up with increases in the cost of living. Under the bill, benefits will rise 1 percent each time the consumer price index goes up 1 percent. This will help make social security inflation proof for the first time, and will insure that future benefit increases granted by Congress will do more than just make up for lost ground. Civil service and military retirement systems already contain cost-of-living adjustment features. It is time that the social security system did likewise.

The bill does not exhaust the possibilities for automatic changes in benefits based on economic change. It does not, for example, provide means for giving social security beneficiaries the benefit of increases in real income that others in the economy receive when productivity rises. This concept of automatic adjustments to enable the elderly to participate in the increase in the community's standard of living—is a long-accepted feature of other social insurance programs. I trust, therefore, that the Senate, and particularly members of the Finance Committee, will carefully consider the merits of such a provision when undertaking the general review of benefits that I believe should accompany consideration of my bill.

Fifth, the bill remedies a longstanding defect in the benefit structure by entitling the widow of a beneficiary to receive the same pension as her husband received. Present law cuts the survivorship pension to 82½ percent of the husband's retirement benefit, and thereby leaves thousands of widows in straitened circumstances every year.

Sixth, the bill provides an alternative method of calculating benefits which reflects more accurately a beneficiary's earning power during his lifetime. It allows benefits to be based upon the average earnings during the 10-consecutive-year period when earnings were highest. Present law requires that the average be based on the entire working life, leaving out only the 5 lowest years. This alternative method will insure that benefits will bear the closest possible relation to productivity during the working years. It will have a significant effect on the amount of benefits payable, especially for the steady worker who realized constantly increased earnings during his working years.

Seventh, the bill remedies another creeping deterioration in protection that has accelerated with the years, a deterioration that has been unfair to above-average wage earners. The $3,000 contribution and benefit base that was in effect in 1938 covered all of the earnings of 97 percent of those in the program. Thus, almost every worker's pension was based on everything he had earned while working. The increases in the contribution and benefit base that have been enacted recently have not kept pace with rising wages, with the result that many workers receive benefits based on only part of their earnings. The bill increases the base to $10,000, effective January 1, 1968, and to $15,000, effective January 1, 1971. For the first time in many years, nearly every worker will have social insurance protection that is calculated by reference to his entire earnings.

These are the major features of the bill which I introduce today. It will not solve all the problems of the aging in our Nation. There are other grave needs which will require our serious attention and commitment. Special effort is still required to bring better housing to the elderly and to involve them in the process of providing community services, and even in gainful employment.

And in the area of income maintenance, there will still be a role, though somewhat diminished, for welfare and public assistance programs. The bill will not provide all of our elderly with all of the income they need to avoid hardship in retirement, and some will, therefore, still be forced to turn to old-age assistance for help. But this reliance will be less needed under my bill.

But the bill does achieve the necessary first step. It will insure a generally adequate level of benefits to all those who subsist on social security. We should have done at least this much long ago.

Nor should the role of private pension plans be minimized. There is general agreement that the best overall retirement system is dual in character, involving both social security and supplemental private pension arrangements. Unfortunately, the scope of private pensions has been too limited in our Nation so far. In general, only the higher-income and better organized participate at present. Private pension plans could make a much more significant contribution to the economic security of our Nation's retirees. The policy underlying a fully developed combination of a liberalized social security system and effective private pension programs is clear: the former would provide a floor of basic economic protection for the elderly; the latter would operate to meet the demands of those who want additional economic security. We must do what we can to encourage private pension plans to develop so as to complement the basic protection which social security affords.

What will be the costs of this legislation? The 50-percent average increase in benefits provided by the bill would cause a considerable increase in the payments out of the trust fund during 1968, the year in which the bill would go into effect. It is important to understand, however, that the bill does not contemplate, nor does actuarial soundness require, that this increase in benefits would be entirely paid for immediately. The trust fund would be replenished over a period of time. This creates no difficulty. The Social Security Administration has told me that "The proposed program as a whole is in close actuarial balance." The "temporary declines in the trust funds," the Social Security Administration adds, "are not significant in terms of the financial soundness of the program over the long run." Thus the costs of the program will be spread over a period of years. This is both actuarially sound and fiscally wise.

It is possible that unforeseen fiscal demands may dictate some changes in the scope of this proposal as it is considered by the Senate. I certainly do not intend the introduction of this bill to commit its sponsors to support a system of financing for the bill which, though fiscally sound on present projections, turns out to be infeasible due to unexpected events. On the other hand all of us hope that some resources now being applied elsewhere will soon be available for domestic use.

The important thing is that we do what we can now toward making social security benefits truly adequate. To do that, in my judgment, we must be prepared to rely partially on general revenues. The general revenue contribution is the major new aspect of this bill. But that does not mean that we could not add general revenues to social security financing on a more gradual basis than the 9-year schedule which the bill provides. And, if it becomes necessary, the proposed benefit increases could be adopted in steps rather than all at once, although I believe that would be less desirable.

In the light of present projections about the economy and about competing demands for resources, I believe my proposal is fiscally sound. Most of the benefit increase would be financed initially by a moderate rise in the payroll

tax. The remainder would be accomplished by a gradual limited use of general revenue financing, which will end up paying for about 35 percent of the retirement system by fiscal 1977. In 1968, the Government contribution would be about $750 million, and in 1969, it would rise to about $3 billion. This intended reliance upon general revenues is fiscally sound as well as actuarially sound. At our present annual economic growth rate of 3.5 percent, additional revenues are being generated at a conservatively estimated rate of nearly $8 billion annually. Indeed, it was announced only the other day that revenues had risen so rapidly this year that the expected deficit of over $5 billion will turn out to be about $2 billion.

Thus, by calendar 1969, when the first significant Government contribution would be expected, the Treasury will be receiving almost $25 billion more annually in revenues than it does now. By the time the general revenue contribution reaches its intended level of slightly over 35 percent of the social security system in 1977, general revenues, at today's tax rates, will be close to $100 billion more than they are today. I believe we can afford to assign enough of this to financing social security to support the level of benefits that I propose today.

And in considering the costs of this proposal, we must bear in mind the savings in welfare costs that it will bring. This is not just a matter of money, although the money alone will help substantially in meeting the costs of an adequate social security system. It is a matter of the dignity of the elderly person who has had to ask his community for its assistance when he could not make ends meet. It is a matter of the self-respect of the individual who will now as a matter of right, based partly on his own contributions, receive a floor of income protection against the burdens of old age. It is a matter of the quality of life in the ghetto where welfare programs have contributed to the disintegration of the family and the deterioration of purpose and meaning.

It is a matter of the administration of State and local government, which have been heavily burdened by welfare costs, and will be aided substantially by any relief from that burden. And it is a matter of the burden on individual taxpayers, who have had to contribute through regressive local real estate and sales taxes to finance the non-Federal part of the cost of public assistance.

The turn to general revenue financing is well supported by considerations of history and policy.

First, as a practical matter, it is difficult to see how the payroll tax can be raised too much further. The payroll tax is highly regressive, and for low-wage employees particularly, a required contribution beyond what is contemplated in this bill would be very burdensome.

And the justification for total payroll tax financing over the years has been that the payroll tax is a contribution that each employee makes to finance his own benefits. In general, the original purpose was that the wage earner would be paid, during his years of retirement, what he had put in during his working years. But this original purpose has been modified somewhat in practice. Considerations of social justice have caused us to create some benefits which are not totally contributory, and these have been financed out of the contributions of others. We have provided benefits, for example, to poor and more irregularly employed workers; to widows and orphans; and to those disabled by injury or illness.

Second, it is essential to recall that Congress provided in the original Social Security Act for full-rate benefits even for those persons who were too old to be in the work force long enough to contribute fully for their benefits. The cost of these benefits is still being financed by the contributions of those who have followed. As Social Security Commissioner Ball has pointed out:

> Since society as a whole benefits from a national social security system, it can be argued that the cost of the benefits for people already too old when the social security program went into effect should be borne by the general revenues rather than by the social security tax.

Third, the general revenue approach has been considered and discussed since the inception of social security. The first Presidentially appointed Council of Economic Security, whose report preceded the enactment of the Social Security Act, said that Government contributions to the system would eventually be needed, adding prophetically that, "It will not be necessary to have actual Government contribution until after the system has been in operation for 30 years."

The 1938 Advisory Council made the same recommendation, giving as its reason that "the Nation as a whole, independent of the beneficiaries of the system, will derive a benefit from the old-age security program." The Council also said, pertinently, that "with the broadening of the scope of the protection afforded, governmental participation in meeting the costs of the program is all the more justified." The 1938 Council stated the principle to be one of "distributing the eventual cost of the old-age insurance system by means of approximately equal contributions by employers, employees, and the Government." This, of course, is what my bill will do by the year after its provisions go into effect.

The Social Security Board itself in 1939 called it "sound public policy to pay part of the eventual cost of the benefits proposed out of taxes other than payroll taxes, preferably taxes such as income inheritance taxes levied according to ability to pay." The Board added that "the wider the coverage, the more extensive this contribution from other tax sources might properly be."

In 1946, the House Ways and Means Committee's technical staff recommended a continuing Federal subsidy up to "a third of the year's total of benefit and expense payments." The 1948 Advisory Council called a Government contribution "a recognition of the interest of the Nation as a whole in the welfare of the aged and of widows and children—of survivors."

Even now, partial financing for medicare for those over 65 comes from general revenues, as it does for the transitional coverage under social security enacted earlier this year for persons over 72 who are not presently covered.

In summary, then, this bill is neither a radical proposal when viewed in light of the clear needs of the Nation's elderly, nor a revolutionary departure from past social security theory. It is a fiscally responsible change in the present inadequate structure. And the partial general revenue financing which it contemplates means that the noncontributory aspects of social security will now be financed out of the progressive Federal income tax rather than the regressive payroll tax. Thus, while substantial new benefits are made available by the bill, the relative tax burden on the middle and lower income wage earner will be eased, as will the burden on the local property taxpayer.

Mr. President, this legislation is long overdue. I urge the Senate to give the entire matter its earliest attention. So that Senators may examine the bill and the changes in benefits which it proposes in detail, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, including the tables of proposed benefits, be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent as well that an outline summary of the bill which I prepared be included in the RECORD, and that the Social Security Administration's study of the costs and actuarial soundness of the bill be included as well.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the table for 10 days for additional cosponsorship.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, tables, summary, and study will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New York.

The bill (S. 3661) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of monthly benefits payable thereunder, to raise the wage base, to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to increase the amount of the benefits payable to widows, to provide for contributions to the social security trust funds from the general revenues, to otherwise extend and improve the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3661

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

be cited as the "Social Security Amendments of 1966".

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES IN BENEFITS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 215 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

*"Cost-of-living increases in benefits*

"(i)(1) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) The term 'base quarter' shall mean the first quarter of a calendar year, and

"(i) in the case of the first base quarter, such term shall mean the first quarter of the first calendar year after 1968 in which the monthly average of the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics exceeds, by not less than one per centum, the monthly average of such Index for the first calendar quarter of 1968, and

"(ii) in the case of any subsequent base quarter, such term shall mean the first such quarter of the first subsequent calendar year in which the monthly average of such Consumer Price Index exceeds, by not less than one per centum, the monthly average of such Index for the last prior base quarter.

"(B) Except as provided in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph, an individual's primary insurance amount for the month of March of a base quarter as determined under this section (without the application of section 203(j)(1) and section 223(b)) shall be increased, effective with the month of July of the calendar year in which such base quarter occurs, by the same per centum (rounded to the nearest one-tenth of one per centum) as the monthly average of the Consumer Price Index for such base quarter exceeds the monthly average of such Index for the later of the first calendar quarter of 1968 or the most recent prior base quarter.

"(C) In the case of a primary insurance amount that is determined under the provision of subsection (f) after March of a year in which a base quarter occurs but is effective for such March, such primary insurance amount shall be increased effective beginning with July of the year in which such base quarter occurs, by the same per centum (rounded to the nearest one-tenth of one per centum) as the monthly average of the Consumer Price Index for such base quarter exceeds the monthly average of such Index for the later of the first calendar quarter of 1968 or the most recent prior base quarter and, if such primary insurance amount is larger than the primary insurance amount previously effective for July of such year, such larger primary insurance amount shall be effective beginning with such July."

(b) Section 203(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon followed by "or", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph—

"(4) When two or more persons are entitled (without the application of section 202(j)(1) and section 223(b) except as provided in section 215(i)(1)(C)) to monthly benefits under section 202 or 223 for March of a year in which a base quarter (as defined in section 215(i)(1)) occurs, that are based on a primary insurance amount to which the provisions of section 215(i) are applicable, such total of benefits for months beginning with the effective month of an adjustment of such primary insurance amount under such section shall not be reduced to less than the product of (A) the maximum amount determined under this section for the month before such effective month on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of the individual for whom such primary insurance amount was determined, and (B) the same per centum increase by which such individual's primary insurance amount is increased beginning with such effective month. The maximum amount so determined shall be effective until a larger maximum amount is determined under this title, but in any case to which section 202(k)(2)(A) was applicable, such maximum shall cease to apply for any month for and after the month in which such section ceases to apply, and in any such case the maximum amount shall be redetermined under the provisions of this section for each such month as though the provisions of section 202(k)(2)(A) had not been applicable for any such month."

INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF WIDOW'S BENEFITS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 202(e)(1) and (2) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "82½ percent" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "100 percent".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months beginning after December 31, 1967.

COMPUTATION OF PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT—ALTERNATIVE METHOD

SEC. 4 (a) Section 215(b)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) For the purposes of column III of the table appearing in subsection (a) of this section, an individual's 'average monthly wage' shall be the quotient obtained—

"(A) by dividing (i) the total of his wages paid in and self-employment income credited to his 'benefit computation years' (determined under paragraph (2)), by (ii) the number of months in such years, or

"(B) if a higher 'average monthly wage' would result therefrom, by dividing (i) the total of his wages paid in and self-employment income credited to him during the 10 consecutive calendar year period for which his wages and self-employment income are the highest, by (ii) 120."

(b) Section 215(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; except that any primary insurance amount so determined which is based on average monthly earnings computed in accordance with the provisions in subparagraph (B) of section 215(b), shall be adjusted as follows:

"(5) If the individual's primary insurance amount, as determined under the preceding sentence, is based on average monthly earnings computed under section 215(b)(1)(B), such primary insurance amounts shall be adjusted to an amount equal to the product of such primary insurance amount times the ratio of—

"(A) the number of the worker's benefit computation years (as defined in section 215(b)) plus the number of years for which the worker is credited with $400 or more in earnings (but not more than such number of such benefit computation years), to

"(B) twice the number of the worker's benefit computation years."

(c) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be applicable only in the case of monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1967.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO TRUST FUNDS

SEC. 5. (a)(1) The third sentence of section 201(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(A) by striking out (in the matter preceding clause (1) thereof) "amounts equivalent to 100 per centum of ———", and inserting in lieu thereof "amounts equivalent to ———";

(B) by striking out (in clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) thereof) the term "the taxes" the first place it appears in each of such clauses, and by inserting in lieu thereof "100 per centum of the taxes";

(C) by striking out the period at the end of clause (4) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon followed by the word "and"; and

(D) by adding after clause (4) thereof the following new clause:

"(5) for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, an amount equal to 6⅔ per centum of the aggregate of the amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4) for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, an amount equal to 13⅓ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, an amount equal to 20 per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, an amount equal to 26⅔ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, an amount equal to 33⅓ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, an amount equal to 40 per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, an amount equal to 46⅔ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, an amount equal to 53⅓ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, and for each fiscal year thereafter an amount equal to 60 per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; except that the amount appropriated pursuant to this clause for any fiscal year shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount specified with respect to such year in clause (3) of subsection (b) of this section."

(2) The fourth sentence of section 201(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "clauses (3) and (4)" the first place it appears therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof "clauses (3), (4), and (5)".

(b)(1) The third sentence of section 201(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out (in the matter preceding clause (1) thereof) "amounts equivalent to 100 per centum of———" and inserting in lieu thereof "amounts equivalent to———";

(B) by striking out the period at the end of clause (2) thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon followed by the word "and"; and

(C) by adding after clause (2) thereof the following new clause:

"(3) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, an amount equal to 6⅔ per centum of the aggregate of the amounts appropriated pursuant to clauses (1) and (2) for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, an amount equal to 13⅓ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, an amount equal to 20 per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, an amount equal to 26⅔ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, an amount equal to 33⅓ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, an amount equal to 40 per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such fiscal year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, an amount equal to 46⅔ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such fiscal year; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, an amount equal to 53⅓ per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year; and for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to 60 per centum of the aggregate so appropriated for such year."

(2) The fourth sentence of section 201(a) of such Act (as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section) is further amended by striking out "clauses (1) and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "clauses (1), (2), and (3)".

INCREASE OF EARNINGS COUNTED FOR BENEFIT AND TAX PURPOSES

SEC. 6. (a)(1)(A) Section 209(a)(4) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "and prior to 1968" after "1965".

(B) Section 209(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(5) That part of remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding subsections of this section) equal to $10,000 with respect to employment has been paid to an individual during any calendar year after 1967 and prior to 1971, is paid to such individual during such calendar year;

"(6) That part of remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding subsections of this section) equal to $15,000 with respect to employment has been paid to an individual during any calendar year after 1970, is paid to such individual during such calendar year;".

(2)(A) Section 211(b)(1)(D) of such Act is amended by inserting "and prior to 1968" after "1965", and by striking out "; or" and inserting in lieu thereof "; and".

(B) Section 211(b)(1) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(E) For any taxable year ending after 1967 and prior to 1971, (i) $10,000, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year; and

"(F) For any taxable year ending after 1970, (i) $15,000, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year; or".

(3)(A) Section 213(a)(2)(ii) of such Act is amended by striking out "after 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "after 1965 and before 1968, or $10,000 in the case of a calendar year after 1967 and before 1971, or $15,000 in the case of a calendar year after 1970".

(B) Section 213(a)(2)(iii) of such Act is amended by striking out "after 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "after 1965 and before 1968, or $10,000 in the case of a taxable year ending after 1967 and before 1971, or $15,000 in the case of a taxable year ending after 1970".

(4) Section 215(e)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "and the excess over $6,000 in the case of any calendar year after 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "the excess over $6,000 in the case of any calendar year after 1965 and before 1968, the excess over $10,000 in the case of any calendar year after 1967 and before 1971, and the excess over $15,000 in the case of any calendar year after 1970".

(b)(1)(A) Section 1402(b)(1)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of self-employment income) is amended by inserting "and before 1968" after "1965", and by striking out "; or" and inserting in lieu thereof "; and".

(B) Section 1402(b)(1) of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(E) for any taxable year ending after 1967 and before 1971, (i) $10,000, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during such taxable year; and

"(F) for any taxable year ending after 1970, (i) $15,000, minus (ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during the taxable year; or".

(2) Section 3121(a)(1) of such Code (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out "$6,600" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000, in the case of any calendar year before 1971, or $15,000, in the case of any calendar year after 1970,".

(3) The second sentence of section 3122 of such Code (relating to the Federal service) is amended by striking out "$6,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "the dollar".

(4) Section 3125 of such Code (relating to returns in the case of governmental employees in Guam and American Samoa) is amended by striking out "$6,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "the dollar".

(5) Section 6413(c)(1) of such Code (relating to special refunds of employment taxes) is amended—

(A) by inserting "and prior to the calendar year 1968" after "the calendar year 1965";

(B) by inserting after "exceed $6,600," the following: "or (D) during any calendar year after the calendar year 1967 and prior to the calendar year 1971, the wages received by him during such year exceed $10,000, or (E) during any calendar year after the calendar year 1970, the wages received by him during such year exceed $15,000,"; and

(C) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and before 1968, or which exceed the tax with respect to the first $10,000 of such wages received in such calendar year after 1966 and before 1971, or which exceeds the tax with respect to the first $15,000 of such wages received in such calendar year 1970".

(6) Section 6413(c)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to refunds of employment taxes in the case of Federal employees) is amended by striking out "or $6,600 for any calendar year after 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,600 for the calendar year 1966 or 1967, $10,000 for the calendar year 1968, 1969, or 1970, or $15,000 for any calendar year after 1970".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (a)(3)(A), and the amendments made by subsection (b) (except paragraph (1) thereof), shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 1967. The amendments made by subsections (a)(2), (a)(3)(B), and (b)(1) shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after 1967. The amendment made by subsection (a)(4) shall apply only with respect to calendar years after 1967.

CHANGES IN TAX SCHEDULES

SEC. 7. (a) Section 1401(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax under the Self-Employment Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there shall be imposed for each taxable year, on the self-employment income of every individual, a tax as follows:

"(1) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1965, and before January 1, 1967, the tax shall be equal to 0.35 percent of the amendment of the self-employment income for such taxable year; and

"(2) in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1966, the tax shall be equal to 0.50 percent of the amount of the self-employment income for such taxable year.

For purposes of the tax imposed by this subsection, the exclusion of employee representatives by section 1402(c)(3) shall not apply."

(b) Section 3101 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on employees under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3101. RATE OF TAX.

"(a) OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE.—In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) received by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b))—

"(1) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1967, the rate shall be 4.2 percent; and

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1968 and 1969, the rate shall be 4.5 percent; and

"(3) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1969, the rate shall be 5.0 percent.

"(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there is hereby imposed on the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) received by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b), but without regard to the provisions of paragraph (9) thereof insofar as it relates to employees)—

"(1) with respect to wages received during the calendar year 1966, the rate shall be 0.35 percent; and

"(2) with respect to wages received after December 31, 1966, the rate shall be 0.50 percent."

(c) Section 3111 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rate of tax on employers under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3111. RATE OF TAX.

"(a) OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE.—In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 3121(a)) paid by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b))—

"(1) with respect to wages paid during the calendar year 1967, the rate shall be 4.2 percent; and

"(2) with respect to wages received during the calendar years 1968 and 1969, the rate shall be 4.5 percent; and

"(3) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1969, the rate shall be 5.0 percent.

"(b) HOSPITAL INSURANCE.—In addition to the tax imposed by the preceding subsection, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to the following percentages of the wages (as defined in section 312(a)) paid by him with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b), but without regard to the provisions of paragraph (9) thereof insofar as it relates to employees)—

"(1) with respect to wages paid during the calendar year 1966, the rate shall be 0.35 percent; and

"(2) with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1966, the rate shall be 0.50 percent."

(d) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966. The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid after December 31, 1966.

INCREASE IN BENEFIT PAYMENTS

SEC. 8. (a) Effective with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after 1967 and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such title in case of deaths occurring after such year, section 215(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following.

"TABLE FOR DETERMINING PRIMARY INSURANCE AMOUNT AND MAXIMUM FAMILY BENEFITS

| "I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified) | | II (Primary insurance amount under 1965 Act, as modified) | III (Average monthly wage) | | IV (Primary insurance amount) | V (Maximum family benefits) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is— | | Or his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsec. (c)) is— | Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is— | | The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be— | And the maximum amount of benefits payable (as provided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self-employment income shall be— |
| At least— | But not more than— | | At least— | But not more than— | | |
| ------ | $22.68 | [1] $59.00 | --- | $94 | $90.00 | $135.00 |
| $22.69 | 23.08 | 60.00 | $95 | 96 | 90.60 | 135.90 |
| 23.09 | 23.44 | 61.00 | 97 | 97 | 91.50 | 137.30 |
| 23.45 | 23.76 | 62.10 | 98 | 99 | 93.40 | 140.10 |
| 23.77 | 24.20 | 63.20 | 100 | 101 | 95.30 | 143.00 |
| 24.21 | 24.60 | 64.20 | 102 | 102 | 96.20 | 144.30 |
| 24.61 | 25.00 | 65.30 | 103 | 104 | 98.10 | 147.20 |
| 25.01 | 25.48 | 66.40 | 105 | 106 | 100.00 | 150.00 |
| 25.49 | 25.92 | 67.50 | 107 | 107 | 100.40 | 150.60 |
| 25.93 | 26.40 | 68.50 | 108 | 109 | 101.10 | 151.70 |
| 26.41 | 26.94 | 69.60 | 110 | 113 | 102.60 | 153.90 |
| 26.95 | 27.46 | 70.70 | 114 | 118 | 104.40 | 156.60 |
| 27.47 | 28.00 | 71.70 | 119 | 122 | 105.80 | 158.70 |
| 28.01 | 28.68 | 72.80 | 123 | 127 | 107.70 | 161.60 |
| 28.69 | 29.25 | 73.90 | 128 | 132 | 109.50 | 164.30 |
| 29.26 | 29.68 | 74.90 | 133 | 136 | 111.00 | 166.50 |
| 29.69 | 30.36 | 76.00 | 137 | 141 | 112.80 | 169.20 |
| 30.37 | 30.92 | 77.10 | 142 | 146 | 114.60 | 171.90 |
| 30.93 | 31.36 | 78.20 | 147 | 150 | 116.10 | 174.20 |
| 31.37 | 32.00 | 79.20 | 151 | 155 | 117.90 | 176.90 |
| 32.01 | 32.60 | 80.30 | 156 | 160 | 119.70 | 179.60 |
| 32.61 | 33.20 | 81.40 | 161 | 164 | 121.20 | 181.80 |
| 33.21 | 33.88 | 82.40 | 165 | 169 | 123.00 | 184.50 |
| 33.89 | 34.50 | 83.50 | 170 | 174 | 124.80 | 187.20 |
| 34.51 | 35.00 | 84.60 | 175 | 178 | 126.30 | 189.50 |
| 35.01 | 35.80 | 85.60 | 179 | 183 | 128.10 | 192.20 |
| 35.81 | 36.40 | 86.70 | 184 | 188 | 129.90 | 194.90 |
| 36.41 | 37.08 | 87.80 | 189 | 193 | 131.80 | 197.70 |
| 37.09 | 37.60 | 88.90 | 194 | 197 | 133.20 | 199.80 |
| 37.61 | 38.20 | 89.90 | 198 | 202 | 135.00 | 202.50 |
| 38.21 | 39.12 | 91.00 | 203 | 207 | 136.90 | 205.40 |
| 39.13 | 39.68 | 92.10 | 208 | 211 | 138.30 | 207.50 |
| 39.69 | 40.33 | 93.10 | 212 | 216 | 140.20 | 210.30 |
| 40.34 | 41.12 | 94.20 | 217 | 221 | 142.00 | 213.00 |
| 41.13 | 41.76 | 95.30 | 222 | 225 | 143.40 | 215.10 |
| 41.77 | 42.44 | 96.30 | 226 | 230 | 145.30 | 218.00 |
| 42.45 | 43.20 | 97.40 | 231 | 235 | 147.10 | 220.70 |
| 43.21 | 43.76 | 98.50 | 236 | 239 | 148.60 | 222.90 |
| 43.77 | 44.44 | 99.60 | 240 | 244 | 150.40 | 225.60 |
| 44.45 | 44.88 | 100.60 | 245 | 249 | 152.20 | 228.30 |
| 44.89 | 45.60 | 101.70 | 250 | 253 | 153.40 | 230.10 |
| | | 102.80 | 254 | 258 | 154.70 | 232.10 |
| | | 103.80 | 259 | 263 | 156.00 | 234.00 |
| | | 104.90 | 264 | 267 | 157.00 | 235.50 |
| | | 106.00 | 268 | 272 | 158.30 | 237.50 |
| | | 107.00 | 273 | 277 | 159.60 | 239.40 |
| | | 108.10 | 278 | 281 | 160.70 | 240.10 |
| | | 109.20 | 282 | 286 | 162.00 | 243.00 |
| | | 110.30 | 287 | 291 | 163.30 | 245.00 |
| | | 111.30 | 292 | 295 | 164.30 | 246.50 |
| | | 112.40 | 296 | 300 | 165.60 | 248.40 |
| | | 113.50 | 301 | 305 | 166.90 | 250.40 |
| | | 114.50 | 306 | 309 | 168.00 | 252.00 |
| | | 115.60 | 310 | 314 | 169.30 | 254.00 |
| | | 116.70 | 315 | 319 | 170.60 | 255.90 |
| | | 117.70 | 320 | 323 | 171.60 | 258.40 |
| | | 118.80 | 324 | 328 | 172.90 | 262.40 |
| | | 119.90 | 329 | 333 | 174.20 | 266.40 |
| | | 121.00 | 334 | 337 | 175.30 | 269.60 |
| | | 122.00 | 338 | 342 | 176.60 | 273.60 |
| | | 123.10 | 343 | 347 | 177.90 | 277.60 |
| | | 124.20 | 348 | 351 | 178.90 | 280.80 |
| | | 125.20 | 352 | 356 | 180.20 | 284.80 |
| | | 126.30 | 357 | 361 | 181.50 | 288.80 |
| | | 127.40 | 362 | 365 | 182.60 | 292.00 |
| | | 128.40 | 366 | 370 | 183.90 | 296.00 |
| | | 129.50 | 371 | 375 | 185.20 | 300.00 |
| | | 130.60 | 376 | 379 | 186.20 | 303.20 |
| | | 131.70 | 380 | 384 | 187.50 | 307.20 |
| | | 132.70 | 385 | 389 | 188.80 | 311.20 |
| | | 133.80 | 390 | 393 | 189.90 | 314.40 |
| | | 134.90 | 394 | 398 | 191.20 | 318.40 |
| | | 135.90 | 399 | 403 | 192.50 | 322.40 |
| | | 137.00 | 404 | 407 | 193.50 | 325.60 |
| | | 138.00 | 408 | 412 | 194.80 | 329.60 |
| | | 139.00 | 413 | 417 | 196.20 | 333.60 |
| | | 140.00 | 418 | 421 | 197.20 | 336.80 |
| | | 141.00 | 422 | 426 | 198.50 | 340.80 |
| | | 142.00 | 427 | 431 | 199.80 | 344.80 |
| | | 143.00 | 432 | 436 | 201.10 | 348.80 |
| | | 144.00 | 437 | 440 | 202.20 | 352.00 |
| | | 145.00 | 441 | 445 | 203.50 | 356.00 |
| | | 146.00 | 446 | 450 | 204.80 | 360.00 |

| "I (Primary insurance benefit under 1939 Act, as modified) | | II (Primary insurance amount under 1965 Act, as modified) | III (Average monthly wage) | | IV (Primary insurance amount) | V (Maximum family benefits) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| If an individual's primary insurance benefit (as determined under subsec. (d)) is— | | Or his primary insurance amount (as determined under subsec. (c)) is— | Or his average monthly wage (as determined under subsec. (b)) is— | | The amount referred to in the preceding paragraphs of this subsection shall be— | And the maximum amount of benefits payable (as provided in sec. 203(a)) on the basis of his wages and self-employment income shall be— |
| At least— | But not more than— | | At least— | But not more than— | | |
| | | $147.00 | $251 | $454 | $205.80 | $363.20 |
| | | 148.00 | 455 | 459 | 207.10 | 367.20 |
| | | 149.00 | 460 | 464 | 208.40 | 371.20 |
| | | 150.00 | 465 | 468 | 209.50 | 374.40 |
| | | 151.00 | 469 | 473 | 210.80 | 378.40 |
| | | 152.00 | 474 | 478 | 212.10 | 382.40 |
| | | 153.00 | 479 | 482 | 213.10 | 385.60 |
| | | 154.00 | 483 | 487 | 214.40 | 389.60 |
| | | 155.00 | 488 | 492 | 215.70 | 393.60 |
| | | 156.00 | 493 | 496 | 216.80 | 396.80 |
| | | 157.00 | 497 | 501 | 218.10 | 400.80 |
| | | 158.00 | 502 | 506 | 219.40 | 404.80 |
| | | 159.00 | 507 | 510 | 220.40 | 408.00 |
| | | 160.00 | 511 | 515 | 221.70 | 412.00 |
| | | 161.00 | 516 | 520 | 223.00 | 416.00 |
| | | 162.00 | 521 | 524 | 224.10 | 419.20 |
| | | 163.00 | 525 | 529 | 225.40 | 423.20 |
| | | 164.00 | 530 | 534 | 226.70 | 427.20 |
| | | 165.00 | 535 | 538 | 227.70 | 430.40 |
| | | 166.00 | 539 | 543 | 229.00 | 434.40 |
| | | 167.00 | 544 | 548 | 230.30 | 438.40 |
| | | 168.00 | 549 | 552 | 231.30 | 441.60 |
| | | | 553 | 557 | 233.00 | 445.60 |
| | | | 558 | 562 | 234.00 | 447.60 |
| | | | 563 | 566 | 235.00 | 449.20 |
| | | | 567 | 571 | 236.00 | 451.20 |
| | | | 572 | 576 | 237.00 | 453.20 |
| | | | 577 | 580 | 238.00 | 454.80 |
| | | | 581 | 585 | 239.00 | 456.80 |
| | | | 586 | 590 | 240.00 | 458.80 |
| | | | 591 | 594 | 241.00 | 460.40 |
| | | | 595 | 599 | 242.00 | 462.40 |
| | | | 600 | 604 | 243.00 | 464.40 |
| | | | 605 | 608 | 244.00 | 466.00 |
| | | | 609 | 613 | 245.00 | 468.00 |
| | | | 614 | 618 | 246.00 | 470.00 |
| | | | 619 | 622 | 247.00 | 471.60 |
| | | | 623 | 627 | 248.00 | 473.60 |
| | | | 628 | 632 | 249.00 | 475.60 |
| | | | 633 | 636 | 250.00 | 477.20 |
| | | | 637 | 641 | 251.00 | 479.20 |
| | | | 642 | 646 | 252.00 | 481.20 |
| | | | 647 | 650 | 253.00 | 482.80 |
| | | | 651 | 655 | 254.00 | 484.80 |
| | | | 656 | 660 | 255.00 | 486.80 |
| | | | 661 | 664 | 256.00 | 488.40 |
| | | | 665 | 669 | 257.00 | 490.40 |
| | | | 670 | 674 | 258.00 | 492.40 |
| | | | 675 | 678 | 259.00 | 494.00 |
| | | | 679 | 683 | 260.00 | 496.00 |
| | | | 684 | 688 | 261.00 | 498.00 |
| | | | 689 | 693 | 262.00 | 500.00 |
| | | | 694 | 697 | 263.00 | 501.60 |
| | | | 698 | 702 | 264.00 | 503.60 |
| | | | 703 | 707 | 265.00 | 505.60 |
| | | | 708 | 711 | 266.00 | 507.20 |
| | | | 712 | 716 | 267.00 | 509.20 |
| | | | 717 | 721 | 268.00 | 511.20 |
| | | | 722 | 725 | 269.00 | 512.80 |
| | | | 726 | 730 | 270.00 | 514.80 |
| | | | 731 | 735 | 271.00 | 516.80 |
| | | | 736 | 739 | 272.00 | 518.40 |
| | | | 740 | 744 | 273.00 | 520.40 |
| | | | 745 | 749 | 274.00 | 522.40 |
| | | | 750 | 753 | 275.00 | 524.00 |
| | | | 754 | 758 | 276.00 | 526.00 |
| | | | 759 | 763 | 277.00 | 528.00 |
| | | | 764 | 767 | 278.00 | 529.60 |
| | | | 768 | 772 | 279.00 | 531.60 |
| | | | 773 | 777 | 280.00 | 533.60 |
| | | | 778 | 781 | 281.00 | 535.20 |
| | | | 782 | 786 | 282.00 | 537.20 |
| | | | 787 | 791 | 283.00 | 539.20 |
| | | | 792 | 795 | 284.00 | 540.80 |
| | | | 796 | 800 | 285.00 | 542.80 |
| | | | 801 | 805 | 286.00 | 544.80 |
| | | | 806 | 809 | 287.00 | 546.40 |
| | | | 810 | 814 | 288.00 | 548.40 |
| | | | 815 | 819 | 289.00 | 550.40 |
| | | | 820 | 823 | 290.00 | 552.00 |
| | | | 824 | 828 | 291.00 | 544.00 |
| | | | 829 | 833 | 292.00 | 556.00" |

[1] Or less.

(b) Effective with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after 1970 and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after such year, the table in section 215(a) of such Act (as amended by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by striking out all figures in columns III, IV, and V beginning with the line which reads:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | "558 | 562 | 234.00 | 447.60" |

and down through the line which reads:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ---------- | "829 | 833 | 292.00 | 556.00" |

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | "558 | 562 | 234.00 | 449.60 |
| | 563 | 566 | 235.00 | 452.80 |
| | 567 | 571 | 236.00 | 456.80 |
| | 572 | 576 | 237.00 | 460.80 |
| | 570 | 580 | 238.00 | 464.00 |
| | 581 | 585 | 239.00 | 468.00 |
| | 586 | 590 | 240.00 | 472.00 |
| | 591 | 594 | 241.00 | 475.20 |
| | 594 | 599 | 242.00 | 479.20 |
| | 600 | 604 | 243.00 | 483.20 |
| | 605 | 608 | 244.00 | 486.40 |
| | 609 | 613 | 245.00 | 490.40 |
| | 614 | 618 | 246.00 | 494.40 |
| | 619 | 622 | 247.00 | 497.60 |
| | 623 | 627 | 248.00 | 501.60 |
| | 628 | 632 | 249.00 | 505.60 |
| | 633 | 636 | 250.00 | 508.80 |
| | 637 | 641 | 251.00 | 512.80 |
| | 642 | 646 | 252.00 | 516.80 |
| | 647 | 650 | 253.00 | 520.00 |
| | 651 | 655 | 254.00 | 524.00 |
| | 656 | 660 | 255.00 | 528.00 |
| | 661 | 664 | 256.00 | 531.20 |
| | 665 | 669 | 257.00 | 535.20 |
| | 670 | 674 | 258.00 | 539.20 |
| | 675 | 678 | 259.00 | 542.40 |
| | 679 | 683 | 260.00 | 546.40 |
| | 684 | 688 | 261.00 | 550.40 |
| | 689 | 693 | 262.00 | 554.40 |
| | 694 | 697 | 263.00 | 557.60 |
| | 698 | 702 | 264.00 | 561.60 |
| | 703 | 707 | 265.00 | 565.60 |
| | 708 | 711 | 266.00 | 568.80 |
| | 712 | 716 | 267.00 | 572.80 |
| | 717 | 721 | 268.00 | 576.80 |
| | 722 | 725 | 269.00 | 580.00 |
| | 726 | 730 | 270.00 | 584.00 |
| | 731 | 735 | 271.00 | 588.00 |
| | 736 | 739 | 272.00 | 591.20 |
| | 740 | 744 | 273.00 | 595.20 |
| | 745 | 749 | 274.00 | 599.20 |
| | 750 | 753 | 275.00 | 602.40 |
| | 754 | 758 | 276.00 | 606.40 |
| | 759 | 763 | 277.00 | 610.40 |
| | 764 | 767 | 278.00 | 613.60 |
| | 768 | 772 | 279.00 | 617.60 |
| | 773 | 777 | 280.00 | 621.60 |
| | 778 | 781 | 281.00 | 624.80 |
| | 782 | 786 | 282.00 | 628.80 |
| | 787 | 791 | 283.00 | 632.80 |
| | 792 | 795 | 284.00 | 636.00 |
| | 796 | 800 | 285.00 | 640.00 |
| | 801 | 805 | 286.00 | 644.00 |
| | 806 | 809 | 287.00 | 647.20 |
| | 810 | 814 | 288.00 | 651.20 |
| | 815 | 819 | 289.00 | 655.20 |
| | 820 | 823 | 290.00 | 658.40 |
| | 824 | 828 | 291.00 | 662.40 |
| | 829 | 833 | 292.00 | 666.40 |
| | 834 | 837 | 293.00 | 668.00 |
| | 838 | 842 | 294.00 | 670.00 |
| | 843 | 847 | 295.00 | 672.00 |
| | 848 | 851 | 296.00 | 673.60 |
| | 852 | 856 | 297.00 | 675.60 |
| | 857 | 861 | 298.00 | 677.60 |
| | 862 | 865 | 299.00 | 697.20 |
| | 866 | 870 | 300.00 | 681.20 |
| | 871 | 875 | 301.00 | 683.20 |
| | 876 | 879 | 302.00 | 684.80 |
| | 880 | 884 | 303.00 | 686.80 |
| | 885 | 889 | 304.00 | 688.08 |
| | 890 | 893 | 305.00 | 690.40 |
| | 894 | 898 | 306.00 | 692.40 |
| | 899 | 903 | 307.00 | 694.40 |
| | 904 | 907 | 308.00 | 696.00 |
| | 908 | 912 | 309.00 | 698.00 |
| | 913 | 917 | 310.00 | 700.00 |
| | 918 | 921 | 311.00 | 701.60 |
| | 922 | 926 | 312.00 | 703.60 |
| | 927 | 931 | 313.00 | 705.60 |
| | 932 | 936 | 314.00 | 707.60 |
| | 937 | 940 | 315.00 | 709.20 |
| | 941 | 945 | 316.00 | 711.20 |
| | 946 | 950 | 317.00 | 713.20 |
| | 951 | 954 | 318.00 | 714.80 |
| | 955 | 959 | 319.00 | 716.80 |
| | 960 | 964 | 320.00 | 718.80 |
| | 965 | 968 | 321.00 | 720.40 |
| | 969 | 973 | 322.00 | 722.40 |
| | 974 | 978 | 323.00 | 724.40 |
| | 979 | 982 | 324.00 | 726.00 |
| | 983 | 987 | 325.00 | 728.00 |
| | 988 | 992 | 326.00 | 730.00 |
| | 993 | 996 | 327.00 | 731.60 |
| | 997 | 1,001 | 328.00 | 733.60 |
| | 1,002 | 1,006 | 329.00 | 735.60 |
| | 1,007 | 1,010 | 330.00 | 737.20 |
| | 1,011 | 1,015 | 331.00 | 739.20 |
| | 1,016 | 1,020 | 332.00 | 741.20 |
| | 1,021 | 1,024 | 333.00 | 742.80 |
| | 1,025 | 1,029 | 334.00 | 744.80 |
| | 1,030 | 1,034 | 335.00 | 746.80 |
| | 1,035 | 1,038 | 336.00 | 748.40 |
| | 1,039 | 1,043 | 337.00 | 750.40 |
| | 1,044 | 1,048 | 338.00 | 752.40 |
| | 1,049 | 1,052 | 339.00 | 754.00 |
| | 1,053 | 1,057 | 340.00 | 756.00 |
| | 1,058 | 1,062 | 341.00 | 758.00 |
| | 1,063 | 1,066 | 342.00 | 759.60 |
| | 1,067 | 1,071 | 343.00 | 761.60 |
| | 1,072 | 1,076 | 344.00 | 763.60 |
| | 1,077 | 1,080 | 345.00 | 765.20 |
| | 1,081 | 1,085 | 346.00 | 767.20 |
| | 1,086 | 1,090 | 347.00 | 769.20 |
| | 1,091 | 1,094 | 348.00 | 770.80 |
| | 1,095 | 1,099 | 349.00 | 772.80 |
| | 1,100 | 1,104 | 350.00 | 774.80 |
| | 1,105 | 1,108 | 351.00 | 776.40 |
| | 1,109 | 1,113 | 352.00 | 778.40 |
| | 1,114 | 1,118 | 353.00 | 780.40 |
| | 1,119 | 1,122 | 354.00 | 782.00 |
| | 1,123 | 1,127 | 355.00 | 784.00 |
| | 1,128 | 1,132 | 356.00 | 786.00 |
| | 1,133 | 1,136 | 357.00 | 787.60 |
| | 1,137 | 1,141 | 358.00 | 789.60 |
| | 1,142 | 1,146 | 359.00 | 791.60 |
| | 1,147 | 1,150 | 360.00 | 793.20 |
| | 1,151 | 1,155 | 361.00 | 795.20 |
| | 1,156 | 1,160 | 362.00 | 797.20 |
| | 1,161 | 1,164 | 363.00 | 798.80 |
| | 1,165 | 1,169 | 364.00 | 800.80 |
| | 1,170 | 1,174 | 365.00 | 802.80 |
| | 1,175 | 1,178 | 366.00 | 804.40 |
| | 1,179 | 1,183 | 367.00 | 806.40 |
| | 1,184 | 1,188 | 268.00 | 808.40 |
| | 1,189 | 1,193 | 369.00 | 810.40 |
| | 1,194 | 1,197 | 370.00 | 812.00 |
| | 1,198 | 1,202 | 371.00 | 814.00 |
| | 1,203 | 1,207 | 372.00 | 816.00 |
| | 1,208 | 1,211 | 373.00 | 817.60 |
| | 1,212 | 1,216 | 374.00 | 819.60 |
| | 1,217 | 1,221 | 375.00 | 821.60 |
| | 1,222 | 1,225 | 376.00 | 823.20 |
| | 1,226 | 1,230 | 377.00 | 825.20 |
| | 1,231 | 1,235 | 378.00 | 827.20 |
| | 1,236 | 1,239 | 379.00 | 828.80 |
| | 1,240 | 1,244 | 380.00 | 830.80 |
| | 1,245 | 1,249 | 381.00 | 832.80 |
| | 1,250 | 1,250 | 382.00 | 833.20" |

The tables, summary, and study, presented by Mr. KENNEDY of New York, are as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

The proposal of Senator KENNEDY of New York to revise Social Security benefits and to adopt a system of partial general revenue financing of Social Security contains the following basic provisions:

I. BENEFITS

A. Effective January 1, 1968, the bill increases retirement benefits by an average of about 50 percent.

B. The minimum monthly benefit payable is raised from the present $44 to $90, effective January 1, 1968. This means that all those whose lifetime wages have averaged $95 a month or less will receive $90 in benefits, or $135 a month if there is a wife who is 65 and therefore qualifies for marital benefits. Thus, for many, benefits will be more than doubled.

C. Persons whose lifetime earnings averaged from $95 a month to $250 a month ($3,000 a year) will receive a 50 percent increase in benefits. Thus, a person who earned $200 a month in his working life, formerly the recipient of $90 a month, will now receive $135 a month in benefits (about ⅔ of his average wages) and $202.50 (slightly more than his average wages) if his wife qualifies for marital benefits. The man who earned $3,000 a year ($250 a month), who formerly received $1220 a year, will receive $1840.80 which is over 60 percent of his previous average wage. If his wife qualifies for marital benefits, their total benefit will be $2671 a year, or 92 percent of his average lifetime wages.

D. The increase in benefits will be slightly less for people whose earnings were higher during their lifetimes.

1. The man who earned $4,000 a year during his life will receive a 45 percent increase in benefits. His annual benefits will be increased from $1440 to $2090, or over 50 percent of what he earned during his life. If his wife qualifies for marital benefits, they will receive over $3100 as a family, or about 75 percent of his earnings as a worker.

2. The man who earned $5000 a year ($425 a month) during his lifetime will receive a 40 percent increase in benefits, from $141 a month to $198.50 a month, or $2,384 a year. If his wife qualifies for marital benefits, they will receive almost $3600.

3. The man who earned $6000 a year ($500 a month) during his lifetime will receive an increase of just under 40 percent, from $157 a month to $218.10 a month, or $2617 a year.

If his wife qualifies for marital benefits, they will receive $3925 annually.

E. The bill will raise a widow's benefits from the present level of 82½ percent of the deceased husband's benefits to 100 percent.

F. The bill provides for a cost of living increase in benefits. Each time a consumer price index rises by 1 percent, benefits will go up 1 percent automatically.

G. The bill provides an alternative method of computing benefits which will increase the monthly pension check of millions of beneficiaries. Benefits are now computed on the basis of a man's average monthly wage throughout his working lifetime, less a few of his worst years. The alternative method which the bill provides would base benefits on a man's average monthly earnings during his ten highest consecutive years of working, so that benefits will more realistically be tied to a man's productivity during his prime working life.

II. FINANCING

A. The payroll tax will be increased from its present level of 3.85 percent (exclusive of Medicare) to 5 percent each on the employer and the employee in a series of step increases during the coming years.

B. The earnings and benefits base will be raised to $10,000 in 1968, and $15,000 in 1971.

C. In addition, benefits will for the first time be financed partly out of general tax revenues. The bill provides a formula whereby an amount equal to ⅔ of 1 percent of the payroll tax base (about $2 billion at present—the payroll tax base is about $300 billion now) will be contributed out of general revenues beginning in fiscal 1969. A like percentage will be added cumulatively each year, so that at the end of nine years, an amount equal to 6 percent of the payroll tax base will be contributed out of general revenues. Thus, by 1977 the Social Security system will be financed about 35 percent out of general revenues.

D. The Social Security Administration has examined the program and states that it is actuarially sound.

---

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION STATEMENT AND TABLES ON SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY'S LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL ON SOCIAL SECURITY

A table comparing the level cost of the present social security program and that of the proposed program is enclosed. As the table shows, the proposed old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has an actuarial imbalance of —0.02 percent of covered payroll (as compared with —0.07 percent under present law). An imbalance of as much as 0.10 percent of payroll is recognized as being within allowable limits of actuarial soundness under present law; a larger imbalance would of course be possible under the proposed expansion of the program. The increase in the earnings base under the proposed program will offset the reduction in the tax rates for hospital insurance. The proposed program as a whole is in close actuarial balance.

There would be, under the proposal, a decline in the funds of about $3½ billion in 1968 and a smaller decline in 1969. These excesses of outgo over income occur, of course, because the full effects of the provisions for increased income to the program are not felt immediately, while the substantial increases in benefits are immediaately effective. Such temporary declines in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds are not, then, significant in terms of the financial soundness of the program over the long run. It is estimated that beginning in 1970 the income to the program will exceed the costs under the bill. (A similar situation occurred in relation to the 1965 social security amendments, where, because the benefit increase was retroactive to January 1965 and the increased taxes did not go into effect until 1966, expenditures in 1965 exceeded income by about $2 billion.)

Of the income to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds in calendar year 1968, about $13¾ billion would come from employers, a like amount from employees, and only $¾ billion from the Government contribution.

With regard to the effect of the benefit increase under the proposed program, it is estimated that as of December 31, 1967, the average benefit for a retired worker with no dependents getting benefits would be $127 (as compared with an estimated $82 under present law). For a retired worker and aged wife both getting benefits, the average benefit would be $214 (as compared with an estimated $144 under present law).

*Cost and income of present and proposed OASDI program and HI program as a percentage of covered payroll*

| | |
|---|---|
| OASDI | |
| Level cost of present program | 9.49 |
| Level cost of proposed program | 15.21 |
| Income of present program | 9.42 |
| Income of proposed program | 15.19 |
| Balance of present program | —.07 |
| Balance of proposed program | —.02 |
| HI | |
| Level cost of present program | 1.26 |
| Level cost of proposed program | .95 |
| Income of present program | 1.23 |
| Income of proposed program | 1.00 |
| Balance of present program | —.03 |
| Balance of proposed program | +.05 |

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to become a cosponsor of the important and significant proposal, relating to social security, just introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New York. For many years now I have come to the well to protest the inadequacy of the current level of social security benefits. Literally millions of older Americans are now asked to survive on social security checks which will not buy the bare essentials of life.

Where, in this great Nation, can an elderly person find food, clothing, and lodging for $44 a month? Where can he find the necessities of life for his wife for $22 a month?

It is one of the greatest tragedies of this century that billions of dollars have been spent to put a man on the moon, while a needy old person has been denied additional pennies a day for sustenance in his twilight years.

Mr. President, we are now engaged in fighting a war on poverty. The sergeants and the generals of this war have sent the troops to many battlefields while in the living rooms of older people across this land the enemy has taken its toll in misery, disease, and destitution.

As my colleagues are well aware, I came to the floor earlier this year to ask for $1.45 per day for all those age 70 and above who were not eligible for social security. On that day, older Americans won a victory in the Senate. Later, at the insistence of the administration, this paltry amount was reduced for some and entirely taken away from others. I vowed then to return to the floor until equity and justice was done to the millions of older Americans who had been denied social security. I now reaffirm that pledge and support the principles embodied in the Kennedy bill as a meaningful and necessary step to provide dignity and decency for many older Americans.

However, I must be candid with my friend the distinguished junior Senator from New York. While I view his bill as an admirable statement of resolution to fight poverty among the elderly poor, I feel that portions of the bill serve to dilute those very objectives.

Last year I proposed an amendment to the Social Security Act Amendments of 1965 which would have established a social security benefit floor of $70. That amendment provided for financing of the new benefit level out of general revenues. Senator KENNEDY proposes to finance his new level of benefits by a 2.3-percent increase in social security contributions, 1.15 percent to be borne by the employee, 1.15 percent to be borne by the employer.

It was my feeling in 1965, and it is my feeling today, that future increases in social security must be financed out of the general revenues of the Treasury. We have reached the point of maximum saturation in contribution levels.

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1965 provided for increases in the contribution rate which by 1973 will equal 0.55 percent for medicare and 1 percent for OASDI benefits. Senator KENNEDY proposes to add an additional 1.5-percent increase for a total tax rate increase on the employee of 2.70 percent. In other words, Mr. President, a wage earner with income in the lower brackets will see his social security contribution rate go from 3.85 percent of payroll to 6.55 percent of payroll, a 41-percent increase in a few short years.

What does this mean to the impoverished family man with $2,000 per year in wages? In 1965, $77 was deducted from his pay for social security. By 1973 this amount will have jumped to $131.

I, for one, Mr. President, can find little justification in financing social security benefit increases with a 41-percent tax increase on those already poverty stricken. Financing the program out of general revenues would mean that no additional tax burden would be imposed on those unable to afford contributions toward the new benefits.

If general revenue financing is not acceptable, then I would recommend that Congress turn its attention to establishing a progressive social security tax contribution rate, a kind of miniature income tax. Until it is demonstrated that general revenue financing would not work, I shall continue to found all of my proposals for increased benefit levels in a program of general revenue funding.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from New York on his boldness and I assure him that while I have reservations as to his financing proposal, I will support every effort to obtain enactment of a meaningful program of social security benefit increases.

---

## EXTENDED MILK PRICE SUPPORT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the current $4-per-hundredweight support price for milk for

3 years. Joining me in sponsoring the legislation are Senators CARLSON, EASTLAND, JACKSON, MONDALE, MORSE, MUNDT, NELSON, PROXMIRE, YOUNG of North Dakota, and HART.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3662) to establish a price support level for milk, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446), as amended, is further amended by striking out the second sentence thereof and inserting the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions for the period beginning April 1, 1967, and ending March 31, 1970, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes shall be supported at not less than $4.00 per hundredweight."

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on July 5, in response to the continuing decline in milk production, with large numbers of dairy farmers going out of business, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, increased the support price for dairy products from $3.50 per hundredweight to $4 for the balance of the marketing year ending March 30, 1967.

I commended the Secretary of Agriculture on taking this much-needed action to encourage our dairy farmers to continue to produce nature's most perfect food.

However, Mr. President, milk production continues below last year's levels. Milk production fell below the same month of the previous year in April 1965, and declining milk production rates have now persisted for 16 straight months. In June 1966, it was 3 percent below last year, although our population now stands at some 3 million more than last year. The Commodity Credit Corporation has no inventory of butter or cheese and little nonfat dry milk with which to meet various distribution needs here and abroad.

If the decline in milk production is to be halted, dairy farmers must have assurance that price supports would not decline in a few months. The bill I have just introduced gives dairy farmers this assurance. They can invest in additional milk cows, or rebuild liquidated herds, with the knowledge that for 3 marketing years the current $4 price support will be maintained.

The bill does not involve any increase in price to consumers; indeed, it may avoid excessive rises due to shortages.

The 3-year extension will provide farmers the basis for sound management plans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 1 week in order that other Senators who wish may join in sponsoring the legislation.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to inform the Senator from South Dakota that I am proud and happy to be a cosponsor of what I believe is excellent legislation.

Mr. President, the idea of providing for a price support only for 1 year may have been adequate in the past, but it is clear that it is not adequate and cannot be adequate for dairy products under present circumstances.

The expressed purpose of price supports for dairy products is to insure an adequate supply. A 1-year price support cannot do this. As the Senator from South Dakota has said, there has been an alarming, a sharp, and a dramatic cutback in the production of milk over the past 6 or 8 years. The situation is shocking in my State, which is known throughout the country as the No. 1 dairy State. Production has dropped, very sharply. This has been true all over the country, in virtually every State.

As the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, this drop has been dramatic over the past year. We now have a situation where we are producing less milk than we did 26 years ago, when the population of the country was about two-thirds the size it is now.

Clearly, we will not have enough milk to meet the needs of our children and adults unless the kind of legislation which the Senator from South Dakota is proposing is enacted. The proposed legislation gives the farmer an opportunity to have full assurance of the kind of income he can expect in 1968, 1969, and 1970. Unless he can have that assurance, he will get out of dairy and into beef, or he will get out of dairy entirely, off the farm, and into a factory, where he can make more money.

In our dairy State, according to the Department of Agriculture statistics, in the areas that are most prosperous, the average farmer is netting an income of 88 cents an hour, and in the less prosperous parts of our State he is earning 30 cents an hour.

These are shocking figures, at a time when the minimum wage is $1.25, and it is expected to be $1.60 in the next year or two or three.

This shows why families are getting off the dairy farm. Unless we can have the kind of legislation that the Senator from South Dakota has introduced, we will not have the quantity of milk that we must have.

Mr. McGOVERN. As the Senator knows, the Committee on Agriculture is preparing legislation, which will be sent to the floor, providing for a sizable expansion in our food-for-peace programs. As the Senator knows, an important part of the food-for-peace package is dairy products.

So that there will be an urgent need not only to meet our commitments at home, but also the expanded needs abroad for dairy products. That is one of the reasons why I believe we need to safeguard our herds and stop the alarming liquidation of dairy herds in the Senator's State and in other dairy States all over the country.

I especially appreciate the continued leadership of the Senator and his support of this important program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

---

## AMENDMENT OF SECTION 175 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 175 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to permit farmers to elect whether they wish to charge tile drainage installations to annual expenses or to depreciate such work.

Mr. President, more and more farms in my State are being plagued with rising saline water tables. When such occurs, degradation of the land as well as the lowering of crop production results. To meet this problem, farmers have experimented with various methods. A most important method has been the installation of tile drains. These drains by underwater diversion remove surface and subsurface salts created by the rising saline water tables. Use of these tile drains is a most important conservation measure.

Approximately 300 miles of tile drains have been installed in Fresno, Kings, and Merced Counties in my State, and the use of tile drains is expected to increase fivefold in the next 10 years.

Mr. President, tile drains help to restore the productivity of the land and, in my judgment, they represent a soil conservation technique that should be encouraged. My amendment, by giving the farmer the choice of electing whether to expense or capitalize, would greatly encourage farmers to install tile drains to restore the productivity of their farmlands.

I hope the Senate Finance Committee will give expeditious consideration to this bill, which means a great deal to the farmers of my State and elsewhere.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3669) to amend section 175 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include expenditures for the installation of tile drains as soil and water conservation expenditures which may be deducted under such section, introduced by Mr. MURPHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

---

## EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX INTEREST ON OBLIGATIONS ISSUED BY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax interest on obligations issued by colleges and universities which will be used for capital improvement or expansion.

More Americans are seeking a college education today than ever before in our Nation's history. This reflects not only our growing population, but the fact that in our society which is growing ever more

complex, advance training becomes more and more essential.

The demand for student space in our colleges and universities has resulted in a great expansion of facilities, but demand has already far exceeded supply. Neither the tax-assisted State institutions nor the private colleges have sufficient resources to build and improve quickly enough.

In 1955, there were 2,260,000 college students working toward degrees. Today, there are 5,526,000 college students working toward college degrees. In 1970, there will be over 7,225,000. By 1974, college enrollments will top 8½ million.

These increased enrollment figures mean that all our colleges and universities, public and private alike, must continue to expand their facilities.

But what exactly does this tidal wave of students mean in construction costs? The Office of Education has estimated the amount needed for the coming years in terms of constant—1963–64—dollars. Expenditures for capital outlay averaged $1.3 billion a year from 1954–55 through 1959–60. For the years from 1959–60 through 1964–65, $2.2 billion a year was spent. This total of $17.8 billion spent from 1954–55 through 1964–65 provided college space for 2.2 million additional students.

But what of the next 10 years when space is needed for another 3 million expected students? Another $26 billion is needed for new facilities by 1974–75.

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 reflects the recognition of Congress of the need to help colleges and universities. It was enacted to provide present and future generations of American youth with the opportunity to develop to the fullest their intellectual capabilities.

This act provided a combination of grants and loans for both undergraduate and graduate facilities. In the Higher Education Amendments of 1966, the President has recommended an extension of the act, to include $453 million in grants for undergraduate facilities construction in fiscal year 1967.

I propose, however, that we can do something more to meet this problem than simply grants and loans. In addition to these programs, we could encourage the colleges to help themselves. We could encourage them to obtain money from private sources by making the interest on bonds, sold to expand their facilities, tax free.

I believe this would be a most useful weapon in the arsenal that will be needed to overcome this great problem. The need is too great for simply a program of direct grants. In the loan program, we subsidize the education institution with a lower-than-market interest rate. With tax-free bonds private sources would provide the construction money and we would lose only the tax on the interest. To meet the problem of modernizing, expanding, and updating our educational facilities to meet the needs not only of today but of tomorrow as well, we must use all the means at our disposal. Education is our stake in the future. It is our investment in growth and progress. The colleges and universities of our great Nation are the seedbed of our future. We must do all we can to make them adequate to the job of turning our hopes and dreams into reality.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3665) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax interest on obligations issued by colleges and universities, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3665

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by inserting after section 103 (relating to interest on certain governmental obligations) the following new section:

"SEC. 103A. INTEREST ON OBLIGATIONS OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

"(a) EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME.—Gross income does not include interest on the obligations of an institution of higher education the proceeds of which are used for the purposes of building, expanding, equipping, or modernizing educational facilities.

"(b) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' means only an educational institution—

"(1) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on;

"(2) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade; and

"(3) contributions to or for the use of which are deductible under section 170."

(b) The table of sections for such part III is amended by inserting at the appropriate place the following new item:

"SEC. 103A. Interest on obligations of colleges and universities."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only in the case of obligations issued after such date.

## GRANTING OF U.S. CITIZENSHIP TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to grant U.S. citizenship at birth to any child born abroad whose father or mother is a citizen of the United States who has served abroad with a church or missionary organization. I am offering this bill at the request of the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association, an agency here in Washington which represents some 7,000 missionaries, many of whose families have mixed citizenship.

Under section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act—8 U.S.C. 1401(a)(7))—a child born abroad to a U.S. citizen father and an alien mother, or vice versa, does not acquire U.S. citizenship at birth unless the citizen parent, prior to the child's birth, was physically present in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling not less than 10 years, at least 5 of which were after attaining the age of 14 years. At present, only members of the Armed Forces may count the periods of honorable service abroad in order to meet the aforementioned physical-presence requirements of section 301(a)(7). My bill would place missionary parents serving abroad in the same category with military personnel.

It is quite common for one parent member of a missionary family to be Canadian, while the other is an American, or for there to be a British-American family. Since missionary families serve abroad for periods of 4 or 5 years at a time, it is not uncommon for their children to be born abroad. Usually, in these instances, the parents wish to raise and educate their children as American citizens, but it is very difficult for them to fulfill the physical-presence requirements of section 301(a)(7).

For this reason, the Evangelical Foreign Missions Association feels that section 301(a)(7) should be amended to enable these children born while their missionary parents are serving abroad, to become U.S. citizens and to give them access to educational facilities in the United States that would not ordinarily be made available to them because of their years spent abroad, and I am happy to introduce this bill in their behalf.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3668) to amend section 301(a)(7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to grant U.S. citizenship at birth to any child born abroad whose father or mother is a citizen of the United States who has served abroad for certain periods of time with a church or missionary organization, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill "To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States."

As a member of the Subcommittee on Territories, I am very much interested in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and in order that Members of the Senate may be acquainted with the justification and desirability of this measure, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Vice President be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3670) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States, introduced by Mr. BURDICK, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Act of June 27, 1952 (66 Stat. 163), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title II thereof the following new section 293:

"SEC. 293. (a) Nothing contained in this title, except for sections 212(a) (27) (28) and (29), 215, and 241(a) (1) (6) and (7) shall be construed so as to limit, restrict, deny, or affect the coming into or departure from the United States of a citizen of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who presents a valid identity certificate issued by the High Commissioner of such Territory: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to give or to confer upon any such citizen any other privileges, rights, benefits, exemptions, or immunities under this Act, which are not otherwise specifically granted by this Act.

"(b) The High Commissioner of the Trust Territory shall issue an identity permit, upon request, pursuant to such regulations as he may precribe, to any citizen of such Territory who resided in the Territory on July 18, 1947, including a citizen temporarily absent from the islands on that date, and to any citizen of such Territory who was subsequently born or naturalized there, if after that date or after his birth or naturalization he continued to reside in the Trust Territory or in the United States, its territories or possessions, and has taken no affirmative steps to acquire foreign nationality.

"(c) Any person who comes to the United States pursuant to the provisions of this section shall, upon completion of the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316(a) of this Act, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of such coming, for the purpose of petitioning for naturalization."

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, D.C.*

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, to permit the free entry of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands into the United States."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation, which addresses itself to a matter of genuine urgency in connection with the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the discharge of the Federal responsibility in that area, if enacted, would permit citizens of the Trust Territory to enter the United States freely, without regard to the quota and visa provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which are now applicable to them, and subject only to those sections of that Act which are enumerated in the proposed bill. The enumerated sections provide for the exclusion and removal of subversives. The bill would not extend to the citizens of the Trust Territory the privilege of counting residency in the Trust Territory toward the residency requirements for naturalization, as is the case with noncitizen nationals coming to the United States from "outlying possessions" as that term is defined in the Immigration and Nationality Act. The bill does provide, however, that any person permitted to enter the United States pursuant to its provisions, and subsequently residing in the United States, would be considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence for the purpose of petitioning for naturalization. The proposal specifically provides that nothing contained in the new section shall be construed to give or to confer citizens of the Trust Territory any other privileges, rights, benefits, exemptions, or immunities under the Immigration and Nationality Act which are not otherwise specifically granted by the provisions of the Act. In view of the circumstances which will be detailed below, and for the reasons which will be set forth, we believe that this proposal is an important and very necessary proposition which should, in the best interests of the peoples of the Trust Territory and of the United States, be enacted into law.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is that group of islands situated in the western Pacific Ocean which prior to World War II were occupied and administered by Japan, principally the Caroline, Mariana and Marshall Islands. While the Trust Territory, with its population of approximately 88,000 persons, consists of some 2,100 islands scattered throughout 3 million square miles of ocean, there is only a total of 700 square miles of land, and only 96 of the island groups are regularly inhabited. The area is divided into six districts for the purpose of administration, but each district also reflects a somewhat distinct culture and state of development. Indicative of the nature of the diversity between areas in the Trust Territory is the fact that a total of nine major languages, with regional dialect variations, are spoken.

The United States administers the Trust Territory pursuant to the provisions of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Former Japanese Mandated Islands, entered into between the United States and the United Nations, which was approved by the Security Council of the United Nations on April 2, 1947, and by the United States on July 18, 1947, by virtue of Presidential approval of a Joint Resolution of Congress. Under the terms of the Agreement, the United States, while not possessing sovereignty over the area, has complete jurisdiction—executive, legislative and judicial. Also pursuant to the terms of the Agreement the United States has assumed the substantial obligation to discharge the responsibilities and seek the objectives imposed and defined by the Agreement. By Presidential direction, the responsibility for administering the Trust Territory was first vested in the Secretary of the Navy, then in the Secretaries of the Navy and Interior, and is presently vested solely in the Secretary of the Interior, except with regard to specific areas closed for strategic reasons.

In the discharge of the Federal responsibility, a central civilian government was established upon the transfer of principal responsibility to the Secretary of the Interior, effective July 1, 1951. That government was composed of an executive branch, a judicial branch, and an advisory legislative branch. The most recent restatement of the nature and scope of the Trust Territory Government is found in Secretarial Order No. 2876, dated January 30, 1964 (29 F.R. 1855). For nearly fourteen years efforts in the Trust Territory have been directed internally and have been prompted and directed by the obvious necessity for equipping the people of the Trust Territory to understand and ultimately join the world beyond the boundaries of the Trust Territory. Given the state of development which existed in the Trust Territory following World War II, it was necessary to regulate both the entry of persons into the Trust Territory and the departure from the area of its citizens, since clearly the people were not then equipped to compete outside of the Trust Territory, nor were they ready to cope with the 20th century if it were to intrude upon them too quickly. Up until mid-1963, even the entry of United States citizens into the Territory was restricted.

These restrictions no longer exist. They no longer exist because demonstrable progress in the development of the Trust Territory has been made. While that progress by many standards was not as great as might have been wished for, it was time to open the door to the Trust Territory and by so doing, admit a new stimulus to its development in the form of capital, investments, tourism, and trade. This was specifically enunciated Executive policy based, in part, on the determination that the state of development of the peoples of the Trust Territory was such that they would be benefited and not harmed by the policy, and by the determination that the development of the Trust Territory had been too slow for too long and that if we were to discharge our responsibilities in that area, an accelerated program utilizing all forms of assistance had to be begun. The late President Kennedy enunciated this policy in a press release which accompanied Executive Order No. 11045, dated August 21, 1962. He said in part:

"Further, I have directed that regulations relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands be revised to facilitate free entry of United States Citizens, United States investment and United States flag vessels into that area. * * *

"I intend that these actions I have taken will foster responsible political development, stimulate new economic activity, and enable the people of the Islands to participate fully in the world of today."

In addition to the need for readying the people of the Trust Territory to meet the outside world on a fair, if not equal basis, one other significant internal problem existed. We have noted the diversity among the various areas in the Trust Territory. This diversity was reflected in the political development and organization of the people. Great emphasis was put upon the significance of the district or the community and upon local problems. It has taken almost fourteen years of effort to develop and have accepted, the concept of one territory or political entity and the concept of the overriding significance of "territorial affairs." These efforts culminated on September 28, 1964, in the promulgation of Secretarial Order No. 2882 which created the Congress of Micronesia, a territory-wide legislative body, whose popularly elected members possess true legislative power. The Congress of Micronesia convened its first session on July 12, 1965, after a two-week indoctrination course for its members. We believe that the Congress of Micronesia will be the vehicle which will finally weld the differing areas of the Trust Territory into a single cohesive political entity.

In view of the foregoing, and in view of an accelerated educational program together with a new and vigorous emphasis upon economic development, it is seemly, we believe, to turn to external factors which will have a meaningful relationship to our role and our responsibilities in the Trust Territory. As in the past, the solution to the problems which exist and the achievement of the goals which we have set can be obtained only with the continuing assistance of the Congress. We therefore ask for consideration of this measure in the hope that, as in the past, consideration will be as prompt and as responsive as the consideration accorded certain other proposals intended to assist the development of the Trust Territory.

The obligations imposed upon and accepted by the United States under the Trusteeship Agreement are numerous but are generally directed toward two goals. The first is the social, economic and political development of the residents of the Trust Territory. The second, through the achievement of the first, is to equip the people of the Trust Territory to exercise an educated choice as to their future and that of the Trust Territory, and to let them make that choice. It is incumbent upon us to do all that we can to provide the basis for a judicious use of this freedom to choose. In this Connection, the significance of this proposal is of tremendous magnitude, both on practical grounds and on grounds of principle. This significance is not exaggerated, nor are the Micronesians oblivious to it. In the course of testimony before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives in connection with a similar proposal in the 88th Congress, Amata Kabua, a Micronesian then not connected with the Trust Territory Government, but since then elected to the Congress of Micronesia, said in part:

"If enacted, this bill, which provides for the people of the Trust Territory freedom of moving in and out of the United States, will favorably create a condition whereby the inhabitants will be better assisted in their striving for their progress and place in this complex world. The effect of this section will be especially vital in providing the people with better opportunities for the pursuit of new and broader knowledge and values needed in shaping their own destiny along with the free world."

The last sentence quoted is important. Today, the natives of the Trust Territory, because of their geographical location, are able to visit with relative ease a number of countries in the Far East. While some of these countries have forms of government compatible with the concepts of the free world, many of them do not. We believe that the United States should therefore encourage the citizens of the Trust Territory to visit, study, live, and work in the United States. They cannot learn enough about America and our way of life from the stateside staff and technicians who are sent into the Trust Territory to assist them.

We intend to attract American investment to provide the commerce and the facilities which the citizens of the Trust Territory cannot provide for themselves because of a lack of capital, but which is essential if the standard of living is to be raised. The people of the Trust Territory will participate fully in this development by furnishing their skills and labor in lieu of capital. Extensive training in various skills will be a prerequisite to any such participation. This training will in many instances need to be acquired in the United States, or an area over which the United States exercises jurisdiction, either as an industrial trainee program sponsored by an American company engaged in an enterprise in the Trust Territory, or as general training not related to specific operations in the Trust Territory. This would be difficult to accomplish as long as the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act are applicable to Micronesians.

The accelerated development program in the Trust Territory places great emphasis on education. Primary and secondary educational needs can be met in the Trust Territory by the institution of a proper program, but for some time, the need for higher education will have to be met by making educational facilities outside the Trust Territory readily available and easily accessible. The proposed bill would facilitate this. It would remove the requirement for obtaining a student visa and the attendant restrictions presently applicable to Trust Territory students, thus permitting any Trust Territory student to attend the school of his choice, if he is otherwise qualified, with a minimum of difficulty. It would also permit students lacking adequate funds greater freedom in seeking gainful employment for the purpose of financing their education. Thus we believe that it is evident that this proposal must be enacted promptly if we are to succeed in acquainting the people of the Trust Territory with the world of the Twentieth Century to the degree that we must if it is to be meaningful, and if we are to meet their needs as justice and good administration require.

In this connection, there exists a further reason for the enactment of this proposal. We are dealing with a geographic area composed wholly of islands and therefore, an area with a precisely limited land base. Even though the total population of the Trust Territory is not great in terms of numbers, being hardly more in the aggregate than the population of a small mainland city, many areas in the Trust Territory are already experiencing severe over-crowding.

The people of the Trust Territory are becoming increasingly aware of the benefits of modern conveniences, educational and medical facilities and gainful employment. Many are no longer content, and we do not believe that they should be, to live in remote areas where only primitive conditions exist. At the same time, however, the district centers and those other areas which today offer the chance to achieve a higher and more modern standard of living can only support a given number of persons before circumstances begin to work against the standard of living in the area and cause it to decline in many respects. The government of the Trust Territory recognizes its responsibility to provide or to assist in providing the physical things essential to an appropriate standard of living, but is limited in its ability to provide these things in as short a time as would be required to alleviate the problem of population pressure in the areas referred to.

At the same time the population of the Trust Territory is expanding at an increased rate just as the population of the world is expanding at an ever increasing rate. Through improved medical treatment, health education, and modern facilities the government of the Trust Territory has achieved an increase in longevity and a substantial decrease in pre- and post-natal mortality. In a sense, our success in the field of health has contributed to the problem of population, but we would not have it otherwise.

In view of the two-fold problem of population and its distribution, we submit that it is necessary that an outlet be provided which may be utilized by those who wish to seek the better opportunities for education and employment and the higher standard of living which exist in Guam, Hawaii and the mainland, and which, even if not utilized to a great extent, will exist as an assurance of our willingness and intention to meet this serious problem. In time, through economic development and other programs, the Trust Territory will be much more able to provide for its own, but that day is yet a number of years away. The enactment of this proposal is, in our estimation, the best, if not the only wholly acceptable solution to the problem.

For all of these reasons the enactment of this proposal is important. Further, since we, as the administering Nation, have opened the Trust Territory to Americans, in the interest of comity we should likewise open the United States to the citizens of the Trust Territory. We do not believe that this will create problems of real magnitude. The population of the Trust Territory is approximately 88,000 persons.

As a practical matter, by reason of education, financial status, and social customs, it is not likely that any great number of these persons would come to the United States except as short-term visitors or students. However, it is most desirable that the young people, the intellectual and social leaders, and those who will play a major role in making the final determination as to the status of the Trust Territory should be able to enter the United States freely if they so desire. In this vein, it should be noted that reference to present statistics concerning the travel of Micronesians can be most misleading to the possible detriment of this proposal. Saipan, the provisional capital of the Trust Territory, is situated only 45 minutes flying time from Guam and the people of the Marianas and of Guam have both intertwined social and business relations. The educational system of Guam, including the College of Guam, also attracts the young people of the Trust Territory. This is relevant because entry into Guam is an entry into the United States for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act and a tabulation of Micronesian entries can be misleading unless it is remembered that the to and fro travel of students or individual business men can contribute an amazingly large number of entries to the total in the course of a year. Similarly, Hawaii attracts persons for business, pleasure, educational and medical reasons, and again a substantial number of entries is added to the total of those Micronesians entering the United States.

In conclusion, we are not unmindful of the discussion in the past which centered around the class of persons to be treated by this proposal. We suggest that the privilege accorded by the proposal be extended to the "citizens" of the Trust Territory. This term would comprehend native-born citizens as well as those persons who have been naturalized in accordance with the laws of the Trust Territory. We believe that a privilege such as this one should be extended to all of the citizen residents of the Trust Territory because we see no valid ground upon which to distinguish between the native-born and the naturalized citizens. We believe, further, that the term "second-class citizen" has achieved such prominence that even in the extension of a privilege, as distinguished from a right, it is imprudent to suggest that such a class of citizens indirectly be legislated into being.

It should be emphasized that this proposal does not confer American nationality upon the citizens of the Trust Territory and and in no wise serves to annex the Trust Territory, or does it obligate the Congress in any way to treat the Trust Territory differently in the future than at present.

Because of the nature of the arrangements under which we administer the Trust Territory, because it is designated as a strategic trust, and because of the involvement of other agencies and of the United Nations, there are aspects of this matter which are classified for security reasons, and which, for that reason, cannot be discussed in this format. However, at such time and place as are appropriate, we will be pleased to furnish such additional information concerning this proposal as may be requested.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
*Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

---

## DIVERSION OF WATER FROM MISSOURI AND COLUMBIA RIVERS TO WESTERN PART OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to introduce today for appropriate reference a measure to provide for an investigation and study of the feasibility of diverting excess water from the

Missouri and Columbia Rivers to the western part of the State of Texas.

Water is something all of us need to think about. If we do not, there will be shortages all through the Nation, particularly in the great western part. There was a time when a shortage of water was regarded as a local problem that could be solved by the action of an individual metropolitan area, by an irrigation district, a river basin authority, or a single State. This simply is no longer the case.

The concept of planning by river basins is now seen as the way to provide an adequate water supply for our future needs. We not too long ago passed the Water Resources Planning Act, which I was happy to cosponsor, as a mechanism to implement the basin planning concept. Congressional action is necessary in dealing with this problem, because traditionally the Federal Government has an important role to play in natural resources conservation and development. Rivers cross State lines, forest fires do not stop at State boundaries, sand storms deposit the soil of one State upon the farms of another. And, water shortage problems are the present-day concern of all regions of the country.

We presently have a depressing picture of water supplies across the Nation. In the East these are serious water shortages, as well as those chronic situations in the West. In the Great Lakes area, the water level has fallen to a dangerous level.

And, in my own State of Texas, careful planning of available resources has been undertaken, but even this will not be sufficient to meet all the needs of the future.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am proposing this measure as part of a continuing search for a workable water program for my State and our Nation. The study herein envisioned would give a basis for planning to meet the future needs of one of the fastest growing areas of the country; an area that will become home to millions of people.

Texas is taking its own steps to plan for water's future. In parts of our State we will need the assistance and cooperation of our neighbors as we seek to provide adequate water for all Americans and the greatest future good for the greatest number. The study I propose today will be a significant step forward in cooperative progress for the Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3671) to provide for an investigation and study of the feasibility of diverting water from the Missouri and Columbia Rivers to the western part of the State of Texas, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

---

## PROPOSED APPROPRIATE ACTION TO BE TAKEN AGAINST ZDENEK PISK, A FOREIGN ESPIONAGE AGENT

Mr. EASTLAND. I submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 291) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. RES. 291

*Resolved*, Whereas one Zdenek Pisk, an alien and a Communist espionage agent, is known to have taken part in activities inimical to the welfare and security of the United States, including an effort to plan an electronic listening device in the office of an important official of our Department of State; and

Whereas the aforesaid Zdenek Pisk presently is a member of the Czechoslovakian Mission to the United Nations and as such claims and enjoys various privileges and immunities; and

Whereas the Joint Resolution of the Congress approved in 1947, which authorized the bringing into effect of a so-called "Headquarters Agreement" with the United Nations, expressly reserved the right of the United States to take appropriate action for the protection of its own security; and,

Whereas the International Organizations Immunities Act also recognizes the right of the United States to take appropriate security action in the case of any alien who has engaged in activities of a subversive nature against the interest of the United States; and

Whereas neither actual diplomatic status, nor any status acquired by virtue of a connection with a foreign mission to an international organization, should be permitted to operate as a license to engage in espionage or any other subversive activities against the United States; and

Whereas it appears no action has been taken against the aforesaid Zdenek Pisk except to report his espionage activities against the United States to the Secretary-General of the United Nations; and,

Whereas the aforesaid Zdenek Pisk's continued presence in the United States is not only contrary to the security of the United States, but is also a challenge to the sovereignty of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States should take or direct appropriate action, as speedily as possible, to strip the aforesaid Zdenek Pisk of all privileges and immunities of a diplomatic or semidiplomatic nature held or claimed by him under the International Organizations Immunities Act or under the United Nations Headquarters Agreement and under any other statute, treaty, or compact; and to cause him either (1) to be expelled from the United States, as soon as may be possible, as an undesirable person, or (2) to be placed under arrest and proceeded against under the applicable criminal statutes dealing with espionage, and conspiracy to commit espionage, against the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, earlier this month the country was shocked by the story of how two espionage agents from Czechoslovakia, who came here as diplomats, had tried to plant an electronic eavesdropping device in an important office in the State Department building.

The two Czechs are Jiri Opatrny, an attaché of the Czechoslovak Embassy, and Zdenek Pisk, formerly second secretary of the Czechoslovak Embassy and present first secretary of the Czech mission to the United Nations, with headquarters in New York.

Through the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Passport Office, of the Department of State, and in particular the heroic and patriotic services of Mr. Frank Mrkva, Administrative Officer of the Passport Office, the subversive efforts of these two Iron Curtain espionage agents were frustrated.

Details of the espionage attempt have been given wide publicity, and need not be repeated here.

The State Department immediately declared Opatrny, the Czech Embassy attaché, to be persona non grata, and asked that he leave the country.

But no such action was taken against Pisk. The State Department, according to published reports, merely sent a report on Pisk's espionage activities to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has taken no action in the matter. Pisk is still in this country; and presumably still engaged in whatever espionage work is assigned to him by his superiors.

Furthermore, it appears that he is going to stay here. Mr. Dan Kurzman, reporter for the Washington Post has written that U.S. delegates to the United Nations indicated Pisk would not be expelled from the United States. Mr. Kurzman quoted his sources as saying:

> Mr. Pisk has done nothing to violate the U.N. Headquarters agreement. Therefore, no action is contemplated on him here at this time.

Mr. President, the failure to expel from the country this Czech espionage agent, Zdenek Pisk, is inexcusable.

Perhaps Pisk's present position as a member of the Czech mission to the United Nations protects him from criminal prosecution, just as the diplomatic status of his partner in espionage, Jiri Opatrny, protected him from prosecution. But Pisk can be expelled from the United States just as readily as Opatrny was expelled.

There is nothing in Pisk's status as a member of the Czech delegation to the United Nations which gives him the right to remain in this country after having engaged in espionage operations against the United States.

When the Congress in 1947 approved a joint resolution authorizing the President to bring into effect an agreement between the United States and the United Nations with respect to the privileges and immunities of aliens entering this country in transit to or from United Nations Headquarters, this agreement was made subject to a specific reservation that "nothing in the agreement shall be construed as in any way diminishing, abridging or weakening the right of the United States to safeguard its own security."

The joint resolution similarly preserved the right of the United States "completely to control the entrance of aliens into any territory of the United States other than the headquarter's district and its immediate vicinity."

It will not serve as an excuse for not ousting the Czech agent, Pisk, to say that the United Nations never accepted the

reservation stipulated in the joint resolution of Congress in 1947.

It is quite literally true that this reservation was not acted upon formally by the United Nations General Assembly. But ever since 1947 the United Nations has been claiming and asserting rights under the headquarters agreement; and since the only agreement the Congress authorized is subject to the reservations stipulated in the joint resolution of 1947, either the agreement must be conceded to exist subject to these reservations, or there is no agreement at all.

My personal opinion is that the latter is the case. There was no meeting of the minds on this subject between the Congress of the United States and the General Assembly of the United Nations. They acted respectively upon two different documents, and so there is no headquarters agreement.

But for nearly 20 years the United States has been granting and recognizing privileges and immunities provided under the headquarters agreement which the Congress authorized in 1947. It is a fact that the Congress did authorize the granting of such privileges and immunities under an agreement with the United Nations, and though the agreement never was formally authorized by United Nations assent to the reservations stipulated in the joint resolution, and Congress has never taken any action since to withdraw its authorization, perhaps United Nations ratification may be presumed from its long time acceptance of privileges and immunities purportedly under the agreement. But as I said before, if the United Nations wants these privileges and immunities for the aliens who come here as members of missions to the United Nations, then the United Nations must recognize the reservations stipulated by the Congress of the United States. The United Nations cannot have it both ways.

So long as the United States of America is a sovereign nation, it must have the right to expel aliens who engage in espionage or other activities against the security of the United States. The United States is a sovereign nation, and it does have this right.

Failure to expel the Czech espionage agent, Zdenek Pisk, and weak deferment to the United Nations in handling this case, approaches the status of a national disgrace.

If the Department of State persists in refusing to take appropriate action with respect to this espionage case, in the interest of national security, the Department's decision and the circumstances surrounding it should be made the subject of a thorough investigation, including complete documentation of the fact that there is, in legal contemplation, no valid United Nations Headquarters agreement.

---

## PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY CONVENTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate resolution calling upon the President to convene an International Motor Vehicle Safety Convention.

While Congress has been deeply absorbed these last few months in hammering out strong and effective motor vehicle safety standards legislation for the necessary protection of our own citizens on our own highways, we have been made increasingly aware that safety on the highways is far from a uniquely American concern.

Throughout the world, the proliferation of highway deaths and injuries has been the universal byproduct of advancing technology and prosperity. We are not alone in seeking new and more dramatic paths toward greater highway safety.

Recently, the Commission of the Common Market gave notice that automobiles will be barred at the border of Common Market countries unless they conform to standards, now under development, for brakes, turn signals, windshield wipers, mufflers, radio static suppressors, safety glass, headlights, and license plates. Great Britain is contemplating a universal requirement for seat belts on all new cars sold on British soil.

In the course of the hearings on auto safety held by the Senate Commerce Committee, we heard evidence of imaginative new departures in safety engineering now being pioneered in Europe and Japan, as well as in the United States.

This internationalization of automobile safety presents both an opportunity and a threat—an opportunity for each nation to shed the isolation of its national safety efforts and to benefit from the free exchange of highway safety information and technology—and a threat to orderly international trade in a major commodity.

Just as 50 conflicting sets of State safety standards would raise havoc with the efficiencies of mass production in the automotive industry, so conflicting and discordant sets of individual national standards would sharply inhibit the order and efficiency of international trade. In 1965, the United States imported $810 million worth of automotive products, while exporting an impressive $1,861 million in motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment. Clearly, the United States would be the loser were incompatible safety standards to serve as trade barriers.

But the international development of uniform minimum safety standards under American leadership would surely represent a milestone in enlightened international cooperation. Internationalization of standards should not be limited to minimum performance standards for motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, but should encompass the establishment of minimum requirements for highway markings, uniform traffic laws and the reciprocal recognition and acceptance of operating licenses and permits. Of course, the development of minimum international standards should in no way be permitted to impair the right of any individual nation to establish more stringent standards for the protection of its nationals, as it deems fit.

Fortunately, there are many precedents for the development of international safety standards, including the Safety of Life at Sea Convention, and the Convention on International Civil Aviation. The aviation agreement was developed by representatives of 52 nations assembled at Chicago in 1944 and is now subscribed to by 108 nations. It established the International Civil Aviation Organization which for the last 22 years has developed technical standards for air navigation, pilot certification, and construction of aircraft. While standards developed by ICAO are not binding upon the various signatory states until adopted internally, most of ICAO standards have been adopted throughout the world. Without such a mechanism, modern aviation transportation could never have reached its present state of international development and sale of aircraft between nations with varying requirements would have been impossible.

For these reasons, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and I join in urging the Senate to affirm the following resolution (S. Res. 292):

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should take appropriate action to extend to the governments of other countries engaged in the manufacture of motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment an invitation to designate representatives to participate in an International Motor Vehicle Safety Convention called to plan the creation of an International Motor Vehicle Safety Organization which would gather, develop and disseminate technical and statistical data pertaining to motor vehicle safety, and develop uniform international standards for motor vehicle safety, such standards to include the establishment of minimum requirements for the performance of motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, highway markings, traffic laws, and the reciprocal recognition and acceptance of licenses or permits issued by the participating governments to their nationals for the operation of motor vehicles.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 292) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator MAGNUSON, in sponsoring Senate Resolution 292. This resolution calls on President Johnson to convene an International Motor Vehicle Safety Convention to establish an International Motor Vehicle Safety Organization. This body would promote international cooperation in motor vehicle safety, uniformity of road signs, and reciprocity in driver license laws.

Motor vehicles have brought great benefits to every nation. They are a major means of personal transportation, trade, and communication. But automobiles have not been an unmixed blessing. Automobile accidents cause thousands of deaths, millions of injuries, and billions of dollars in economic loss each year.

The problems created by motor vehicles are common to every nation. Today, however, there is no mechanism by which one country can learn how the others are resolving these problems.

Traffic safety would be advanced if an organization were established to facilitate exchange of safety information and ideas among nations.

The United States as the largest producer of automobiles in the world has a great opportunity to take the lead in traffic safety. The Congress is about to approve the first comprehensive safety legislation enacted by any country. We should follow this up by calling an international conference to enlist the other nations in the battle against traffic accidents and establish an international institution to provide for continuing international cooperation in the safety field.

Mr. President, I urge President Johnson to call an International Motor Vehicle Safety Convention.

## AMENDMENT TO MINIMUM WAGE BILL BARRING AGE DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 714

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], all members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which is presently considering the minimum wage bill, I submit for appropriate reference, an amendment to that bill barring arbitrary age discrimination in employment. The amendment would add a new title to the Fair Labor Standards Act, placing enforcement of the age discrimination ban within the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, which presently enforces age provisions affecting child labor, subject to judicial review.

A major and scarcely touched area of difficulty is the problem of the unemployed older worker, who faces grave difficulties in finding a new job, in spite of considerable skill and maturity. Here, I believe there is an urgent need, and have repeatedly urged in the Congress speedy and forceful action to remove the two major barriers which the unemployed worker in his middle and older years must overcome:

First. Arbitrary and unjust age limits on hiring, imposed by employers through prejudice and misunderstanding; and

Second. Insufficient skills or education to qualify for entry into the increasingly technological industry of today.

Momentum for positive action on discrimination because of age has been steadily growing. Executive Order 11141 issued on February 12, 1964, has made it public policy to ban discrimination because of age in employment under Federal contract, except upon the basis of a bona fide employment qualification, retirement plan, or statutory requirement. Twenty States and Puerto Rico have adopted laws prohibiting this kind of discrimination. Over half of these laws have been passed since 1960; all but three since 1955. Under these measures, the States have had broad success in reducing age discrimination and expanding job opportunities for older workers. The major hindrance to further progress has been limitation on staff and funds. My own State of New York, has had such a law since 1958, and substantial progress has already been made.

Despite the existence of State laws and last year's Executive order, much more needs to be done. The steps already taken must be extended to cover the entire Nation, so that age discrimination can be fought universally and effectively. In June 1965 the Congress received a report on age discrimination in employment from the Secretary of Labor as required by section 715 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a provision which I sought in the Senate.

The Secretary's report concluded as follows:

> There is persistent and widespread use of age limits in hiring that in a great many cases can be attributed only to arbitrary discrimination against older workers on the basis of age and regardless of ability. The use of these age limits continues despite years of effort to reduce this type of discrimination through studies, information and general education undertaken by the Federal Government and many States, as well as by nonprofit and employer and labor organizations.
>
> The possibility of new *non-statutory* means of dealing with such arbitrary discrimination has been explored. That area is barren. [Emphasis in original.]
>
> State experience with statutes prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of age indicates that such practice can be reduced by a well-administered and well-enforced statute, coupled with an educational program. It is clear from this experience that an educational program to promote hiring on the basis of individual merit is far more effective when provided for by statute.

The most effective way to accomplish this is to make it an unlawful employment practice under the Fair Labor Standards Act to discriminate unjustly on account of age. Our amendment would give the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department authority to enforce prohibitions against arbitrary age discrimination in employment. It would integrate into the Fair Labor Standards machinery enforcement against age discrimination. The Administrator would be made responsible for investigating complaints of age discrimination in employment, and for negotiating or compelling redress where complaints are well founded. This procedure would fully effectuate Secretary Wirtz' recommendation that—

> The elimination of arbitrary age limits on employment will proceed much more rapidly if the Federal Government declares, clearly and unequivocally, and implements so far as is practicable, a national policy with respect to hiring on the basis of ability rather than age.

The Secretary's report set forth the scope and complexity of the problem, concluded that it can be solved, and cited the success of State laws against age discrimination in employment. With regard to skills and education, the report called for increased efforts, under the Manpower Development and Training Act and other existing training programs, to upgrade, retrain, and counsel older workers to enable them to adjust successfully to the organization and skills requirements of modern industry.

Expanded training and counseling, however, will avail little unless the other more grievous barrier to employment for older workers—unjust age discrimination on the part of employers—is stricken down. The imposition of arbitrary age limits on hiring, by which many companies refuse to hire any worker above a certain age—regardless of his often considerable abilities or qualifications—is the most serious, the most wasteful, and the least justifiable aspect of the problem, and is a practice regrettably widespread in this country. In the words of Secretary Wirtz' report:

> An unmeasured but significant proportion of the age limitations presently in effect are arbitrary in the sense that they have been established without any determination of their actual relevance to job requirements, and are defended on grounds apparently different from their actual explanation.

Although lack of physical capacity is the most frequently cited reason for rigid age limits, many considerations tend to invalidate the idea that any useful purpose is served by such rigid restrictions. They include: the wide variation of age limits for comparable jobs, the general lack of statistical studies in justification of such limits, and the fact that many responsible employers hire workers for jobs from which they would have been barred by other employers solely because of age.

In a Nation which is more and more oriented toward meeting the needs of the young, we must not neglect the ever-expanding population of older workers who have the capacity to be productive, valuable members of the national economy, but who cannot find a job. They must be given adequate scope for their skills and their experience.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 714) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES IN THE CASE OF MINING—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 715

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I submit on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], an amendment to H.R. 4665, Calendar No. 1342, relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining, and I ask that it be printed.

It is a brief but significant amendment, Mr. President, because it will give the coal mining industry the same option being extended to all other taxpayers in the mining industry. I include a brief statement discussing the intent and need of the amendment at this point in the RECORD.

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT

Under previous law, taxpayers in the mining industry can deduct mineral exploration expenditures, up to $100,000 per year with a limit of $400,000 over a taxpayer lifetime, without "recapture" of the benefits of the deduction.

In H.R. 4665, as passed by the House of Representatives, taxpayers in the mining industry, other than coal, would be permitted and required to treat all future expenditures in a new manner. They could be deducted without limitation, but the benefit of the deduction would be "recaptured" when mineral production began. This new treatment would have applied even if the taxpayer had not yet used up his $400,000 deduction under old law. Consequently, it would have helped some taxpayers—those who had already used up the $400,000—and hurt others—those who had used only part of the $400,000.

During executive consideration of H.R. 4665, the Senate Finance Committee approved the Smathers amendment in order to avoid hurting some taxpayers. As approved by the committee, the taxpayers are given an option: they can choose the old law if they wish, or they can choose the new law which permits them to deduct without limitation, but with recapture of benefits. However, H.R. 4665, as reported, accords the option to all taxpayers in the mining industry, with the exception of coal. The amendment which I offer with my colleague from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] would correct this situation.

I would also like to point out that the national leadership organizations of the coal industry, the National Coal Association, and the American Mining Congress, have indicated that their membership, by a numerical majority, preferred coal's exclusion from H.R. 4665, as passed by the House, because it would have hurt some taxpayers and helped others. However, the coal industry has stated that, with adoption of the Smathers amendment, it would prefer to be given the same privileges as those extended to other mining taxpayers.

Adoption of our amendment would correct this inequity and remove what amounts to discrimination against the coal industry. The bill, I might point out, does not affect oil and gas, whose exploration costs are treated in a different manner.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

## PROVISION FOR AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF LEAD AND ZINC—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 716

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by me to S. 564 which I sponsored earlier in this Congress to provide for equitable treatment of the important lead and zinc industries in the United States. The bill, S. 564, was introduced by me and several of my colleagues and is pending before the Senate Finance Committee. Its purpose was to liberalize the inflexible quota system which was in effect at the time of introduction. This formula embodied in S. 564, as originally introduced, was fair to the consumers, producers, and importers of lead and zinc metals. However, the quota has been canceled by executive action and therefore a new plan for legislation has now been proposed by the leaders in the industry. It will provide effective import quotas based on current industry conditions.

It is quite obvious that in recent years the economic outlook for the lead-zinc industry in the United States has improved considerably, along with the general economy. Increased consumption has trimmed the excessive metal stocks on hand and thus encouraged our domestic industry to reopen mines, develop and produce new ore resources and expand smelting facilities.

This process, however, is going on all around the world. The present favorable conditions, as history reveals, could change in a short period of time. Very easily the market situation could result in a surplus of supplies, thus driving the price down to a point where our domestic mining industry would be forced to close its mines. That is why I have, along with Representative ASPINALL and others, constantly urged that a sensible plan be devised to provide for an evenness in the market. This kind of stability could encourage economic growth and dependability on the part of the users of these metals, as well as to the producers and those foreign importers who supply a large part of our market.

Several important changes in approach have been made which I believe are fair and reasonable and should go a long way toward meeting the objections previously raised to this type of legislation. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a summary of the provisions of the new amendment.

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

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

1. A five year term is proposed to permit re-evaluation of the program at proper intervals and to serve until a minerals policy for the lead-zinc industry has been enacted.

2. During the life of the legislation, a quota regulating imports of lead and/or zinc ores and metals could become effective for a term of three years, if the lead and/or zinc stocks of United States primary lead-zinc producers reach levels considered excessive to normal requirements as compared to smelter shipments (an indicator of consumption) of either metal.

3. If during the term of a lead or zinc import quota, enacted as indicated above, there should occur a shortage of the metal in the United States, again determined by the relative level of producers' metal stocks, the import quota would be canceled.

4. Specific import quotas would be assigned to countries with an import record in excess of 10% of imports during a current base period determined at the time a quota plan became effective. Countries with a lower level of imports would participate in an "all other country" quota.

5. Individual lead or zinc manufactured products may be placed under an import quota, if the item is entering United States markets at rates judged to be excessive, during the period that a quota is in effect on ores and metals.

6. A minimum quota is provided to assure the importer a share of participation in United States markets.

The plan is simple, fair to producer, consumer and importer alike and would only be in effect when necessary to stabilize the supply-consumption ratio at proper levels.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I want to extend my compliments to the leaders of the industry, particularly the chairman of the Lead-Zinc Committee, Mr. Clark L. Wilson. He has devoted a great deal of time and effort to the enormous task of harmonizing the many and varied views and interests of the various segments of this industry. He has, patiently, continued to do an outstanding, and sometimes little-rewarding job of working out a formula which is fair to all concerned. He has contributed, in my judgment, a great deal to the public interest by his efforts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 716) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3641) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, early in the week I introduced S. 3632. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have added as joint authors and cosponsors of that bill the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

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

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3550) to provide for the issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of a 25-cent-per-bushel export marketing certificate on wheat for the 1967, 1968, and 1969 crops of wheat.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution No. 175, designating a National Dairy Farmers Cooperative Week.

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

## NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Alfred W. Moellering, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Indiana, term of 4 years—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, August 4, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

## NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

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

## THE CALENDAR

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1375, and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SENATE DELEGATION TO ATTEND COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The resolution (S. Res. 276) authorizing the appointment of a Senate delegation to attend a meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 276

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate (at least one of whom shall be from the Committee on Foreign Relations) as a delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, at the invitation of the Canadian branch of the Association, and to designate the chairman of said delegation.

SEC. 2. (a) The expenses of the delegation, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist said delegation, shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

(b) The expenses of the delegation shall include such special expenses as the chairman may deem appropriate to carry out this resolution, including reimbursements to agencies for compensation of employees detailed to the delegation and expenses incurred in connection with providing appropriate hospitality to foreign delegates.

(c) Each member or employee of the delegation shall receive subsistence expenses in an amount not to exceed the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964.

## PRINT AS SENATE DOCUMENT STUDY ON OPERATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT BOARDS OF CONTRACT APPEALS

The resolution (S. Res. 281) to print as a Senate document a study on operation and effectiveness of Government boards of contract appeals was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 281

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document a study on the operation and effectiveness of Government boards of contract appeals, prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Small Business by Professor Harold C. Petrowitz; and that three thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the committee.

## AUTHORITY TO PRINT REPORT ON AUTOMOTIVE AIR POLLUTION

The resolution (S. Res. 285) to authorize printing of the report on automotive air pollution was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 285

*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.

## ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The resolution (S. Res. 286) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Finance was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 286

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Finance is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-ninth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

## MARGUERITE A. RICUCCI

The resolution (S. Res. 289) to pay a gratuity to Marguerite A. Ricucci was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 289

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Marguerite A. Ricucci, widow of G. Joseph Ricucci, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to ten months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## TRIBUTE TO LT. GEN. DUDLEY HEATON, SURGEON GENERAL OF THE ARMY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it is fitting at this time for the Senate to recognize the service of a distinguished soldier of the U.S. Army. President Johnson has announced that Lt. Gen. Leonard Dudley Heaton will continue as Surgeon General of the Army until December 1, 1968. As a legal matter, General Heaton will reach the mandatory retirement age of 64 this coming November. General Heaton's name is now before the Senate in order that he may be retired upon reaching age 64, and thereafter be recalled to active service in order for him to continue to serve as Surgeon General. The Nation is indeed fortunate that General Heaton has agreed to continue his active service beyond the mandatory retirement age. His new appointment is a milestone which deserves special recognition.

Mr. President, General Heaton began his active service in the Army 40 years ago, when he became a lieutenant in the Army Medical Corps. In reviewing his contribution to the Nation, his service has always combined the rare qualities of a distinguished active surgeon and an able leader. Because of the national respect for his surgical judgment and technical skill, he has been entrusted with performing major and extremely delicate operations on many distinguished individuals, including President Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. His professional skill has received international recognition.

As a military leader, General Heaton has the responsibility for administering the farflung activities of the Army Medical Service. About 72,000 people are under his immediate direction.

The Surgeon General is responsible for maintaining the health of the U.S. Army, now numbering over 1 million men, along with the thousands of military dependents located throughout the world.

From among the many accomplishments of General Heaton, I would like to mention a few. During the attack on Pearl Harbor his able handling of mass casualties during the Japanese attack earned him the Legion of Merit. During his tenure as Surgeon General he has carried out a vast rehabilitation program of U.S. Army hospitals, including the famous Letterman General Hospital in San Francisco. At General Heaton's instigation the Walter Reed Army Institute of Nursing was established several years ago, under which students after 4 years' training become second lieutenants in the Army Nurse Corps. I pay special tribute to this unique effort.

General Heaton is in a large way responsible for the research and development resulting in the new mobile field hospital. This is literally a complete

field hospital, which can be lifted in sections by helicopter. This revolutionary advance in medicine, which takes the surgeon to the battlefield, is resulting in a remarkable saving of lives in Vietnam.

Mr. President, in a sense, the recognition of General Heaton is a recognition of the Army Medical Service itself. From its inception over 190 years ago as a part of the Continental Army, the Army Medical Service has enjoyed a long history of medical leadership and prestige in performing its job of maintaining and restoring the health of American soldiers. The most striking measure of meeting this task is the fact that of the American soldiers hospitalized in Vietnam, more than 99 percent are saved. This remarkable progress may be compared to World War II, when only 95.5 percent of those hospitalized could be saved.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to the record and accomplishments of General Heaton. He can be assured of the confidence of the Nation as he continues his task.

Mr. President, a long story could be told here of the amazing achievements of the American Medical Corps in the surgical services and all other medical services that have been rendered to our fighting men. It is an amazing record, not only with respect to the saving of the lives, but also with respect to the saving of the future use of arms and legs and the treatment of related injuries.

To emphasize this achievement is not to discredit the Navy medical service or the Air Force medical service, by any means. But the Army has borne the brunt of these recent developments in this fighting, and this wonderful man and his staff and his Nursing Corps are entitled to the greatest credit.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, nothing gives me more delight than to utter my approval of the action taken in continuing the service of General Heaton. I believe he is one of the great hospital administrators of all time. It is fitting that he is presiding over the destinies of Walter Reed Hospital, in the Nation's Capital. He is really in the great tradition of Walter Reed, who, together with Surgeon General William Crawford Gorgas, in my judgment, made possible the construction of the Panama Canal.

It is one of the interesting stories in American history. At the time when William Howard Taft was President, Walter Reed and William Crawford Gorgas insisted that unless they cleaned up the mosquito situation in Panama and got rid of malaria, they would never get the canal built; that malaria was caused by the mosquito. De Lesseps, the superintendent of construction of the canal came to Washington and saw President Taft, and wanted Walter Reed and General Gorgas fired. Thank goodness, President Taft did not follow the advice of the canal superintendent. Through the work of these two great doctors, the canal became not only a possibility, but also an actuality.

So Gen. Leonard Heaton walks in that same tradition, and he is doing an amazing job at Walter Reed Hospital and also as administrator of the Army medical service.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Beautifully done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## REDUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, speaking in the Senate yesterday on the subject "Reduction of U.S. Forces in Western Europe," the distinguished majority leader said:

> The time to end the inertia is now.

The majority leader then continued:

> In my own view—and it is not by any means a recent view—one or two American divisions actually on the ground in Europe in present circumstances would be just as indicative of our desire and intentions to meet our NATO obligations as the present six divisions stationed in Europe.

The military necessity for keeping these hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens in Europe is now most questionable; the possible diplomatic advantages could cut both ways, and the economic disadvantages incident to our continuing unfavorable balance of payments are heavy.

Therefore, I could not agree more with the majority leader.

The necessity for reductions in our forces in Europe is becoming so clear and obvious that I hope that it will be taken into consideration the next time a bill having to do with the national security comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the able assistant majority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] that this matter has been discussed among many leading Democrats in private sessions, Democrats who would like to support the President in his policies.

The Senator knows that, almost without exception, the feeling has been that we cannot understand why there is not some reduction in the number of troops in Europe. We have heard the arguments for no reduction. As the Senator has already said, those arguments make a very weak case.

No one else has done everything he indicated he would do in that regard. The Senator is correct in saying that the majority leader is right. One or two divisions would be just as indicative of our firm desire and intention to back up our commitments as the stationing of hundreds of thousands of men and women in Germany and other places in Western Europe.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the assistant majority leader. I agree with what he has said.

## THE PLANNED CURRENCY TO REPLACE THE DOLLAR

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in a colloquy incident to a thought-provoking statement in the RECORD of July 26 by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] entitled "U.S. Balance of Payments Likely To Continue To Deteriorate," the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] mentioned that he and other Senators "have been conferring regularly with the Secretary of the Treasury to keep informed on this problem."

The Senator from Pennsylvania then made the following observations:

> To my way of thinking, gold is an utterly obsolete medium of foreign exchange. The sooner we get away from the gold standard—back to the Roosevelt days—the better it will be.
>
> There is not enough gold being produced to enable us over a foreseeable period of time to create the reserves necessary to finance the constantly growing international trade. One of the principal factors are efforts being made by the Department of the Treasury—and I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin does not agree—particularly Secretary Fowler and his deputy Mr. Deming, in an effort to persuade 10 central nations to create a new medium of foreign exchange in the form of CRUS which will, as quickly as possible, get us off the gold standard and onto a basis of international finance in which the gold available will balance, in a sense, in relation to the needs of international trade.

If a new currency, to be called the CRU, is, in effect, to replace the dollar, at least in international transactions, I think the more the Senate and the people of the United States know about this development, and the sooner they know it, the better.

An article published this morning in the Wall Street Journal states the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, stopped over in London after a 2-day meeting at The Hague with the group of 10; and that only France dissented on a plan to confer with the directors of the International Monetary Fund as to a contingency plan for increasing world liquidity.

Then there is a most curious sentence, which reads as follows:

> Many continental nations contend the present problem is an excess of liquidity, rather than lack of it.

In any case, and especially in that France dissents, and also in that the important fiscal and monetary nation of Switzerland is not a member of the group of 10, let us hope that as soon as possible we obtain full details about this planned new currency substitute for the dollar.

## THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on my desk this morning when I came to the office was a telegram reading as follows:

JULY 27, 1966.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D.C.:*

On behalf of the 150,000 members of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, employed in the Nation's city passenger transportation, airlines, railroads and gas utilities industry, we urge your strenuous opposition against legislative proposals aimed at breaking the legitimate strike of the International Association of Machinists against 5 airlines.

Such legislation flimsily camouflaged as necessary to the country's health and safety

is an insidious attack on free collective bargaining in the United States. Every effort by the union to reach an acceptable agreement without strike was exhausted. Every legal procedure was adhered to before the airlines were grounded by their own managements' provocation and unreasonableness.

Scarcely more than 3 percent of the travelling public is affected by the strike, a fact which should dispel the fraudulent claim of danger to national health and welfare. A far greater consideration is the grave and irreparable damage that such congressional strike-breaking will do all American workers and their unions.

My answer to this telegram is that it does not state the facts as they really exist.

A Presidential Board was appointed to make a settlement of the claim that $130 million in increased wages should be granted. The Board recommended the grant of $76 million and turned down the $54 million.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated on the floor of the Senate a half dozen times that the grant and the recommendation were liberal, and that to have granted more would merely feed the fires of inflation.

The Transport Workers Union undoubtedly was connected with the strike of the metropolitan transport system in New York. New York was paralyzed. The court issued an injunction against the union, prohibiting the continuance of the strike. The union refused to obey it. In fact, statements were issued flagrantly defying the order of the court. The union persisted in carrying on its strike, although it paralyzed the economy of New York and although it paralyzed the liberty and freedom of movement of millions of people.

The same situation exists now. There is brazen defiance of the rights and interests of the people of the Nation. This union has no concern except the exercise of the omnipotent power of preventing the operation of the airlines.

Now I am asked to interfere with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I want to make one statement on that subject, and for that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. Congress is dilly-dallying. It is refusing to take action. Bills have been pending since July 11, because it was on that day that I introduced the first bill on this subject and nothing has been done since.

The airline industry in the main is still tied up. I think the time is at hand when courage must be exercised by public officials. We cannot continue to tolerate sovereign power being exercised by labor unions in defiance of the rights of 190 million Americans.

More than the isolated airline strike is involved. Involved is the message that goes out to the people of the Nation as to whether government is supreme or whether labor leaders are supreme.

This has, in a measure, a relation to the bloody and murderous riots which are erupting in many cities throughout the country. Law and order has broken down. The mobsters and the rioters are in command. The innocent citizen is afraid to leave his home. Guns are being purchased by honest, law-abiding citizens feeling that they will be the victims of riots and must protect themselves.

My answer to the union is, "Abide by the recommendations made by the President's Board. Have some consideration for the people of your country. Stop exercising the omnipotent power which you feel will bring the Government, the airlines, and the people of the country to their knees."

Mr. President, I will not stand idly by. My voice will be heard on this subject. To the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] I make the plea, "Get action of some kind taken in your committee."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

---

## HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, this is a sad day for the American people who buy or build on credit, or who owe money.

Interest rates have reached a new peak.

Johnson interest rates are now higher than Hoover interest rates. The effect on the people is hurtful and harmful.

Johnson interest rates now compare with Harding interest rates. In fact, Johnson interest rates are the highest since their peak in the administration of President Warren G. Harding.

Strange as it may seem, the money, monetary, and interest rate policies of Presidents Harding, Hoover, and Johnson are almost identical.

It should come as no surprise, then, that the effects are similar.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt drove the money changers from the temple. He led the country through World War II with reasonable interest rates.

President Truman led the country to final victory in World War II and through the Korean war with reasonable interest rates by keeping the money changers out of the temple.

The money changers, Mr. President, are back in the temple. The Johnson interest rates are the highest they have been in 45 years.

To illustrate the point I have obtained statistics on the lowest annual average yield on Government bonds during several administrations.

The lowest annual average yield on Government bonds under President Harding was in 1922, at 4.30 percent.

Under President Coolidge, in 1928—3.33 percent.

Under President Hoover, in 1930—3.29 percent.

Under President Roosevelt, in 1941—2.05 percent.

Under President Truman, in 1946—2.19 percent.

Under President Eisenhower, in 1954—2.55 percent.

Under President Kennedy, in 1961—3.90 percent.

Under President Johnson, the lowest annual average yield was in 1964, at 4.15 percent.

The Senate might be interested to know that in 1965 the average yield on Government bonds advanced to 4.21 percent. Today, the average yield on Government bonds is up to 4.80 percent. One issue is selling at a yield of 5.26 percent.

Mr. President, this is a disastrous policy. I call these facts to the attention of the Senate in the hope that President Johnson will be awakened to the consequences of this policy, so that Presidential leadership may be provided for the people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to express my disappointment that interest rates have increased again on Government issues. In my judgment, the way to fight the pressures which the Government faces in the war in Vietnam—and I admit that it does create some pressures on our fiscal and monetary system—is a program that shares the burden in such fashion that all segments of the economy bear their share of it.

Up until now, the answer to it has been a program which rewards bankers with greater and greater income and money lenders with much greater income, but virtually crucifies the housing industry in this country. At the same time, it makes adequate credit available to big business to build large plants which, on balance, and under other circumstances, I would approve; but not when we are asking Americans to make such disproportionate sacrifices. Big business and big money have been asked to make very little sacrifice in this effort to carry their share of the burden of the war in Vietnam.

In my judgment, we should be following the precedents of President Truman during the Korean war—and that was a limited war—when the Federal Reserve Board was given powers, and asked to exercise them, to limit the availability of credit in such ways that the burden of the war would be more generally distributed.

A regulation of the Federal Reserve Board required a down payment limit on various items people were buying and restricted the time for repayment, and this made it possible to carry forward the burden of that war at a much lower interest rate than would have been available otherwise.

To try to meet all the fiscal and monetary problems that go with fighting a war by a program of tight money and high interest rates is merely a way to finance the war on a program which fattens the rich and skins the poor.

That is not the way we should be fighting a war. We should be asking big money and big business to contribute its share of the sacrifice and carry its share of the burden, rather than to reward them with the highest income they have ever received in 30 years.

Mr. GORE. Forty-five years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Tennessee corrects me. He says it is 45 years. I do not dispute those figures.

These high interest rates apply not just to the national debt. The increase of interest on our national debt alone, since President Truman left office, is enough to account for $6 billion a year of the increase in the cost of Government.

One item, interest on the national debt, has about doubled, and that is a tremendous part of the cost of government.

Furthermore our total public and private debt amounted to $1.4 trillion the last time I looked at the figures. If interest rates are about 2 points more than they need to be, it amounts to $28 billion a year in increased interest charges.

I have heard the point made that business pays for interest rates. It is true that big business pays interest, but, in the final analysis, they conduct their business in such a way as to carry interest as an expense of doing business and they pass it on to the public as a part of the price of the product that the public pays, just as they pass on the cost of the social security tax as a part of the price of the product the public buys, and as they pass along sales taxes.

So in most instances, businesses pass these interest costs on to the public, because, in the final analysis, business must make a profit in order to stay in business.

So what happens when we have interest rates that are two points higher than they need be? It adds a cost of about $28 billion to the backs of the working people of the country for the benefit of the money lenders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. President Roosevelt took action to keep interest rates at a lower level during his administrations. That was perhaps one of the chief reasons for the success of his administration and party. The President used his power, and Congress cooperated, to keep interest rates at a very low level, so the burden of the war would not be unnecessarily made greater for those least able to pay.

I hope the President of the United States will give us the benefit of his leadership in this field. It is true, from a technical point of view, that the members of the Federal Reserve Board are responsive to Congress. The Board reports to Congress; they do not report to the President. However, as a practical matter, Congress is not able to ride herd on the Federal Reserve Board without the leadership of the President. He appoints the members of the Board. The Secretary of the Treasury is in constant touch with the Board.

Even though I am chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I have enough knowledge of public life and politics to know that neither the Senator from Louisiana nor any other Member of Congress can reverse the trend, such as having standby controls instead of a program which is proving to be so punitive to so many working people, the rank and file who are compelled, in the last analysis, to bear the burden of high interest rates.

I hope one of these days the President of the United States will see fit to give us the benefit of his leadership and reverse the trend that has taken place since he became President of the United States. It seems to me that the President of the United States must accept responsibility, because he appoints the members of the Board. He knows as well as anybody that individual Senators or Representatives cannot reverse the policy if the administration does not want it to happen.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, is a sincere man, almost to the point of being a zealot for the little people of the country. He is a Congressman from Texas and a great admirer of the President of the United States. His efforts have met with lack of success.

If the Democratic Party does not measure up and live up to the image it has created in the past, of looking after the interests of the rank and file people, of the little people, of the working people, that image is not going to last.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The war on poverty is but a small drop in the bucket compared to the effect on the people that the high interest rates are having.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Since I gave the low yields on Government bonds on an annual basis during each of several administrations, I think it would be fair to cite the highest interest rates paid on direct Government obligations issued during each of the administrations.

The highest rate paid on a direct obligation during the administration of President Harding was on a certificate issued on March 15, 1921. The interest rate on the certificate was 5.75 percent. On August 16, 1921, a note was issued which also had an interest rate of 5.75 percent.

The highest rate under the Coolidge administration occurred on October 15, 1928, when a certificate was issued at 4.75 percent.

The highest under the Hoover administration was on a certificate, issued on June 15, 1929, at 5.125 percent.

The highest under the Roosevelt administration, was a certificate issued on March 15, 1933, soon after he came into office, bearing a rate of 4.25 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. GORE. The highest under the Truman administration was on June 1, 1945, when a bond was issued at 2.50 percent.

The highest under President Eisenhower was on a note, issued on October 15, 1959, at 5 percent. On January 1, 1960, the Eisenhower administration issued some Treasury bills at an average interest rate of 5.099 percent.

The highest under President Kennedy's administration occurred on August 15, 1962, when a bond was issued bearing 4.25 percent.

Today, under the Johnson administration, the interest rate on an issue of certificates and an issue of notes is 5.25 percent, one full point higher than the highest rate paid during the Kennedy administration.

This trend, may I say to the Senator from Louisiana, is such a shocking trend that not only should the President give us his leadership to reverse it; we first need his leadership to stop it. We cannot do it without the President's leadership. That is why I have called today's interest rates, unhappily, Johnson high interest rates.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When President Hoover adopted various policies, including high interest rates, they led to a great depression. People called it the Hoover depression.

They did not excuse Hoover for a great number of omissions. They called it the Hoover depression. The high interest rate policy is causing people to pay 7, 8, or 9 percent for housing loans, if they can get the money when you take the discounts into consideration.

Mr. GORE. I hope my presentation of these interest rates does not present an unfair picture. I have undertaken to show what the interest rates were under several administrations. I have given the facts. I have done so, not with pleasure, but to show my concern for the American people and to call attention to the fact that we are headed for trouble unless the trend is reversed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The kind of interest rates the people are being charged will lead to a depression—not a recession, but a depression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. GORE. The overall effect is also leading toward a concentration of the Nation's wealth. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt, there was a trend toward deconcentration, toward a redistribution of the Nation's wealth. Through monetary policies, through economic policies, through political programs, this redistribution was accomplished to an admirable degree.

But under present policies, this trend toward redistribution through fair and equitable programs has been reversed, and we are experiencing a reconcentration of the Nation's wealth into the hands of a comparatively few.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope that those of us who speak on this subject may begin to bring about something of a change in these policies. I very much desire to work with the President, to cooperate with him, and to help him with his program. But, Mr. President, there is not a Member of the Senate who represents the President of

the United States. We represent the people of our sovereign States; and we have a duty to speak out when we believe that programs of our U.S. Government are not in the public interest; and I must say, this is one which I believe fits that category.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TALMADGE. I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana may have 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I compliment our distinguished majority whip and the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee for raising this question of interest rates. The rates are getting very much out of line, and have created an almost impossible burden upon many segments of the American economy. The building industry, particularly, is becoming almost completely stagnated; and that industry is one of America's largest employers.

It seems to me that the situation requires a number of remedial actions. First, I do not believe we can carry on a war in Vietnam that is costing about $2 billion a month, and continually expand welfare programs of all types in this country. Some of those programs, under ordinary conditions, may be highly desirable; but we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. We must put first things first.

Then, as has been repeatedly pointed out by some Senators, we have almost six divisions in Western Europe at the present time, and that, as one of the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee says, is costing our country $2.3 billion a year—much of it being converted into a dollar deficit and a gold drain—while at the same time we are continuing to draft more of our American sons to send them to South Vietnam.

It seems to me that we should reduce our troop commitments in Europe very drastically, and call on those countries which have greater gold reserves than we to assume a greater responsibility and a greater share of the burden in defending themselves.

Those are two things which can be done immediately. Those things can be done, in my judgment, by executive decision; and then whatever is necessary in addition to that to bring some semblance of order into the high interest rates that are slowing down the economy of our country, and in my judgment will place hundreds of thousands of people out of jobs in the not too distant future, certainly should be done.

I compliment and commend my distinguished fellow Senators for raising their voices in this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, interest rates are of concern, or at least should be of concern, to every American. But we should not overlook the fact that interest represents the cost of money, and when a commodity is in short supply, prices rise. It so happens that there is a greater demand for money than the existing supply.

One great contribution this Federal Government could make to reduce that excessive demand and thereby reduce interest rates, is in line with what the Senator from Georgia has just said; and that is, to stop trying to carry on all of the expansive Great Society spending programs and financing them with deficit spending.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration, in the last 5 years, has spent $30 billion more than it has taken in, and $1.5 billion of our interest burden today goes to pay the interest costs on the deficits created by the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

There is one difference between the high interest rates today and the records of high interest rates in previous administrations. In other administrations they at least let the small investors join in reaping the benefits of the higher interest. This administration is placing a ceiling of 4.15 percent on E-bonds. It now proposes a ceiling on certificates of deposit for the small depositors while leaving the lid off for the larger ones.

I do not know why an administration that is always talking about wishing to help the smaller people is trying to penalize them on this point. It is sheer hypocrisy. The best thing this administration could do in the way of finding a solution to relieve the cost of interest and this excessive demand for money, would be to stop advocating the expansion of every Great Society idea. Many of these programs may be meritorious if we had the money to pay for them, but they are certainly not meritorious when we are borrowing money at 5¼ percent interest rates to defray their costs.

The Government should set the example of fiscal responsibility.

## RACE RIOTS IN CLEVELAND

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have here a letter dated July 24, from an Edward A. Spelic, 2848 Lorain Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. The letter is a simple expression of what seems to be a humble citizen's view of problems confronting our metropolitan areas. I wish to read the letter:

> Hon. Senator FRANK LAUSCHE: I would like to know if you could recommend medals for bravery for all the police and firemen of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, because the police and firemen this last week have been through hell because of these Communist-led race riots. Also, if you are going to take up a collection for the President's daughter's wedding, how about a collection for the police and firemen who are trying to help save an American city called Cleveland, Ohio, from being destroyed?

This letter has great significance to me in the thought that it expresses. Throughout the country, all too frequently, at the end of every riot, the charge is made of police brutality.

It has been sought to lead public opinion into the belief that the culprits of the riots are innocent, and that the firemen and especially the police are the guilty ones.

On Tuesday, July 19, at a meeting in what is known as the J.F.K. Club, in the Hough Avenue area of Cleveland, a group was assembled. In that group was present an individual who was a friend of the Government.

The subject of discussion of the group was the development of ways and means to snipe at firemen trying to put out blazes, and at policemen maintaining law and order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. While the meeting was in progress, policemen entered. With the policemen's entry, the gathering was dispersed. Hence it is not known what ultimately happened in the development of a design and plan for sniping at police and firemen. All we know is that while the firemen were facing the fire in the buildings, they were also facing the fire sent forth from the gun barrels of the rioters.

The time has come, Mr. President, when we had better stop denouncing police and firemen. At this point, I wish to take exception to what my colleague from Ohio stated about the Ohio National Guard. He stated that some of the members of the Ohio National Guard were trigger happy.

It is a tragedy that we had to bring them in. They were there in the face of danger. They performed valiant and proper service for the maintenance of law and order.

I thank Mr. Spelic for his letter. I cannot start a collection for the police or the firemen. I cannot secure awards for them for their courage and their adherence to duty.

I bow and express my gratitude as a citizen of Cleveland to the police, the firemen, and the National Guard, who brought order to Cleveland, after 96 buildings had been destroyed, some wholly and others partially, after violence had run rampant, and government had been defied.

I regret to say this, but, in my opinion, Cleveland, Rochester, and Brooklyn are clearly training grounds for the worst that is yet to come. There are drills, trials, and maneuvers. Unless we back our Government and demand that the full force of law be used, including the police, the firemen, the National Guard, and the morale of the people, there is no foretelling what the end will be.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, some years ago I was chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

I believed then and I believe now that punishment, like a shadow, should follow the commission of any offense against law and order in our country.

I am, of course, opposed to mob violence, whether it be in Mississippi, Alabama, Ohio, or any other place in our Nation. On Tuesday of this week, I spoke out at some length on the disorders in

Cleveland and on the frustrations, the helplessness, and hopelessness of those who live in what we term the Hough Avenue area of Cleveland. I mentioned their pent up frustrations which finally erupted in violence.

We in Cleveland have always been proud of our great city. It is a melting pot of all ethnic groups which have come here from the old country, seeking liberty and seeking to free themselves from oppression and to escape the hopeless situation they faced in the old country.

I stand by every statement I made on Tuesday in a rather lengthy speech which was referred to by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio. I shall be happy to have any of my colleagues read that speech in its entirety, and not just take one sentence out of context:

In my opinion, the police of the city of Cleveland in some instances were guilty of acts of violence and of unnecessary brutality toward those who were violating the laws, burning buildings, rioting in our streets and also toward some innocent bystanders.

The junior Senator from Ohio, throughout his rather long life, has never liked people who push other people around. There were, in some instances, individual policemen who acted irresponsibly.

For instance, in Newsweek of August 1 is pictured a Negro woman seated in an automobile, riddled by police bullets. Caption of the lady with blood streaming from her face is "Hough: Police Bullets Riddled a Car and Wounded a Young Mother." Surely that is evidence of irresponsible action by police.

Mr. President, I stand by my statement of last Tuesday. We have a fine police department in Cleveland. We have a fine fire department. In my statement of last Tuesday I was careful to state it was a minority of policemen who did not conduct themselves as responsibly as they should under the circumstances. The great majority of the Cleveland police force is to be commended on its restraint during that difficult time.

Years ago I was a private in the Ohio National Guard. Those guardsmen called from their civilian vocations performed an unpleasant duty in a highly creditable manner. It is a fact as stated by me, and I reaffirm every statement I made last Tuesday, some of these guardsmen, most of them very young men, are unaccustomed to handling weapons in combat. A few appeared "trigger happy," as the saying is; and in a couple of instances their guns were fired accidentally. Fortunately, they injured no one.

For instance, the Cleveland Press reported an incident in which a National Guardsman fired several rounds from a machinegun at East 55th and Harlem Court when he thought he heard prowlers. Firing several rounds from a machinegun in a heavily populated neighborhood appears to me to have been the act of a trigger-happy guardsman.

I do assert that there was no nationwide conspiracy or Communist conspiracy, so-called, involved. While there may have been organized bands of hoodlums who took advantage of the riots to pillage and loot; while there may have been extremist groups who grasped the opportunity to exploit the violence for their own selfish ends; I am convinced that the riots themselves did not begin as a result of any conspiracy or organized plan. To state the riots were Communist, or otherwise, inspired appears to me to be a lame excuse to salve the consciences of those who do not want to, or refuse to, face the conditions that precipitated this disaster and similar ones in other great cities of our Nation—rat-infested slums, unemployment, poverty, hopelessness, frustration, and despair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for an additional 3 minutes on another matter.

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

## PRIME MINISTER KY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Prime Minister Ky, of the Saigon regime, has been in power since June 1965, when 10 generals conspired and overthrew the civilian government of South Vietnam.

I realize that at the Honolulu Conference, earlier this year, our President embraced him and made a sort of sweet-smelling geranium of him. Evidently power has gone to the head of this flamboyant so-called air marshal.

Shortly after the 10 generals made him Prime Minister, in an interview by an American reporter he was asked:

> Who are your heroes, Marshal Ky?

His answer was:

> I have only one—Hitler. I admire Hitler because he pulled his country together when it was in a terrible state in the early thirties. The situation here in South Vietnam is so desperate that one man would not be enough. We need four or five Hitlers in Vietnam.

When his fellow countrymen were fighting for liberation against the French colonial oppressors from 1946 to September 1954, where was Ky? Not only was Ky one of the tories in the war for liberation in Vietnam at that time, as he was being trained in the French Air Force, but the startling fact is that 9 of the 10 generals who overthrew the civilian regime at Saigon served with the French, fighting against the forces of the National Liberation Front, or Vietminh.

We Americans have regarded ourselves as the most revolutionary people in the world. We revere those patriots who won the Revolutionary War against England. We have always held low opinions of the American tories of that time who opposed those Americans who fought for the liberation of our country from colonial oppressors. However, we seem to be adhering at the present time to the tories in Vietnam.

Unfortunately at present time our Nation in the estimation of heads of state of most Asiatic countries has become the neocolonial oppressor. We are carrying on with our military might where the French left off. The United States has long been regarded as the most revolutionary nation in the world. We Americans revere the memory of those patriots who won the war for independence and then demanded that the first Congress write into our Constitution the first 10 amendments which we affectionately term our Bill of Rights. In our Revolutionary War the tories fought against the patriots.

We have alined ourselves directly with the tories of Vietnam in the civil war that is raging there. It is my hope that our President would disassociate himself from his involvement with Prime Minister Ky. Ever since the Honolulu conference earlier this year where the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces embraced this egotistical Prime Minister he has been too big for his britches.

Last October I interviewed him personally and I have followed his operations as best I can. Now this man, who himself was born in Hanoi and presently holds a position of power in Saigon which was usurped by the general's coup, apparently wants to go home. He has even had the effrontery to state that war between the United States and Red China is inevitable within 5 or 10 years. Why wait, he says. Talking as a native of what is termed North Vietnam he said ultimately the people of the North would overthrow the Communist regime there. Then he posed the question:

> Does the free world have the patience to aid and build South Vietnam for the necessary period of waiting? If not, we must destroy the Communists in their lair—

He said. Then he said that he did not believe that the Chinese Communists would intervene directly in the Vietnamese war at this time. He said, however, it was certain they would intervene directly in Vietnam or elsewhere in Asia in 5 or 10 years unless they were stopped.

Very definitely Ky should be removed as Prime Minister of South Vietnam. We Americans should repudiate his statement that the U.S. Government should join in an allied invasion of North Vietnam and an armed conflict now with Communist China. Administration officials and Secretary of State Rusk should immediately dissociate our Government from the irresponsible statements made by our South Vietnam puppet Ky. If he wants so badly to return to Hanoi, let him do it on his own two feet and not by reason of the untimely death of thousands of killed and wounded young American fighting men presently involved in a miserable civil war in Vietnam, a far-off country which is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

## FORTUNE MAGAZINE WARNS THAT ECONOMY IS SLOWING DOWN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, our economy is slowing down. Despite a lingering tendency for prices to creep upward, the overall pace of economic activity is slowing dramatically.

Instead of being worried about whether to impose a restraint in the form of a tax increase, as so many were this spring, we ought to be making sure we do not sit on our hands as we head into a recession.

In recent statements, I have cataloged in detail the movement of several economic indicators showing clearly that the steam is going out of the boom. Consumer demand has fallen. The Index of Industrial Production and the gross national product have been increasing at far slower rates. Housing starts have plunged sharply.

An excellent, thorough review of the current economic situation has just been published in the August issue of Fortune magazine. It begins:

The change in the pace of economic expansion is now unmistakable. Most people welcome it as a relief from inflationary pressure. Many of the readjustments looming up, however, look to be more painful than has been generally recognized. Each month's new business statistics are revealing further deterioration in the prospects for underlying demand in the domestic economy. The figures begin to suggest a change in direction, not just a change in pace.

Mr. President, we cannot afford "a change of direction" in the economy. A small change in pace, yes. But not a change of direction. We must continue to examine this situation closely and make certain that we do not slip into a recession in a misguided effort to restrain prices by drastically slowing down the economy.

Economist Sanford S. Parker, who prepared the Fortune roundup, discusses succinctly the influences he believes point to an increasing economic slowdown. He goes on to warn, however, that the slowdown may not bring prices down.

Food prices and some others seem certain to fall, he notes, but adds:

The main uncertainties in the price outlook are not so much economic as they are political, in the sense that they hinge on the broad politics of labor negotiations. The big question is whether or not unions will demand and win large wage increases to make up for inroads that rising living costs have already made in family budgets.

In short, Parker is suggesting that prices may continue to move upward regardless of the general level of economic activity. I agree that this is a very strong possibility.

The point I wish to make is this: Even if prices do continue to rise, it must not become a reason for adding further restraints on an economy growing at a progressively slower pace.

It is time—past time really—that we begin serious consideration of easing the monetary restraints that have been a large factor in causing the dramatic drop in real growth of the economy. The restraints, however necessary they may have been, have resulted in severe strains in our money markets and have been directly responsible for the near-recession conditions that now prevail in the housing industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Fortune roundup so that its examination of economic trends will be available to each Member of Congress. It is serious reading that should be carefully weighed.

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

A CHANGE IN DIRECTION—SIGNS OF DETERIORATION—THE MONEY PINCH BEGINS TO HURT—A BIG "IF" IN THE PRICE OUTLOOK—THE COMING LETDOWN IN INVENTORY BUYING

(By Chief Economist Sanford S. Parker, Associate Economist Morris Cohen, Staff Economists Radivoj Ristic, Vivian Howard)

The change in the pace of economic expansion is now unmistakable. Most people welcome it as a relief from inflationary pressure. Many of the readjustments looming up, however, look to be more painful than has been generally recognized. Each month's new business statistics are revealing further deterioration in the prospects for underlying demand in the domestic economy. The figures begin to suggest a change in direction, not just a change in pace.

Read G.N.P. grew by only 0.6 percent last quarter, a third as fast as the quarterly advance in the previous year.

Inventory accumulation reached a rate of $13 billion in the spring, significantly higher than had been estimated last month, which means that the adjustment of inventory buying will have to be that much more drastic.

Consumer purchases of cars have continued to run below year-ago levels, and excess stocks will overhang autumn sales and assemblies of 1967 models.

Residential and commercial construction contracts and permits fell abruptly in May, as did new lending commitments for future projects. This marked the first effect of the credit squeeze on construction activity.

The money markets were turbulent last month, preoccupied not only with the rise of interest rates but also with their alignment. The larger question for the economy today, however, is what effect the rise of interest rates to date will have on activity in the future. Costs of raising new money for business have risen in eight months by almost 1 percent at long term, on mortgages and new bonds, and by even more at short term, on new bank loans, commercial paper, etc. And perhaps a fourth of this rise occurred between mid-May and mid-July.

In reckoning the effects of the rise of interest rates up to June, Roundup last month forecast a gradual $2-billion decline in home building by next spring. This estimate, consistent with econometric models made by the Brookings Institution, implies a 10-percent decline in housing starts from the rate of nearly 1,500,000 that prevailed in 1965 and early this year. But in May, as it turns out, housing permits plunged, in effect, down to the level projected for *next* May, and housing starts, on which statistics are erratic, fell well below that.

Last month funds were still flowing out of the savings-and-loan associations, the main mortgage lenders, and clearly housing will run below the former projections the rest of this year. It might yet conform to them in 1967 *if* the current shortage of mortgage money is relieved (e.g., by a realignment of interest rates and savings). Yet the decline in housing might become larger if in fact it stems from a resistance by home builders and home buyers to the rising interest rates on mortgages, which are now at their highest since the 1920's.

A TOUCH OF PESSIMISM

Money costs ordinarily influence capital investment more belatedly than housing. In its forecast, Roundup figured that because of dearer money, capital spending would run some $3 billion lower by the end of 1967 than it otherwise might. Yet already in May the rate of new contracts for commercial construction projects dropped by $2 billion, and this area involves only a tenth, albeit a sensitive one, of the whole volume of capital investment.

There are no bargains in money today. The costs of all kinds of borrowed funds are at the highest levels in forty years. To meet the demand for loans, banks have still been borrowing reserves from the Federal Reserve at a discount of 4.5 percent, but paying an unusual percent more than that for the "federal funds" they borrow from other banks. Rates on commercial paper and other short-term business borrowings have kept pace. At long term, corporate borrowers are paying a percent more than a year ago, as are home buyers, when they can get the money; high commercial-bank interest rates on savings are drawing funds away from savings-and-loan institutions. Meanwhile the Treasury's (and municipalities') borrowing costs have also kept climbing, though by somewhat less, of course.

The news about construction, inventories, and money should call for some downward revision of the business forecasts that were made in late spring. Like most forecasters, executives reporting to Fortune's quarterly inventory survey had already pared their earlier projections a little. On average, they looked for an increase of only 3 to 4 percent over the next year in the FRB Index of Industrial Production. This was also the average prediction of the more than fifty economists regularly surveyed by J. A. Livingston of the Philadelphia *Bulletin*. But fully a third of these economists expected the FRB index to wind up 1967 a little below its peak of last spring, and in light of the month's news, a recanvass might now show that the proportion of "pessimists" has grown. Some of these pessimists thought output would go up before it came down; others thought it would go up after it first came down; and some foresaw—as Roundup last month forecast—a small dip in coming months, followed by a plateau.

The FRB index stood near 156 in June, up by 1.5 percent during the spring quarter, which was still a rapid rate of advance, though not half as fast as during the previous six months. Month by month into the autumn, the index will go up or down fractionally, depending on how fast inventory buying comes down in response to the leveling of sales and the softening of industrial markets.

During the spring Fortune's index of industrial pressure declined a bit for the first time since late 1963, as supplies available from new industrial capacity and inventories went up faster than demand (as represented by factory sales or output). This easing of the pressure index, already reflected in reports of purchasing agents, will gradually become more pronounced in coming months, and by year-end the pressure index will be down 3 to 4 percent, to the lowest levels since 1964. Pressure will ease whether or not inventory buying falls in the meanwhile, and the easing of pressure itself dictates that such buying will inexorably decline, later if not sooner. When stockpiling does drop, the FRB index will be down a bit from its spring highs.

The multibillion variables of inventories and the credit squeeze will dominate the near-term outlook. By comparison, the continual reshaping of defense plans counts as a minor variable. The Pentagon recently increased summer draft calls and thus may still be building up the strength of the armed forces, which have already reached the levels earlier authorized for the end of fiscal 1967. Yet this will add only slightly to the projected growth of arms spending.

Last month Secretary McNamara announced a cutback of $1 billion in the planned rate for future procurement of air

munitions. One reason, he said, is that output of bombs, rockets, etc., has built up faster than expected. This is true, too, of total arms procurement, which is running ahead of budget levels. Indeed, the rise of arms output slowed in the spring from the hectic pace it held through the winter. Output will continue to advance, of course, and so will the rate of total arms spending, which in real terms has gone up about $5 billion in the past year and should increase almost as much in the next. The rise can hardly depart much from this range as long as the U.S. sticks to the policy of a steady and sustained buildup of strength in Vietnam. Only a major change in policy could alter the setting in which new forces are beginning to assert themselves in the domestic economy.

PRICES: A WAGE QUESTION

The balance of economic forces at work could limit the upward movement of prices, which is now clearly inflationary. Price indexes have risen more in the past year than for nearly a decade; in the first half of 1966 consumer, industrial, and G.N.P. prices went up at an annual rate of between 3 and 4 percent. Recently, however, food prices have begun to turn down and industrial pressures have begun to diminish. Given some good luck with productivity gains, it is possible that the price bubble could break within the next year. The main uncertainties in the price outlook are not so much economic as they are political, in the sense that they hinge on the broad politics of labor negotiations. The big question is whether or not unions will demand and win large wage increases to make up for inroads that rising living costs have already made in family budgets.

Retail food prices advanced for five quarters (seasonally adjusted) through last spring, 7 percent in all, but the big rise in fact ended last March, and wholesale food prices have been declining for several months. Meat prices, which rose by a dramatic one-fourth at wholesale, have come down appreciably, and the supply prospects are favorable. The spring pig crop, just coming to market, was up 10 percent from 1965, and the fall crop should be up even more; so hog prices should come down faster later this year. Poultry prices should also be falling sharply then. Beef did not run up as much as pork and so it is coming down more moderately. To be sure, wheat prices are climbing, dairy prices are surprisingly strong, and food distribution, of course, continues to cost ever more. But all in all, retail food prices should ease a percent or so between now and autumn.

Prices of services, which have risen the most next to foods, are still going up around 4 per cent a year. One reason has been that the rise in medical-care costs has doubled to a 6 percent rate, partly in anticipation of the introduction of medicare, whose actual operation may push costs up even further. A tight-labor market continues to be an underlying factor in service industries, which will be particularly affected if Congress passes the minimum-wage bill.

Prices of clothing and foot wear have also been rising at a 4 percent rate, in part owing to heavy military demands, and other soft-goods prices have accelerated by nearly as rapid a rate. Consumer durables, however, have held close to the levels of last year-end. From here on, these products should rise at a slower rate, so that taking everything into consideration the rise in living costs could taper off from a rate of 4 percent in the first six months of 1966 to around half as much from now on.

In industrial prices, capacity utilization is the hopeful factor. Utilization rose some 3 percent a year for three years, then jumped in the first half of this year. Meanwhile since industry was putting higher cost plants to work, industrial prices rose a little—less than a percent a year on average. Utilization should now decline at least as fast as it rose, because manufacturing capacity is growing 7 percent a year while output—at full employment—can do no better than 4 percent. If, as Roundup expects, industrial output levels out or dips, prices should tend to fall a couple of percent—other things being equal, i.e., assuming no change in unit labor costs. These costs actually eased a little from 1962 to 1965, but in the first half of 1966 they advanced as much as the 2 percent by which industrial prices rose in that time. Almost half of this rise in labor costs stemmed from a nonrecurring factor: the increase in employers' payroll taxes for social security, effective last January 1.

RIDING THE ESCALATOR

Productivity has been and may continue to be the key to labor costs. In manufacturing it rose by well over 4 percent in 1963 and 1964, more than offsetting wage increases, but the gain slowed to 3.3 percent in 1965—the same as the last ten years' average—and so far in 1966 the gain is running at about that rate. Over the next year and more, industry should be able to improve productivity performance by gradually concentrating on the use of efficient plant and workers. But in the short term, productivity could continue to lag; many companies say they incur heavy added expenses on new plants until they are operating normally.

Thus labor costs may continue to increase for some months, even though nothing spectacular is happening yet to wages. Average hourly earnings in manufacturing have risen 3.4 percent in the past year, in part because there has been an increase in overtime payments. Overtime, however, is already diminishing, and in the coming year earnings could shrink a percent or so on this account. Wage increases scheduled under previous years' contracts averaged only 3 percent for 1966. Far fewer workers than formerly are covered by cost-of-living escalator clauses, but among those who are covered are the auto workers, whose wages are up 5 percent over a year ago. In that time the consumer price index used in their contracts has risen 2.7 percent, about twice the average of recent years.

Collective-bargaining agreements negotiated in the first three months of 1966 provided average wage increases of 3.7 percent a year over the life of the contract, up from the 3.3 percent averaged in negotiations last year. The only important contracts coming up for settlement the rest of this year are at G.E. and Westinghouse. But in 1967 more than twice as many workers as this year will be affected by new agreements. High profits and diminishing overtime may stiffen labor's stance in coming months. And both the attitude of the unions and actual wage costs will be influenced by the pending minimum-wage legislation. This would raise the standard minimum wage from the present $1.25 to $1.40 next February and $1.60 two years later, and would extend coverage to millions of new workers, at $1 next February and $1.60 in 1971.

Incredibly, there are no official estimates of how many workers will get how much of a pay increase from all this. But it could be that as many as five million will start a rapid climb up the wage ladder. That might directly add up to half a percent a year to the rise of business' total wage bill, and indirectly it could add even more, as workers above the minimums press their unions to get them pay raises of a similar kind. Thus it could happen that inflation would get a new push from the cost side in 1967, just as the pressures from the demand side were subsiding.

INVENTORIES AT THE TURNING POINT

The inventory phase of the long business upsurge has come to a turning point. It has reached a stage of excess, in the size of present stocks as well as in the rate that they are growing. One kind of business after another will be coping with the consequences in coming months, reducing inventory-buying rates before or inevitably after stocks become surplus. The drop in inventory demand will prove an independent and powerful factor in the economy.

A slowdown in the rise of sales has caught many optimistic executives by surprise, as Roundup warned three months ago that it might, leaving them with unexpected excesses of stocks. Business had been accumulating inventory at a rapid annual rate of $8 billion or more in order to keep stock in pace with rapidly rising sales, which advanced 3 percent in the first quarter of 1966 alone. Anticipating further sales gains, business had increased its orders again for the spring, but then sales eased. The Commerce Department is now estimating that inventory accumulation reached a $12-billion rate in the second quarter. In fact, the data on sales and output suggest that the rate reached fully $13 billion.

This $13 billion amounts, on an annual rate basis, to a 10 percent increase in business' total stocks, the highest—except for the abnormal first quarter of 1960—since the even wilder gyration in the early quarters of the Korean war. The increased buildup was by no means confined to the usually volatile auto and steel industries. In all other sectors, stocks have been growing at a rate of 9 percent a year for the past nine months. This couldn't last even in an economy growing at a "normal" 4 percent.

The spring stockpiling raised the ratio of inventories to final sales by more than 2.5 percent, leaving the ratio at the highest level in several years. In view of the long-term tendency for inventory turnover to improve by a half percent or so per annum with the use of computerized techniques, stocks now may be quite a bit too large.

Executives reporting to Fortune's quarterly inventory surveys have for the past year or two been saying that they expected to reduce their stock-sales ratios by 1 percent a year (though they were in fact never able to do so). Now they say they hope to pare off 2 percent by next spring, and their plans for further accumulation are more modest than in the recent past. But if business reduces its ratio 2 percent and if final sales grow only 2 percent in the next year, there would theoretically be no need for any inventory accumulation at all. In fact, $5 billion seems a likely average for the rate of buying in the second half of the year. Inventory plans of specific industries are beginning to portend a major and widespread letdown, but not an immediate collapse in accumulation.

TURNS IN CARS AND STEEL

Detroit is scheduling a record 700,000 assemblies for next month, in part because new models are being introduced earlier than usual. That could leave dealers, who say they have excess stocks now, with a bit *more* inventory, seasonally adjusted, than they had at midyear when they started cleaning up 1966 models. At that time they had 1,727,000 old models on hand, 350,000 more than a year earlier. Detroit has slashed its July–August assemblies, but with sales continuing lower than a year ago, dealers may be left with as many old models on hand at summer's end as they had a year ago, *plus* a good many more new ones—unless there is a sudden surge of demand for 1967 models. Stocks could be coming down in the autumn, say, at an adjusted rate of $1 billion or more, a dramatic reversal of last spring's $1.7-billion rate of accumulation.

Steel stocks came down last autumn after the labor settlement and ran off at a slower rate through the winter. As ingot production rose to a rate of some 140 million tons again this spring, total supply (including some 10 million of net imports) seemingly got back into reasonably close relation

with expanding steel use. Steel mills built up their own stocks to cover rising shipments but that should stop soon. The inventory situation of steel users, as it is portrayed by various Census statistics, is murky, but users reporting to Fortune say they held supplies steady through the spring. They now expect to reduce their present sixty-day supply on hand to a fifty-seven-day supply by the end of the year, and then stay at that level, which would be only a little higher than the 1962–63 lows. This suggests a turn again toward a little liquidation, particularly if the easing in Detroit's use of steel should more than offset the rise in defense use.

HIGHFLYING AIRCRAFT

In durable industries, total inventories of all kinds have been growing at nearly a $5-billion or 12 percent rate. The auto makers and building-materials firms will soon stop stockpiling in order to adjust to the recent slowdown in their production and sales. This year's really huge buildups have been going on in aircraft, at a $1.25-billion or 25 percent annual rate, and in electric machinery at a $1-billion or 15 percent rate. Both reflect booming arms and capital-goods demands, which will gradually slow down.

In consumer durables lines, stocks in some cases must be getting overbuilt, for merchants and manufacturers of home goods, for example, have been adding to inventory at a rate of 15 percent or so this year, while their sales have recently leveled out. Clothing sales have also stopped rising, but inventories seem to have been growing at a 5 percent rate or less as have the stocks of other soft-goods merchants.

Inventories of nondurables manufacturers have been rising substantially for a good many months, but at a rate that varies for each product. Chemical producers have been accumulating this year at a $700-million or 14 percent rate, which raised their stock-sales ratio 3 percent higher than a year ago. Makers of paper and paper products have begun to accumulate inventory again, but before long they as well as the users of their products will have brought their stocks up to needs. Textiles and petroleum, after building up stocks last autumn and winter, were running them down in the spring—which leaves executives in those industries just where they want to be.

In short, as inventory buildup has been widely spread throughout business, so are the signs of a coming slowdown.

## HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ORDERS CHILD NUTRITION BILL REPORTED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am very happy to state that the House Agriculture Committee has ordered an amended version of H.R. 13361, the Child Nutrition Act, reported to the House floor. As I understand the situation, one section of this amended bill would extend the special milk program for schoolchildren on virtually the same basis as Senator ELLENDER's recently passed nutrition legislation while at the same time retaining the autonomy of the program.

I am very hopeful that the House will be able to act quickly on this legislation so that the uncertainty which overhangs the school milk program can be resolved. We all recognize the value of the program. Now is the time for action.

## UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN HOSTS SEMINAR ON COMPUTERIZATION OF TRANSPORTATION RATES AND TARIFFS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most complex areas of specialized knowledge in the country today can be found in the transportation industry. Every year a fantastic multitude of decisions are made as to the tariff structure of common carriers. The tariffs charged by trucklines, railroads, airlines, and water carriers for transporting goods and people between designated points must be scrupulously worked out with a due regard for competitive conditions as well as the needs of the public. These tariff schedules must then be filed with the various regulatory agencies here in Washington, who have the ultimate power of approval or disapproval.

Furthermore, thousands of shippers, large and small, must decide which of these multitude of tariff schedules best meet their needs. This means deciding between competing carriers and routes in the same mode of transportation as well as choosing among competing modes of transportation.

Next week a seminar will be held at the University of Wisconsin which should be of great interest to both the carriers and the shippers who have to make these decisions—decisions which, quite literally, could be the difference between success and failure of businesses small and large.

This is the "Second Executive Seminar on Computerization of Freight Rates, Tariffs and Transportation Pricing for Carriers, Shippers, and Agencies." The seminar chairman, Herbert O. Whitten, of Whitten & Associates here in Washington, feels that computerization may well be one important step in solving the many pricing problems of the carrier, the shipper, and the Federal agencies which must decide whether a given tariff schedule is within permissible guidelines.

The Management Institute of the University of Wisconsin is to be commended for presenting this seminar. I wish the many participants the best in attempting to coordinate their efforts to utilize to the fullest the computer revolution in the transportation industry.

## NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE URGES INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several resolutions agreed to at the recent Governors' conference held in Los Angeles.

I wish to note particularly the resolution which urges the Federal Government to require coordination and review at the State level of Federal programs in order that their impact be assessed and fully understood in relation to the total development of a State.

Although the Senate passed S. 561, which I cosponsored, a bill designed to improve cooperation and coordination among the various levels of government, the House of Representatives unfortunately has thus far failed to enact this legislation. I intend to examine our Federal programs to make sure that State coordination is given a high priority.

The final resolution of the Governors' conference calls attention to the fact that the farmers' share of the food dollar has diminished from 60 cents to under 40 cents in the last 25 years. I believe we must make certain that our rural citizens are encouraged to continue their work of producing food for our ever-increasing population, and for the entire world. Certainly one method of discouraging farmers is to allow their share in the national income to decrease.

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

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL AID PROGRAMS

Whereas some states have centrally coordinated all federal programs within the office of the Governor or within a unit directly responsible to the Governor; and

Whereas such coordination places state government in an essential position in relation both to federal and local governments; and

Whereas it is necessary that the impact of federal programs be assessed and fully understood as related to the total development of a state, its regions and local governments;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the National Governors' Conference:

1. That the federal government, in planning and through its enabling legislation with respect to state, regional and local government assistance programs, require coordination and review at the state level; and

2. That federal programs requiring the existence of regional, metropolitan or areawide bodies, or planning processes, as a prerequisite for financial or other assistance also require coordination and review at the state level.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION ACT

Whereas the United States Senate has passed S. 561, a bill designed to improve cooperation and coordination of activities among the several levels of government; to improve the administration in the states of federal grants-in-aid; to provide for periodic Congressional review of grants-in-aid; to permit provision of reimbursable technical services to state and local governments; to establish coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of grants and loans for urban development; and to provide for the acquisition, use and disposition of land within urban areas by federal agencies in conformity with local government programs; and

Whereas S. 561 enjoys the support of numerous regional and national organizations of state and local government officials;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the National Governors' Conference declares its support of S. 561 and urges the United States House of Representatives to take early favorable action thereon.

AGRICULTURE

Whereas rural life in America is undergoing a major social and economic change which is bringing about a declining farm and small town population, thereby reducing their legislative representation; and

Whereas the farm economy is a vital part of the prosperity and progress of our Nation; and

Whereas agriculture is not sharing the full measure of prosperity enjoyed by other segments of the economy and is caught in a cost

price squeeze, wherein the farmers' share of the food dollar has diminished from $0.60 to under $0.40 in the last 25 years; and

Whereas expanded research facilities are needed to maintain the necessary efficiency and productivity of agriculture;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the National Governors' Conference that Congress and the administration, be urged to enact and implement such measures as may be required to make certain that agricultural income be adjusted to a level that American farmers are receiving their rightful share of the national income.

## THE AIRLINES STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a very serious crisis facing this Republic in the form of the airlines strike.

Yesterday the Secretary of Labor appeared before our committee and tried to sustain a fallacious position that a national emergency does not exist. In my judgment, the very evidence that the Secretary of Labor put into his statement rebuts his thesis. I think that there is no question that there is a national emergency facing this country; but, Mr. President, the administration now is moving into a very strange position in the argument of the Secretary of Labor that national health and safety are not involved.

Mr. President, yesterday morning I amended my resolution, although I think national health, safety, and defense are involved. I amended my resolution yesterday to apply the language of the Railway Labor Act which vests in the Congress the authority to proceed, as the Supreme Court has held on various occasions, to take necessary steps to regulate interstate commerce and protect the American people in such legislation.

In the case of Wilson against New, a 1917 case, which I pointed out this morning to the committee, the Supreme Court sustained the power of the Congress to arbitrate a case, because in its bill the Congress determined the hours and the wages that the railroad workers were to receive for 90 days. The case sustained the Congress in sending them back to work for the 90 days because of the vested public interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Congress not only has the power but—let me say, because of the point I am about to make—has the duty to protect the public interest. The major parties to this dispute are no longer the carriers and the union. The major party is the American public and the American public is entitled, without any delay, to have Congress take necessary steps in this regulated industry to see to it that the men go back to work, and are guaranteed, as my resolution guarantees them, a fair settlement of the dispute.

My resolution authorizes the President to appoint a special mediation board to serve, if necessary, for an additional 180 days. All that my resolution does in this matter is to extend the present 60-day period, that is authorized in the present act, to an additional 180 days and until the parties have the time, under the guidance of such a board, to reach a settlement. If after 150 days they have not reached a settlement, the Congress could take such further action.

In my judgment, the mere passage of the resolution will do much to end this strike and result in a fair settlement in not more than 30 days—possibly 10 days.

But, what has become of the issue?

The issue now is whether the union is going to be allowed, by the use of naked economic power, to force a settlement with the airlines which will not be in the public interest. It is the public interest more than the airlines interest that is important. The record is perfectly clear, even on the basis of the testimony yesterday of witnesses before the committee, that there is practically no hope of a settlement unless that settlement is one which goes far beyond reasonable inflationary control.

Therefore, as I have already said to the majority leader, it is of the utmost importance that the Senate be in session tomorrow.

I believe the leadership of the Senate has a clear duty to have the Senate in session tomorrow. If it becomes evident that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is using parliamentary procedures aimed at delaying consideration of my resolution, I propose to bring it to the floor of the Senate. So long as the committee proceeds to consider modifications of my amendment, offered in good faith and on its merits, I will completely cooperate with the committee, as I told it this morning, in consideration of those amendments. But we all know as Senators, because we have all been in the same position, the difference between having a matter considered on its merits and having it considered under a parliamentary tactic seeking to prevent its coming to the floor on its merits.

I say to my colleagues in the Senate, whether they agree or disagree with me on the procedure for the settlement of this case, we owe it to the American people to be available, and to stand up and vote, and vote before this weekend is over, on whether we want to adopt the proposal which I have suggested.

Mr. President, this situation is so serious that I hope the leadership will not create a bad image in the country tomorrow of not having the Senate in session in order to take legislative action on this matter.

Let me tell the Senate what is involved in regard to the great losses being suffered by our fellow Americans. They amount to millions of dollars. There are cities in this country which have no airline service at all. There are regions and sections of the country—and do not forget that the Railway Labor Act refers to sections of the country that are being denied essential transportation facilities—that is what the Supreme Court has referred to in its decisions—there are those sections of the country which are being denied adequate service. Congress cannot walk out on its responsibilities to those sections of the country because of a powerful union which obviously wants to get an inflationary wage settlement, with a long list of unions just waiting to proceed along a similar line.

There is American Airlines that had to have an Emergency Board appointed yesterday. There is also the telephone company, General Electric, Westinghouse, ground transportation, and so forth. They are waiting to see whether the union succeeds in cheapening the value of the American dollar by a breakthrough on the inflationary control ceiling.

In my judgment, we cannot permit this situation to continue when we can guarantee full protection to the workers of their legitimate rights which my resolution would provide, including retroactivity in regard to the money factors to January 1, 1966.

But, it is obvious from the testimony of the president of the International Machinists Union yesterday that so long as——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield right there?

Mr. MORSE. Not just yet.

If the Government takes the position that the settlement must be within inflationary control, the president of the IAM sees little hope for a settlement. He told us that yesterday. That, in my judgment, is a clear warning to Congress and to the people of this country of what the union is going to insist upon.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio, if he were a lawyer for the carriers, and they cannot get some relief from the loss of millions of dollars, which they are now suffering, would the Senator advise them not to fight an inflationary wage increase, and then go to the CAB——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Surely—surely.

Mr. MORSE. And ask for some increase in rates?

I yield to no one in this body in insisting on a fair wage settlement for the union, but that is not what they are asking for. They are asking for an inflationary settlement.

Therefore, Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I have already asked my majority leader to take note of the fact that the eyes of the country will be on the Senate as to whether we are in session tomorrow to act on behalf of the protection of the people of this country in what is obviously a national crisis.

## THE WASHINGTON NATIONAL NOISE DROME

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as a Member of Congress, I want to raise my voice in protest against the decision—which is against the national interest and particularly against the interests of the Capital of this Nation—made by the Federal Aviation Agency, to permit jets of the largest size to use the Washington National Airport.

This airport should be renamed the "Washington National Noise Drome." There is no airport in America, the airlines proudly brag, so near the heart of the city as the one in Washington.

Because the airport is so near to the heart of Washington, D.C., the airplanes that use it fly over at least 5 miles of

heavily developed residential areas coming in and a greater distance going out. Anyone living near the line of flight hears a 15-second buildup of noise to a crescendo as the plane approaches and an equal period of diminishing noise after the plane passes. The noise is deafening, and the present plan is to permit the planes to take off 40 times per hour or every 90 seconds.

As one Senator who lives near the course so many of the planes take—I live in one of the best insulated buildings against sound in the Washington area—it is horribly irritating to hear these tremendous jets flying overhead. Horrifying noise can make slums out of property, just as much as slums can be made by obnoxious odors in an area, or unsightly objects.

It has been suggested on this question of noise that only the smaller jets be permitted to land. For a longe time jets were denied landing facilities at all, but now the airlines, with their financial power behind them, and their ability to make the Federal Aviation Agency bend to their will, with the support of a few commuting Congressmen, have succeeded in lifting the order so that now there are going to be 40 planes an hour—presumably the largest jets—making noise 8 to 10 times as much as a propeller driven airplane, zooming up and down the Potomac River area which was once a quiet and pastoral scene, with a beautiful view, and with the finest real estate values to be found in the whole area.

No one could get permission of the FAA to locate an airport in that area if one was not already there. As any area grows, its airport should be moved out. A better use of the property would be a plan to park automobiles, prohibiting automobile parking on the main streets. Philadelphia is doing something of that sort—so that we would not congest the downtown traffic arteries with so many parked cars. Taxicabs and public transportation facilities could be used to move people around the heart of town.

Now that action has been taken by the Federal Aviation Agency and we are asked to submit the heart of the Capital to the monstrous noise which will be made by additional airplanes, it is suggested that Bolling Air Force Base, across the river, be reopened for similar outrage to accommodate the largest jets that can be constructed. I would be curious to know if Midway Airport in Chicago is now to be put to similar use near the heart of Chicago.

Mr. President, it will be only a matter of time until some of these airplanes crash in the District. These enormous behemoths when they crash, will tear down rows of office buildings or rows of residential houses, as the case may be.

A number of them have crashed in the vicinity of Kennedy International Airport on Long Island.

We have a very fine airport in Dulles with the longest runways on the eastern seaboard. We have a very fine airport north of Washington, in Friendship. About the only thing that is really needed to make these airports close, in point of time, is simply to open the Interstate Highway System into the heart of town or build rapid transit conveyances between the city and the airports.

The FAA, I understand, will permit 40 flights per hour from National. It considers 44 flights the saturation point. It is going to yield to the public interest to the extent of lightening that load by decreasing the number of flights by four. I suppose the citizens living in the path of earth shattering noise every 90 seconds are supposed to say, "Thanks a lot, it could have been 10 percent worse." When the supersonic transport plane becomes available for use, which creates more noise than is made by a large gun being fired, is the FAA going to use the same procedures in allowing such planes to come into the heart of cities?

Mr. President, this is part of a bigger problem we are going to face. Noise can destroy real estate values.

An SST, crashing through the sound barrier across the Nation, will create noise as loud as a naval barrage. The SST should fly over the oceans, wherever possible, so that the noise wave will spare as many people as possible. Where land areas are overflown we should pay for the depressed values of properties of citizens as a result of the noise that such planes will make.

The alternative answer would be simply to condemn the whole United States to suffer from this kind of noise, and say that since everybody's property had suffered as a result of the noise produced by the SST, nobody would be reimbursed for the devaluation of their property.

Dulles Airport can stand many more flights, three times as many.

People who ride on planes are interested in the safety factor. Dulles Airport is empty most of the time. It has the longest runways on the Atlantic seaboard.

National Airport is one of the most dangerous airports on which the big jets land, but that does not stop people who want to grab an advantage in getting the cream of long-distance air flights by having planes come right into the heart of the city, in spite of the safety factors involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred, entitled "Traffic at National," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TRAFFIC AT NATIONAL

The Federal Aviation Agency, batted back and forth like a shuttle-cock between the airlines and Midwest members of the congessional Tuesday to Thursday club, has issued a new order limiting flights at Washington National Airport.

It provides no permanent solution either for National or for the air traffic pattern of this area. The new order will impose a limit of 40 operations an hour. This is four less than the volume desired by the airlines. And, of course, it abandons the 500 mile limit and permits several schedules in excess of 650 miles.

The daily operations will be limited to 600. Without the limitations, according to FAA, the number would have risen to 760. Within the instrument limit of 60 an hour there can be 40 airlines operations, 16 general aviation operations and four air-taxi flights.

If the airlines can agree on the allocation of the available operations—and they have not done so yet—the volume will exceed the amount of traffic that ought to be allowed in and out of National. This amount of business still will over-burden the facilities at the airport, oppress the residents of the community with an intolerable amount of noise and inconvenience, those who travel by air and those who do not, throughout the metropolitan area. The time will arrive when no city will tolerate the risks and hazards of increasing traffic over built-up urban areas. This city would not do so if it had self-government. Any elected government would promptly close National or limit its use to general aviation and move the airlines to Dulles International Airport.

The new rule, no doubt, will move back to National a number of schedules that would go to Dulles under a 500 mile limitation. The finest airport in the world will continue to be only partially utilized. The convenience of Congressmen and airline operators has won out over the comfort, safety and convenience of citizens. Residents of the District are not totally without means of showing their own preference. They cannot vote, but they can "vote with their feet" by using the services available at Dulles International Airport and Friendship Airport. The last word has not yet been said on Washington National Airport. Sooner or later, the great volume of Washington traffic will be moved to an airport that is convenient, comfortable, commodious, and safe.

## RECENT RIOTS IN CLEVELAND—NEGRO EDITOR BLAMES SOME MINISTERS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the Cleveland Press of Tuesday, June 26, are two letters dealing with the Cleveland riot. They constitute a refreshing breeze coming out of that city which, about a week ago, was brought to ashes and ruins in many sections of the Hough area.

The two articles in the Cleveland Press quote statements made by leading Negroes. One is by William O. Walker, editor of Cleveland's Call & Post, a newspaper with a large circulation. Mr. Walker is director of industrial relations in the Rhodes cabinet in Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. Walker stated that the blame must be "placed upon individual white pastors and their association, the Emergency Clergy Committee for Civil Rights."

Mr. Walker stated:

They misinterpret and misunderstand many aspects of the Negro life. I don't think they are the best missionaries in the Negro's fight to win civil rights.

The white ministers did not intentionally incite the riots.

But in trying to right the wrongs of 100 years overnight they set up the Negro population for that other element all over America that today is ready to take advantage of a bad situation.

The article states further:

Walker said the common pattern of rioting in big cities suggests a central source, but he said the existence of such a source remains to be proved.

In Chicago yesterday I talked on this subject and, in substance, I said that the tactics adopted in Cleveland are in complete compliance with the tactics in other metropolitan riots throughout our country.

I want now to discuss for a moment the statement made by Leo Jackson, a

councilman of the city of Cleveland. He is a Negro. He urged the declaration of martial law. He had great courage. The Negroes were rioting. He asked that martial law be declared and imposed, with all the severity incident to it.

I read from the headline of that article: "Leo Jackson Warns Council of Organized Negro Thugs."

He said that this riot "was organized by thugs to intimidate the people."

That is the statement of that Negro councilman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. He also said it was organized by—

> An element which looks with contempt on the man who holds two jobs to support his family; disrupts schools and takes over playgrounds; snatches purses of women rather than seeking employment; burglarizes homes and stands around street corners treating our women with utter disrespect.

Then he goes on to say the riots were not an attempt to get "Whitey." He stated:

> You don's get Whitey in a neighborhood where 99% of the people are Negro.

I remind Senators that 97 buildings occupied by Negroes—who are seeking quarters—were burned down.

Now, this is the highlight of his statement:

> Jackson said the thugs provoking and participating in the riot terrorized their neighbors.

He quotes what was said to him by one of the people living in the neighborhood.

He said:

> It is the same element that told me they'd burn me out of my home where I live peacefully with my wife and children.

Furthermore—and mark what I say now—this is a peaceful, law-abiding citizen in his home, who states:

> It is a painful experience to maintain a vigil for four nights with a shotgun across my knee.

Visualize a peaceful American family man, living within his home, a Negro, maintaining a vigil for 4 nights with a shotgun across his knee, feeling he would become a victim of the riot.

But what will happen? Condemnation will be made of the part played by the National Guard, the city government, and the police. I repeat that my colleague from Ohio, in the face of all this, said that the National Guard was trigger happy.

The National Guard did not fire a shot. They did not take a life. But they were there in the midst of fire, in danger; and yet there is now condemnation of the National Guard—an obvious encouragement to the thugs.

I commend William Walker, the editor, and Leo Jackson, the councilman, who are trying to follow a course that will serve the interests of the Negro people, maintain law and order, and preserve our democracy.



Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles from which I have quoted 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 Cleveland Press, July 26, 1966]

NEGRO EDITOR BLAMES SOME MINISTERS

William O. Walker, editor of Cleveland's Call & Post, today placed upon individual white pastors and their association, the Emergency Clergy Committee for Civil Rights, some blame for the Hough riots.

He said "they misinterpret and misunderstand many aspects of Negro life. I don't think they are the best missionaries in the Negro's fight to win civil rights.

"The white ministers did not intentionally incite the riots," he said.

"But in trying to right the wrongs of 100 years overnight they set up the Negro population for that other element all over America that today is ready to take advantage of a bad situation.

"I am talking about the Rev. Charles Rawlings, executive director of the Metropolitan Affairs Committee of the Council of Churches; the Rev. David Zuverink, former pastor of the Glenville Presbyterian Church, and the Rev. Paul Younger, director of the Protestant Ministry to Poverty."

The other element to which Walker alluded, he said, is the "social theorists" both white and Negro. He identified them as social workers.

"They are social workers, particularly in the field of relief, who want to enhance their own positions and get raises for themselves.

"The recent march on Columbus, for instance, was promoted more by professional social workers than by relief clients."

Walker said the common pattern of rioting in big cities suggests a central source, but he said the existence of such a source remains to be proved.

Walker also predicted a short future for the term "Black Power." Already, he said, it has been given so many different interpretations that it is becoming a "babble" and it soon will cease to exist.

"Power, like God, knows no color," Walker said. "It is the instrument intelligent people use to make progress."

Walker is in New Orleans, where, as director of Ohio's industrial relations, he is attending the convention of the International Association of Government Labor Officials. He made his statements in an interview.

None of the ministers named by Walker was available immediately for comment.

---

[From the Cleveland Press, July 26, 1966]

LEO JACKSON WARNS COUNCIL OF ORGANIZED NEGRO THUGS

(By Norman Miachak)

Thugs and hoodlums are engaged in an organized and systematic adventure to overthrow traditional leadership in Greater Cleveland's Negro neighborhoods.

Their attempts to intimidate residents and undermine leaders led to five nights of rioting which rocked the Hough area last week, according to Leo A. Jackson, Negro councilman in the Glenville area.

"This was not a peaceful civil rights action," Jackson said in an impassioned address in Council last night.

"This was organized by thugs to intimidate the people."

Lashing away at the organizers and perpetrators of the riot, Jackson described them as "an element which looks with contempt on the man who holds two jobs to support his family; disrupts schools and takes over playgrounds; snatches purses of women rather than seeking employment; burglarizes homes and stands around street corners treating our women with utter disrespect."

The riots, Jackson said, were not an attempt to get "Whitey."

"You don't get Whitey in a neighborhood where 99% of the people are Negro."

Jackson said the thugs provoking and participating in the riot terrorized his neighbors.

"It is the same element that told me they'd burn me out of my home where I live peacefully with my wife and children.

"It is a painful experience to maintain a vigil for four nights with a shotgun across my knee."

"You can build all the recreation areas you want and you won't get this element in them. It doesn't want respect and order."

Jackson called on Council and the community to repudiate the rioters. He appealed to police to enforce the law strictly and rigidly.

"We're going to maintain law and order in the Glenville Area.

"Give us the protection so I won't have to sit night after night with a shotgun on my knees."

Ward 20 Councilman M. Morris Jackson told Council that he could not justify the loss in lives, property and security caused by the riots.

"But it did not come without warning," he said attributing its causes to broken promises on urban renewal; inadequate housing and recreation facilities; insufficient city services and lack of an integrated police force.

"These were the seeds of discontent that exploded last Monday night. Where do we go from here?"

Mayor Locher called the riot the work of "thugs, hoodlums, arsonists and snipers" and said he would not yield to them because to do so would be to make a concession to lawlessness.

"It is a responsibility of all of us to provide remedies and solutions to problems that affect urban areas," he said.

"But there must be a recognition that this must begin with the individual and the individual family.

"All the government largess and its millions of dollars won't cure this if it doesn't begin with the individual."

Four employment projects were underway, he said, when the rioting began. "The city itself said to those between the ages of 21 and 25 years old: If you want a job come and get it."

---

## DRUG PRICES IN ARGENTINA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on June 22 of last year I introduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the New York Journal of Commerce indicating that Decree No. 3042 of the Argentine Ministry of Health might cause the bankruptcy and collapse of that nation's pharmaceutical industry. The various companies in Argentina were asked to take certain steps to comply with the decree. This they have done. The Ministry of Health, with very few exceptions has not fulfilled its agreement and permitted a readjustment of prices by the companies which are being injured by this decree. I am hopeful that the new government in Buenos Aires will show its good faith by correcting the situation described in the article which I will insert in the RECORD following these remarks.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared on March 17, 1966, in Confirmado, a publication in Buenos Aires.

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

[From Confirmado, Buenos Aires, Mar. 17, 1966]

MEDICINES AND THE WHIMS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH MINISTER

The estimated dangerous consequences for the Argentine drug industry from Decree 3042/65 are beginning to be felt: last week two laboratories had to merge, and a third one was sold to a U.S. company in order to survive. For the rest of the pharmaceutical industry the outlook is no brighter; merger is not always possible and selling to a foreign group is feasible only when a buyer is available. The alternative for a high percentage of Argentine Laboratories seems to be—if circumstances do not change—bankruptcy.

Both CAEME (Argentine Chamber of Medicinal Specialties) and CILFA (Industrial Center of Argentine Pharmaceutical Laboratories), representing the entire industry are in agreement on the attitude of the Minister of Public Health, Arturo Õnativia, i.e. that he does not appear to be attempting to solve the problem. "The Õnativia whim" as his intransigent position has become known does not correspond to the statements he has made. On November 2, 1965, Õnativia had a meeting—it was to be the last one—with the representatives of CAEME. At that time it was concluded: a) the period of price control established by Decree 3042 has lapsed; b) from that date, the Ministry would take into consideration any increase in manufacturing costs and would allow it to be reflected in the selling prices; c) submission of the complicated accounting forms prescribed by the Decree would no longer be required.

Ten days later, Õnativia met with the representatives of CILFA, and re-iterated the same conclusions arrived at with CAEME. However, four months later, none of these promises had been fulfilled, and laboratories continue to sell at the same prices, frozen since October 31, 1963. In reference to the submission of forms, there are no substantial changes; on the contrary, if in a few cases some slight price increases were allowed, many laboratories have been forced to introduce reductions even below the frozen prices.

Paradoxically, the public of Buenos Aires is at present paying 20% more than before the Decree for many medicines; this being the result of the elimination of the discounts which the pharmacies previously were granting on their own initiative.

Hector M. Blanco, vice president of CAEME, recognizes that Õnativia is justified to a certain extent in trying to derive political benefits from the pricing of pharmaceuticals. But he firmly believes that the Minister "could obtain better results in that direction if he were honest and frank in the matter." Õnativia's present policy, if pursued further, will cause the disappearance of the national drug industry, and will leave him facing the foreign *pool* on which he will not be able to impose indefinitely price ceilings.

Because of this politically-inspired price control, the industry has eliminated its allocations for research work. The launching of new products has also been curtailed, thus denying the public the benefits of new medicines.

There are some cracks, however, in Õnativia's rigidity. Not long ago, the Minister ordered a foreign-financed laboratory to introduce three drugs received from the U.S.A. and recognized as effective on certain types of tumors. This constituted a clear violation of Decree 3042, since the laboratory did not have to submit the manufacturing cost forms. Even though a sector of the public benefited from the imported drug, the preferential treatment was detrimental to other laboratories capable of launching new products for the good of public health.

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC GROUP

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to the phenomenal progress in civilian nuclear power being made by one of our New England electric utility groups. I refer to the pioneering achievements of the Yankee Atomic Electric Co. in constructing and operating the Yankee atomic electric plant at Rowe, Mass. This plant on June 30 completed 5 years of commercial power operation.

From time to time I and other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have informed this body of the progress being made in the application of nuclear energy to the generation of electric power. Current estimates predict over 100 million kilowatts of installed nuclear capacity in this country by the year 1980. We are in the midst of a revolutionary change in the field of central station power. A few statistics illustrate this clearly. Two years ago less than one-half percent of the central station power in this country was nuclear. The big move to nuclear power started in 1965 when 6,500,000 kilowatts of nuclear capacity—or 25 percent of all power plants ordered were nuclear. Thus far in 1966 plans for buying over 12 million kilowatts of nuclear power generating capacity have been announced—or over 50 percent of all central station capacity ordered.

I trust that in the future when most of our electric power in this country will be generated through the use of atomic energy that we will all look back with pride to the pioneering efforts to which I am calling attention today.

The Atomic Energy Commission through its reactor development program built and operated the Shippingport pressurized-water reactor from which basic data were derived for the detailed design of the Yankee plant. The Yankee plant is the first pressurized-water reactor constructed and operated by industry. Since its initial operation a considerable number of commercial pressurized-water reactor plants have been committed and are expected to contribute heavily to the nuclear portion of our Nation's electric power capacity during the next several decades.

There is a very important aspect of the accomplishment at Yankee which I have not yet mentioned. Financing of this plant was based upon estimates made in July of 1958. It has been found however through actual operating experience that the plant was capable of almost one-third higher power rating than had been estimated and that the expenses were about one-fourth to one-fifth less than initially estimated. These figures are presented in detail in a memorandum dated July 11, 1966, and issued by Mr. William Webster, president of Yankee Atomic Electric Co. Without objection I would like to submit a copy of that memorandum for the RECORD.

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

YANKEE ATOMIC ELECTRIC CO.,
*Boston, Mass.*

*To Yankee Directors:*

On June 30 Yankee completed five years of commercial power operation. Over this period we have been very fortunate to avoid major hard luck, to exceed our output estimates, and to be on the low side of cost figures. Our average power cost for these first five years was 9.8 mills/KWH*—this is less than two-thirds the July 1958 estimate of 15.3 mills/KWH.

This result is due partly to the original low construction capital cost, partly to the attaining of a higher capability and more hours output than projected, and partly to a net saving in many assorted items of operating expense. These favorable developments stem mainly from the capable and dedicated efforts of a very fine group of individuals. This letter is written to call to your attention and to record the accomplishments of our splendid "Yankee Team".

Here is a comparison of actual figures with the July 10, 1958 estimates that were used as a basis for Yankee financing. These figures cover the first five years of commercial operation (July 1961 through June 1966).

| | 1958 estimates | Actual performance | Change (percent) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Net kilowatt | 134,000 | 175,000 | +31 |
| Gross kilowatt | 142,000 | 185,000 | +30 |
| Hours critical | 31,000 | 35,835 | +15 |
| Net kilowatt-hour (millions) | 3,970 | 4,953 | +25 |
| Expenses (including fuel and taxes) | $37,200,000 | $29,300,000 | −21 |
| Depreciation | 13,500,000 | 9,900,000 | −27 |
| Interest and return | 12,600,000 | 9,500,000 | −25 |
| Total | 63,300,000 | 48,700,000 | −23 |
| Power cost, mills per kilowatt-hour | 15.3 | [1] 9.8 | −36 |

[1] Note that the power costs shown above are based on 20-year straight-line depreciation and normalized Federal income taxes. With 30-year depreciation and flow-through, as used by most of our companies, the 5-year average power cost would have been 8.4 mills instead of 9.8.

WILLIAM WEBSTER,
*President.*

JULY 11, 1966.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, because of my special interest in atomic energy and because I feel that atomic energy can make an important contribution to the peaceful activities of this Nation and of the world, it gives me special pleasure to learn of the fine record that has been established at Yankee and to see in this record of performance clear indication that economic nuclear power is close at hand if not already with us.

Again I congratulate Mr. Webster and each and every member utility of the Yankee Co. for this fine record. Their confidence expressed a number of years ago in the ability of the atom to contribute significantly to this peacetime application has been shown to be well-founded.

## "SUPER" 6TH ARMORED DIVISION REUNION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, members of the 6th Armored Division Association today begin their 19th annual reunion. Members of the association and their families will be here in Washington for 3 days with the Sheraton-Park Hotel as reunion headquarters.

Being a member of the 6th Armored Division Association is a source of great personal pride to me. I served with this division during World War II under a great division commander, Maj. Gen. Robert W. Grow, now retired. For most of the time in action, we were part of the 3d U.S. Army under General Patton.

It is natural to be proud of one's military unit. I know that many of my colleagues here have similar attachments.

But I hope I will be pardoned in saying that members of the 6th Armored Division Association have special justification for their pride.

The division participated in five major campaigns in France and Germany, including action in the Battle of the Bulge. In these battles more than 1,200 members of the division lost their lives and more than 4,000 others were wounded.

The division landed on the Normandy Peninsula on July 18, 1944, and for the next 221 consecutive days the division was constantly in contact with the enemy. Between July 18 and May 8, when the war in Europe ended, the division fought through campaigns in Normandy, northern France, the Rhineland, Ardennes, and central Europe. The division raced across Germany in a final burst of bold power and skill which helped end the war quickly.

From the time it landed in Normandy until the end of the war, a total of nearly 10 months, the division was in combat continually except for a period of less than 2 weeks.

As General Grow later commented:

> From the hedges of Brittany through the forest gorges of the Ardennes and the flooded bottoms of Lorraine, to the beautiful rolling hills of Saxony, the division mastered every variety of terrain.

The 6th Armored Division ceased to exist as a separate unit 3 years, 7 months, and 3 days after it was activated at Fort Knox, Ky.

The memories of those days remain clear today. Yet when members now get together at the reunions, the talk is more of the pleasant memories of past associations and not the grim and bitter struggle we all went through.

Talk at our reunions is also of the future, and the association is contributing to that future through a scholarship program begun in 1962. Each year two students having some relation to association members are awarded scholarships on a competitive basis.

Our reunions are family affairs. The District of Columbia Task Force, which has arranged the reunion program, has made sure to provide plenty of time for families to see our beautiful Capital City. As one member of the association, I welcome them to Washington.

## URBAN RENEWAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as long as the Congress continues to deny home rule to the District of Columbia, it has the obligation to consider legislation concerning the needs of the District. One of the most urgent of these needs is urban renewal.

But the House Armed Services Committee has adopted a rider to the military construction bill which would prevent the District of Columbia from carrying out an urban renewal project on the old Bolling-Anacostia airfields.

Official findings have indicated that continued use of these fields for airplanes would pose a safety hazard, in view of the proximity of National Airport. The President has asked that this urban renewal project be completed next summer. The amendment which would "preserve" these airfields for future military use—unforeseen by the Defense Department—is irresponsible and directly opposed to the best interests of Washington and its residents.

Today's Evening Star contains a cogent editorial on this point. The Star calls the rationale of the amendment a phony argument, and I agree. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

WRONG THINKING

The latest effort of the House Armed Services Committee to block an urgently needed District urban renewal project on a part of the old Bolling-Anacostia flying fields makes no more sense today than a similar effort made a year ago.

In defense of this ridiculous action, L. MENDEL RIVERS, the committee chairman, is sticking largely to the same phony argument as was used before: That the entire vast Bolling-Anacostia complex should be "preserved" for a future military use.

What future use? The Pentagon, which is in the best position to know, is unaware of one. The truth is that Washington's federal and local planning agencies have been working hand-in-glove with the Defense Department in laying out the renewal area. The immediate and future military needs, including space for a "Little Pentagon" office building, have been fully agreed upon as a starting point. Accordingly, the land left for urban renewal has been trimmed to less than half the total of 940 acres. And military officials are fully in accord with the arrangements.

Perhaps recognizing the flimsiness of his position on this score, Mr. RIVERS has dreamed up another argument to bolster his committee's latest proposal for a five-year "freeze" on the area. Instead of being used for urban renewal, Mr. RIVERS now says, parts of the large tract might be converted to use as a "general airport" for private flying to relieve the load on National Airport. And what is surprising about the scheme is that it has drawn support from the Federal Aviation Agency.

The FAA switch is surprising first because it conflicts head-on with President Johnson's own clearly worded directive of only a year ago to the effect that work should proceed immediately on a Bolling-Anacostia urban renewal plan, to be completed no later than July 1, 1967. It is surprising, secondly, because the FAA, no less than a year ago, vehemently opposed any type of air operations at Bolling-Anacostia as a hazard to National's flight patterns.

To be sure, the influx of jets at National has modified that airport's flight patterns to some extent. And FAA officials claim they endorse the Rivers scheme only as a "temporary measure," which is not intended to block the urban renewal program for all time.

As the FAA is well aware, however, the type of "temporary" program advanced by Mr. RIVERS, once begun, would surely not be cut off by the time the urban renewal program is slated to begin a year from now. The consternation and outrage expressed at the House committee action—and at the FAA position—by the Planning Commission, the United Planning Organization and the District Democratic Central Committee is wholly justified.

Two steps are in order. The White House should reiterate the fact that the mischievous "freeze" order, attached by the House committee to a military construction bill in the form of a rider, is directly contrary to administration policy regarding the urban renewal projects. And the House, when it has the opportunity, should strike the rider from the bill.

---

## DON'T BLAME FARMERS AND RANCHERS FOR INFLATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am disturbed very much to note that the cost of living has gone up again. Figures for the month of June indicate that the consumer price index rose three-tenths of 1 percent. This latest increase carried the index up to a level equal to 112 percent of the 1957–59 average, an increase of 2.5 percent over a year ago.

All of these figures mean different things to different economists, Mr. President, but to the working American they mean only one thing. His dollar buys him a little less than it did a month ago, noticeably less than it did a year ago, and much less than it did 8 years ago. He is not fooled by the small monthly creeping increases in the price of living because he knows all too well that these small increases add up month after month until the increase is not small at all. In fact, he finds that he now pays $11.29 for the same market basket of goods which cost him only $10 in 1959.

I am disturbed also, to note that the administration seems determined to place the blame for this unjustified rise in prices everywhere but where it belongs—on the fiscally unresponsible spending policies of the administration itself.

A number of calls have gone out for housewives to restrain their spending, for farmers and ranchers to cut back, for businessmen and industry to curtail expenses.

None of these actions has done much to curb an inflation which is out of the so-called creeping stage and moving at a brisk trot if not faster. Of course they haven't done any good, Mr. President, because the real culprit is the Federal Government which has insisted on spending money it does not have—sort of "going now and maybe paying later." The Federal Government may or may not pay later, but the average American, be he worker, farmer or businessman, is paying right now.

The housewife is paying when she goes to the market and finds food prices up three-tenths of 1 percent in a month.

But in spite of what some Government officials would have us believe, she is not paying the price increase to the farmer or rancher.

I think it is particularly unfortunate that farmers and ranchers have been singled out by many of those casting about for culprits responsible for the increased cost of living. In many cases, if the farmer is not charged directly he certainly is convicted by implication.

No less a spokesman than Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman has implied that recent consumer price increases are tied to farm produce prices. Secretary Freeman has said that he was "pleased" to report that farm prices have moderated from what he called highs responsible for most consumer food cost increases.

Nothing could be further from the truth. As a matter of fact, prices paid to the farmer have gone in the reverse direction. Even though farm prices have increased 4 percent since 1960, they are still 14 percent below what they were in 1952. This 4-percent increase in farm prices did not keep pace with the 8-percent increase in farm production costs during that same period. Even with a 14-percent drop in farm prices from their 1952 levels, the housewife is not getting food for less; she is getting it for about 18 percent more.

The rise in prices being paid by the housewife is the result of an increase of 41 percent in costs after the food leaves the farm. And it is a result of federally induced inflation.

There are a number of instances in which Federal policies have worked against the farmer or rancher, increasing his costs and decreasing his prices, catching him in a squeeze between lower income and inflation:

Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of grain have been used by the Department of Agriculture to lower farm prices.

Increased imports are threatening dairy and other farmers.

Export of cattle hides was restricted to lower the price of leather, but the cost of shoes went up anyway.

Butter and pork were taken off the mess tables of our servicemen.

Also, if Congress had not acted promptly, the school milk program would have been wiped out.

When not faced by adverse Agriculture Department policies, our farmers and ranchers have had to contend with similarly unenlightened decisions by the Labor Department. One of the major reasons why fruits and vegetables cost more today than a year ago is the higher production cost forced on farmers by impractical policies.

For instance, California recently had nearly $6 million worth of asparagus waiting to be harvested and in danger of rotting in the field—yet Federal labor policies prevented growers from obtaining help to harvest the crop. Farmers tried to obtain domestic workers to avert the crisis but were unsuccessful. Had the Labor Department not issued such stringent prohibitions against the use of bracero labor, this cost-increasing harvest crisis could have been avoided.

I find absolutely no farmers who can understand why many top Federal officials are pressing so hard for a reduction in farm prices when farm prices are now at only 80 percent of parity and are continually declining.

The farmer and rancher cannot be blamed for today's higher consumer prices. The return he gets is less, not more, than in previous years.

The housewife cannot be blamed for today's higher food prices. She selects her purchases today ever more carefully, not more haphazardly.

It is about time the Federal Government quit pointing its accusing finger at somebody else and resolved to get its own spending house in order. The road to lower living costs and to improved farm prices lies in the resumption of Federal sanity.

It is time the Federal Government attacked inflation, not its citizens.

## TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR REISCHAUER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the distinguished career of our Ambassador to Japan, Edwin O. Reischauer, is coming to a close and in my view this distinguished diplomat is deserving of the Nation's highest praise.

During a period when good United States-Japanese relations were essential to the peace of Asia, Ambassador Reischauer served as an excellent conduit of good will between our two countries. The Nation will rely on his judgment in future years in its deliberations on Asian affairs.

In my official visits to Japan I found him always cordial and helpful and most responsive to the interests and needs of American citizens. He was particularly helpful recently in assisting the Nevada mining industry in its dealings with Japanese industry.

The editorial in praise of the Ambassador which appeared in the July 27, 1966, edition of the Washington Daily News comments on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE AMBASSADOR RETIRES

Our Ambassador to Japan, Edwin O. Reischauer, is giving up his post to return to Harvard, where he was teaching when President Kennedy appointed him more than five years ago. His credentials were patently tops: born in Tokyo, fluent in Japanese, well versed in Japanese and Asian affairs, married to a Japanese lady. But even better has been his outstanding performance.

During these five years of dramatic change in Asia, Ambassador Reischauer has done an intelligent and constructive job of reporting on Japan to us, and representing us to the Japanese. He has steadily helped forge closer links between the United States, with our deep interests in Asia, and Japan, one of Asia's prime powers. In an important bit of peace-making on the side, he was instrumental behind the scenes in the restoration of normal relations between Japan and South Korea, its former colony.

So, three cheers. One for Prof. Reischauer. We will be listening for his voice on Asian affairs. One for professors and other eggheads of this cut, who can serve the country as well, or maybe better, than campaign contributors, fashionable hostesses, and the like. And one for Presidential appointees, over career diplomats, when the President has a good one.

## NATIONAL CONSPIRACY SEEN IN RIOTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by David Lawrence and published in today's Washington Evening Star be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL CONSPIRACY SEEN IN RIOTS

(By David Lawrence)

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, is one of the most independent-minded men in the Senate and has the confidence of the people of his state, where he served five terms as governor and previously as mayor of Cleveland. He has just spoken out about the riot in Cleveland as well as the disturbances in other parts of the country, and his conclusion is that the disorders and the looting are part of a national conspiracy "methodical and manifestly directed by experts."

LAUSCHE addressed yesterday a convention in Chicago of the Independent Grocers' Alliance, and he minced no words as he warned civil rights leaders that the street demonstrations are not helping their cause. He said in part:

"What is the difference between stimulating the masses to a fever pitch of violence under the guise of nonviolence and stirring up the emotion of people with lawlessness as your objective? Wrought-up emotions stir up normal reactions regardless of the intent of their perpetrator. Government must remain supreme. No sector of our society or our economy should be permitted to exercise powers greater than those exercised by the government."

The Senator referred to the riots in cities across the country, and then added:

"The mode of operation, especially in the Cleveland riot, indicated design and organization. The technique adopted clearly showed that there were certain centrally managed tactics keeping the riot in progress while many innocent people became involved in it."

"The riots have not been a help to the cause of the Negro. The advocates of 'black power,' 'get whitey' and 'take the gun and the holster away from the white man and put it on the black man,' are clearly adopting a course of extremism. They are advocating action which coincides completely with the action about which they so justly complain in certain parts of the country."

The Ohio Senator said that increased defiance of law and order is due in large part to those "civic leaders, including clergymen," who publicly argue that "civil disobedience is justifiable if one believes the law to be morally wrong."

While LAUSCHE was making his speech, news dispatches from Cleveland reported that a 17-year-old Negro youth had told a grand jury investigating the riots there that the looting, fire-bombing and sniping had been planned by a gang known as the Black Panthers.

The Negro boy said there were about 200 "hell raisers" in the organization and that he himself took part in the rioting and threw several firebombs.

City and state officials in Cleveland are determined to get at the facts. Louis B. Seltzer, retired editor of the Cleveland Press

who is foreman of the grand jury, is quoted by the United Press International as saying:

"The grand jury saw enough to realize that the violence was organized and planned because of specific targets singled out for looting and burning."

There was a time when most of the racial disturbances were in Southern states, and the National Guard in Mississippi, for example, was superseded by federal troops on the theory that a court order was involved and that the guardsmen might not be too enthusiastic about intervening. Since those days, however, riots have occurred in Rochester, Brooklyn, New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and a dozen other smaller communities in states outside the South.

During the last few days criticism has been voiced by a few Negro leaders about the phrase "black power" as used by Chairman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee. He denies any intention to stimulate racial feeling, but the net effect of the cries for "black power" has been to stir up animosities between the races and arouse fears that the uneducated and irresponsible elements—both Negro and white—in the big cities will become involved in more and more disorders.

Here in Washington, Congress is well aware that resentment is building up in different parts of the country because of the stimulus given by men in public life to "demonstrations." Politicians are beginning to talk about possible reaction at the polls in November that may come as a result of the overemphasis on civil rights and the lack of emphasis on individual responsibility and the maintenance of order.

## PFC. DENTON W. CROCKER, JR., OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, N.Y.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, Pfc. Denton W. Crocker, Jr., of Saratoga Springs, N.Y., died last month of wounds suffered in Vietnam, just 1 day after his 19th birthday. Private, first class, Crocker's desire for service to his fellow man, both in the 101st Airborne Division and as a civilian, was well described in an article in the Saratogian, on June 6, 1966.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

"HE HAD SO MUCH TO GIVE"—DENTON W. CROCKER, JR., 19, KILLED IN VIETNAM

"He had so much to give. We couldn't believe he wouldn't come back, so he could give it here."

Mrs. Denton Crocker was speaking of her son, Pfc. Denton W. Crocker, Jr., who died of wounds in Viet Nam June 4, one day after his 19th birthday.

Young Crocker, a member of the Class of 1965 at Saratoga Springs High School, was the first Saratoga Springs boy to be killed by enemy action in Viet Nam and the third in Saratoga County.

WANTED TO HELP PEOPLE

Determined from the time the American involvement in Viet Nam started to grow to "help the Vietnamese people," Denton finished high school early so that he could enlist in the Army.

He joined the 101st Airborne Division, volunteered for duty in Viet Nam and managed to get a transfer from supply services to a line infantry company. There he saw weeks and weeks of combat action with the "Gypsies," an elite force of "shock troops," sent on one mission after another against the Viet Cong.

And on June 4, his family was notified by telegram he "died of wounds received from hostile arms fire while on a combat operation."

RECALL HIS DETERMINATION

In their home at 118 White St., Mrs. Crocker and his father, Dr. Denton W. Crocker, who is chairman of the biology department at Skidmore, recalled their son's determination to get involved in the war.

From the time he was a little boy, his mother said, he had been a prolific reader and had developed "a real commitment to the ideals of freedom and of devotion to duty, things I suppose we all believe in, but don't do very much about."

In the early part of his senior year in high school he began to press for permission to enlist. Finally, it was agreed that he should graduate from high school, and then could enter service.

And so, he was graduated in March, 1965. On the way, he had scored the highest of any Saratoga High senior and fourth in the county on the Regents scholarship exam. But use of that scholarship, he figured, could wait more important affairs.

"I asked him whether he would be happy in service," his mother said, "and he said that it was not the point to be happy. Last fall, he was happy. He was working with the Vietnamese and some of them expressed gratitude for the American presence."

The young soldier was concerned with more than combat. He found the country beautiful, but saw the children starving. That was while he was on a 101st Division operation near Tuyhoa.

He wrote and asked that his family recruit some assistance for the Vietnamese civilians through the Marine Civic Action Program, affiliated with CARE. The Marines, stabilized as a garrison force, had more opportunity to do that sort of thing, he explained. They could provide, with Care, the tools, food, clothing and other things the villagers needed.

WAS THERE 8½ MONTHS

Private Crocker had arrived in Viet Nam 8½ months ago, after basic training at Fort Dix and paratroop training at Fort Benning, Ga.

Originally he was in the supply services, although even there he earned the Combat Infantryman's Badge. But, said a high school classmate who had stopped to share a letter with his family, Denton had written, "You couldn't sit and see friends risking their lives."

"I guess this (The Infantry Badge) wasn't enough for him," said his father. He managed to get transferred to a line company.

He had written once that he had been on 13 combat patrols. A last letter to his classmate had said that he had been on combat missions for five weeks, mostly near the Cambodian border.

LEFT HOSPITAL

When he wrote, he was hospitalized in Saigon, for what cause his family does not know. He had seen his best friend killed by his side and was willing to come off the combat line.

But, he evidently returned to combat from the hospital and received his fatal wounds.

He was born June 3, 1947 in Ithaca, and came to Saratoga Springs when his father joined the Skidmore faculty. He is survived, in addition to his parents, by two sisters, Carol, 16, and Candace, 7½; and a brother, Ralph, 9.

## NEW PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED BY HEW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued on March 18, 1966, some new public assistance procedures which, in my judgment, go straight to the heart of one of the most troubling welfare problems in the District of Columbia. This most troubling problem is not, as some would have us believe, that welfare rolls in the District of Columbia are in danger of being greatly padded by alleged "chiselers" who violate the "man-in-the-house" rule. The serious and troubling problem of welfare in the Nation's Capital is that welfare practices are too often an assault against the human dignity, which welfare recipients possess in the same measure as do other Americans.

It is to this issue of human dignity that I am delighted to see these new procedures of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare address themselves. Handbook Transmittal No. 77 deals with the subject: "Methods for the Determination of Eligibility." These new procedures take a fresh look at the practices of special investigators, trained in police methods, about whom there has been much discussion in the District of Columbia. The new procedures require changes in these methods, changes which I, for one, plead will be implemented in the fullest measure by the District's Department of Public Welfare. As a matter of fact, it would seem to me that the changes are so sound and long overdue that the Department should put them into practice immediately, rather than by July 1, 1967, when each State plan will be required to implement them.

I want to detail what I think are the key elements of these new procedures:

First, Handbook Provision 2220, section 1, requires that procedures and policies in a State plan for public assistance must "respect the rights of individuals under the U.S. Constitution" and should "not result in practices that violate the individual's privacy, or personal dignity, or harass him or violate his constitutional rights."

This is a most timely and needed reminder to welfare departments throughout the country. Officially, it has always been incumbent on welfare departments to respect the rights of individuals under the Constitution. But I am gratified to see that the new procedures begin to spell out some of the practices which violate the rights of welfare applicants and recipients. Handbook Provision 2230 illustrates the practices which are contrary to a sound welfare program: "States must especially guard against violations in such areas as entering a home by force, or without permission, or under false pretenses, making home visits outside of working hours, and particularly making such visits during sleeping hours; and searching in the home, for example, in rooms, closets, drawers, or papers, to seek clues to possible deception."

These are not idle illustrations. They have a familiar ring in the District of Columbia. There have been charges by clients that each of these now prohibited and cruel methods has been used by special welfare investigators. On the other hand, we have had denials about their use by the special investigators in recent months. Nevertheless there seems to be the strongest temptation among these

investigators to justify their continued presence on some public welfare payrolls and there were unquestionably, in the period of large-scale investigations, many instances of midnight visits, entering homes by force, and searches without the consent of the relief client.

I think the changed procedures place a particular responsibility on the Department of Public Welfare to assure that the prohibited practices will not be tolerated. But there is also a further great responsibility placed on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: The Department must monitor the enforcement of this procedure with utmost viligance.

A second procedure incorporated in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare revision again speaks to the issue of the welfare client or applicant as a person possessed of dignity. Provision 2220, section 5a, says that "Applicants and recipients will be relied upon as the primary source of information about their eligibility." Section 2230 elaborates on this provision, noting that "Reliance on the applicant—and public records—as the primary source of information will ordinarily make it unnecessary to consult other sources of information." This is sound, in my opinion, for it applies the same principle to a welfare application as is applied to an income tax return or a social security application. The Government, in the latter two instances, accepts the taxpayer or the social security applicant as the primary source of information and will ordinarily not consult with other sources of information. This has not been so in regard to public welfare. Verification has too often meant long, drawn-out application periods during which hungry adults and hungry children need to wait for a decision on their applications. The extended efforts to verify every possible source of information are not only time consuming and often wasteful; their basic assumption is that the welfare applicant has made out an application form with an intent to deceive. This, I submit, is contrary to our treatment of others who have financial dealings with government and, very importantly, damages the main purpose of welfare, which is to meet human need.

Related to this is the procedure which advises the local department of public welfare that it cannot rely on a "blanket" consent by the applicant for all the investigations it may decide to undertake when determining a client's eligibility—provision 2230, section 5c. It is unfortunate that the applicant's signature on the welfare form has been used to justify all manner of undercover investigations, including contacts with any source, whether discussed with and authorized by the applicant or not. The questionable visitations and searches of clients' homes, the ferreting out of information from a client's neighbors, all of these have been defended in some quarters by this "blanket" consent which the client's signature is supposed to give to public welfare authorities.

In the new procedures, a limitation is being placed on one aspect of the consent issue—contacts with collateral sources will need the specific consent of the client. I look toward an exploration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of how authorization by the client should be applied to special investigations.

The new set of procedures formulated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare therefore raises many questions about the philosophy which has guided the District's Department of Public Welfare. It is perfectly clear that special investigators are a problem in and of themselves, possibly even a threat to the intent of the Congress, in enacting social welfare legislation, to help feed, provide shelter, and clothe those who are unable to care for themselves. It is evident that the methods of the investigators are seriously questioned, yet the District of Columbia carries more such investigative personnel on its payroll than any other city in the United States. With these investigators, and no doubt because there are so many of them, the administrative costs per aid-to-families-with-dependent-children case in the District of Columbia far exceed that of any State in the Union. These are not the costs of the grant to the needy client; I refer only to the costs of administering this grant.

Whether examined on economic, legal or moral grounds, there is substantial evidence that special investigators in the District's welfare program have not added very much soundness to its operation.

I welcome the new procedural changes established by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and look to their fullest implementation in the Nation's Capital at the earliest possible time.

I ask unanimous consent that Handbook Transmittal 77 be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, WELFARE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., March 18, 1966.*

HANDBOOK TRANSMITTAL NO. 77

To: State Agencies Administering Approved Public Assistance Plans.
From: Fred H. Steininger, Director.
Subject: Methods for Determination of Eligibility—Handbook IV-2200.
Material transmitted: IV-2200-2230 (Effective 7/1/67).
Material superseded: IV-2200-2241, dated 7/31/63 (Effective 7/1/67).

BACKGROUND AND EXPLANATION

The enclosed statement has been developed in response to a long recognized need for a comprehensive statement about methods for determination of eligibility in public assistance programs under the Social Security Act. This is a crucial area of administration, both for achieving the objectives of the programs and for maximum efficiency in administration.

This material is limited to conformity—to requirements for State plans and the interpretation of those requirements. It differs from current Handbook material primarily as follows:

1. It imposes a requirement that the State plan contain policies and procedures for determination of eligibility that are consistent with the objectives of the program and the constitutional and statutory rights of applicants and recipients and that do not violate those rights or the individual's privacy or personal dignity, or harass the individual.

2. It deletes material now in IV-2232 on Federal financial participation. This subject is treated in IV-5514.

3. *IV-2220, item 4a* clearly establishes a time limit of 30 days for promptness in acting on information about changes that may affect a recipient's eligibility.

4. *IV-2220, item 5a and 5c* make mandatory a practice now recommended in IV-2241—relying on the individual as the primary source of information; and limiting the verification of conditions of eligibility to those "reasonably necessary to assure that expenditures under the program will be legal."

5. *IV-2230, item 5c* contains new specific content about obtaining the individual's consent for outside contacts and the way the agency makes such contacts.

SUBMITTAL OF PLAN MATERIAL

All State agencies are required to submit plan material to comply with the enclosed material.

Plan amendments implementing these requirements for each program should be submitted to the appropriate regional office as early as possible, but not later than April 1, 1967, as plan approval will be necessary prior to release of the grants for the quarter beginning July 1, 1967, the effective date of the requirements. Preferably, plan material covering the six plan requirements should be submitted as a unit, as an integral part of the State plan. However, if the State agency, upon review of its current approved plan provisions on determination of eligibility, believes that any of them fully meet one or more of the six plan requirements in the enclosed material, such plan material may be cited in respect to the identified specific plan requirement(s) in IV-2200. This is important so that there is mutual understanding of the identity and content of the plan provisions governing practice under the approved plan with respect to "Methods for Determination of Eligibility."

EFFECT ON OTHER POLICIES

To the extent that other current policies in the Handbook may be inconsistent with the enclosed Handbook statement, when it becomes effective the latter will govern.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR HANDBOOK MAINTENANCE

1. In Part IV, at the top of pages 2200 through 2241-p. 4, dated 7/31/63, put the notation "Remove this page on 7/1/67" with pen-and-ink.

2. In Part IV, insert the enclosed pages immediately following page 2241-p. 4, dated 7/31/63.

3. Make appropriate notation on the Form Record of Receipt of Handbook Transmittals.

HANDBOOK OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

*Part IV. Eligibility, Assistance, and Services*

2000-2999. Methods for Determination of Eligibility, 3/18/66

2200. *Methods for Determination of Eligibility*

2210. *Provisions of the Act*

Sections 2(a), 402(a), 1002(a), 1402(a), and 1602(a) specify that:

"A State plan . . . must . . . (5) provide such methods of administration . . . as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;"

Sections 2(a)(10)(B), 2(a)(11)(D), and 1602(a)(13) specify that a State plan under Title I or XVI must:

"Include reasonable standards, consistent with the objectives of this title, for deter-

mining eligibility for and the extent of" aid or assistance under the plan.

2220. *Requirements for State Plans*

Effective July 1, 1967, a State plan under titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI must:

1. Include policies and procedures for determination of eligibility for assistance or other services that are consistent with the objectives of the program, and that respect the rights of individuals under the United States Constitution, the Social Security Act, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (see Supplement C), and all other relevant provisions of Federal and State laws, and that will not result in practices that violate the individual's privacy or personal dignity, or harass him, or violate his constitutional rights.

2. Provide that (a) each person who wishes to do so will be given an opportunity to apply without delay for public assistance and other services, (b) prompt action will be taken on each application, and (c) assistance will be given promptly and will continue regularly to all eligible persons until they are found to be ineligible, so long as assistance is being provided under the specific category.

3. Provide that each decision that an applicant for or recipient of assistance or other services is eligible or ineligible will be supported by information in the case record that shows either that all eligibility requirements of the State plan are met or that one or more such requirements is not met.

4. Provide that eligibility will be determined in each case where an individual has been determined to be eligible:

a. Through prompt action within a specified time period—no longer than 30 days—after the agency has information which indicates that changes in a recipient's circumstances may affect the amount of assistance to which he is entitled or may make him ineligible.

b. Through regular periodic redetermination at specified intervals, of eligibility factors subject to change—intervals no longer than 3 months in AFDC–UP, 6 months in other AFDC cases, and 12 months in the other categories.

5. Provide that in the process of determination of initial and continuing eligibility:

a. Applicants and recipients will be relied upon as the primary source of information about their eligibility, after an adequate interpretation of the agency's requirements, and the agency will help them provide needed information, or, if they are unable to do so, because of physical or mental or other difficulties, the agency will obtain the necessary information for them.

b. Each determination of eligibility will include at least one interview with the applicant or recipient, or, if direct contact with him is impractical or would delay case action, with someone acting responsibly for him. Where a declaration form or similar procedure is used, the interview may take place within a reasonable time after determination of eligibility.

c. Verification of conditions of eligibility will be limited to what is reasonably necessary to assure that expenditures under the program will be legal.

d. Applicants and recipients will be notified in writing that assistance has been authorized in a stated amount or that it has been denied or terminated for a specified reason.

6. Include a description of the methods by which the State agency will be kept currently informed about local agencies' adherence to the State's plan provisions concerning the above requirements and to the State agency's procedural requirements for methods for determination of eligibility. (See II–4200 re State-wide operation.)

2230. *Interpretation of requirements*

The above requirements for State plans are considered essential for proper and efficient operation of public assistance programs under the Social Security Act. They reflect the basic principles about the rights and responsibilities of individuals and of governmental agencies in our democracy. They are necessary in order that these rights shall be protected in the determination of eligibility. They are also necessary to achieve the broad objectives of the programs for individuals and families and for society. Public assistance programs based on these requirements will inspire public confidence so that those who are eligible will make appropriate use of the programs and those who do not need them will respect both the agency and those who avail themselves of the agency's assistance and other services.

The following explains the import of the corresponding items in IV–2220.

1. The requirement that a State plan contain policies and procedures for determination of eligibility that are consistent with program objectives and that respect legal rights of individuals and do not violate the individual's privacy or personal dignity, or harass him or violate his constitutional rights, necessitates the testing of each pertinent policy and procedure against those positive and negative criteria. If the program is locally administered with State supervision, the State agency must see that supplementary locally developed procedures are consistent with this requirement.

The prohibition against a State plan containing policies and procedures for determination of eligibility that will result in violation of privacy or personal dignity, that constitute harassment, or that violate constitutional rights, requires careful and continuing attention to practices and procedures that may result in violations of these rights and principles. By way of illustration, States must especially guard against violations in such areas as entering a home by force, or without permission, or under false pretenses, making home visits outside of working hours, and particularly making such visits during sleeping hours; and searching in the home, for example, in rooms, closets, drawers, or papers, to seek clues to possible deception.

2. The general requirement about the application process requires the State agency to take those actions that are necessary to facilitate the exercise of the right to apply for assistance and other services, for the application process is the first step in determination of eligibility. Such actions include: making arrangements to accept applications without delay, informing applicants about the eligibility requirements and their rights and obligations under the program, and acting promptly on applications. This is a general requirement. Detailed requirements covering the application process are contained in IV–2300.

3. The requirement that the plan provide that decisions on eligibility or ineligibility will be adequately supported and recorded requires that each decision be based on facts—statements about eligibility requirements that have been substantiated by observation, or written records, or other appropriate means.

This requirement should result in the maintenance of case records that will provide a valid basis for accounting for expenditures of public funds, and that will assure the availability of needed information if the applicant or recipient appeals to the State agency for a fair hearing.

4. The requirement that a State plan provide that redetermination of eligibility will be made promptly—at least within 30 days after the agency has available information which suggests the need for redetermination—and at regular intervals no longer than the specified maximum periods, is designed to contribute to efficient administration. This applies when the agency obtains the information during a regular redetermination of eligibility or when providing social services, or when the recipient or another person or agency reports changes in the recipient's situation.

In requiring that a State plan provide that redeterminations of eligibility will be made periodically—at periods no longer than every 3 months in AFDC–UP, every 6 months in other AFDC cases, and every 12 months in the other programs—it is recognized that the situations of families with children are apt to change more frequently than those of recipients of the other categories. The time periods specified are the maximum periods that a State plan may provide for between periodic redetermination of eligibility. This requirement in no way affects the right of the recipient to receive assistance regularly so long as he remains eligible. Hence, failure of the agency to make a periodic redetermination cannot be used as a basis for withholding assistance.

5. The detailed procedural requirements for State plan provisions on methods for determination of eligibility are based on recognition of the rights and obligations of applicants and recipients to be responsible participants in the process and the fact that the objectives of the program can only be achieved through an agency-client relationship based on mutual respect.

a. The requirement that a plan provide that applicants and recipients will be relied upon as the primary source of information regarding their initial and continued claim for assistance does not relieve the agency of the responsibility to recognize the differing capacities of applicants and recipients to discharge their responsibilities to the agency. Some can provide or obtain needed information after the agency explains what information is needed; others will need specific directions to sources of information; others may want, or have to rely on, the agency to obtain the information for them.

If the individual is unable to participate in the determination of eligibility, because of such circumstances as physical or mental disability, inability to speak English, or other difficulties, the agency is obliged to take measures to provide him the assistance and services for which he is eligible.

Reliance on applicants and recipients as the primary source of information will enable the agency to determine initial or continuing eligibility in a large percentage of cases on the basis of information provided by the individual, supplemented if necessary by information from public records. Such reliance on the individual includes placing responsibility on recipients for notifying the agency, on the basis of instructions understood by them, about changes in their situations that may affect the amount of assistance to which they are entitled or may terminate their eligibility.

When available information is inconclusive, reliance on the applicant or recipient as the primary source of information requires the agency to explain to the individual, in writing if necessary, (1) what questions remain and how he can resolve or help to resolve them and/or what actions the agency can take to resolve them, and (2) the necessity for resolving the questions if eligibility is to be established or continued. If the individual is reluctant or unwilling to help resolve the question or permit the agency to do so, the agency is responsible for considering carefully with him his reasons—both to prevent him from deciding unnecessarily or unwisely to withdraw from the program when he is eligible, and to discharge the agency's responsibility for evaluating whether facts had previously been presented correctly. (See IV–2600 re Fraud.)

If the individual is unwilling to have the agency seek verifying information, the agency may not be able to determine eligibility and thus have no recourse but to deny or terminate assistance. In such instance, the individual should be told that he has the right to re-apply at any time.

b. The plan requirement of an interview with applicants and recipients in each determination of eligibility requires a personal interview, preferably in the individual's home, unless this is impractical or would delay case action. If difficulties of transportation or other causes preclude a personal interview, contact by telephone or correspondence may be substituted. If the physical or mental condition of the applicant or recipient makes any type of direct contact with him impractical, the requirement may be met by a personal interview or other contact with someone who can act responsibly for him. In the case of initial determinations of eligibility, however, a personal interview with the applicant is required as soon as possible.

In States where eligibility is determined either initially or on redetermination on the basis of declaration forms or similar procedure, the interview should take place as soon as possible, and in any event within 90 days.

c. Reliance on the applicant (and public records) as the primary source of information will ordinarily make it unnecessary to consult other sources of information. The agency should take no steps in the exploration of eligibility to which the applicant does not agree, including contact with collateral sources. When information is sought from collateral sources, there should be clear interpretation of what information is desired, why it is needed, and how it will be used. Agencies should not rely on a "blanket" consent for outside contacts, but should obtain specific consent for each contact, whether with social agencies, doctors, hospitals, and similar resoures, or with relatives or other individuals.

The consent should cover the purpose of the contact as well as the individual or agency to be consulted.

If the agency has to assume responsibility for the entire process of determination of eligibility or for parts of it, because of the individual's inability to participate in establishing his eligibility, the same care must be taken in selecting sources to be contacted as would be taken if he were participating.

Agency actions contrary to the foregoing practices will be inconsistent with requirement IV–2220, item 5c, unless limited to specific situations where there is special need to use other procedures. If other procedures are followed in a specific situation, the case record must specify the reasons why they were needed, and the specific procedures followed, which must be consistent with IV–2220, item 1, and IV–2230, item 1.

d. The requirement that applicants and recipients be notified in writing that assistance has been authorized in a stated amount requires such notification both at the initial determination of eligibility and each redetermination that results in a change in the amount of assistance to which the individual is entitled. When assistance is denied to an applicant and when a recipient's assistance is terminated, the written notice to him must contain the reason why he has been determined to be ineligible. The written notice will provide a basis for the individual to express dissatisfaction with the agency action. (See IV–6000 re Hearings.)

6. The State plan must provide reporting and other administrative and supervisory methods for obtaining information about whether local agencies carry out the State plan provisions and meet Federal requirements in determination of eligibility, thus enabling the State agency to identify problem areas and take corrective action. (See II–4200, item 3, re State-wide operation.)

## THE AIRLINES STRIKE—POLITICS VERSUS PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to an excellent editorial about the airlines strike, which was published in today's New York Times. Clearly, it is high time that the White House actively intervene in efforts to bring this intolerable strike against the public interest to a prompt conclusion. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 28, 1966]

POLITICS VERSUS PUBLIC INTEREST

The only conclusion possible from Secretary of Labor Wirtz' testimony on the airlines strike is that politics is the chief yardstick the White House applies in determining when the cut-off of an essential service creates a national emergency.

The Secretary's recommendation that Congress scrap plans for an immediate back-to-work law and give "free collective bargaining" another chance was a clear capitulation to the dictates of organized labor. Twenty-four hours earlier, while the Senate Labor Committee held off its hearing at the Administration's request, George Meany had given the White House its cue.

"No danger to the nation's health and welfare and no threat to national defense have been demonstrated," the A.F.L.–C.I.O. president declared. "The air traveling public has, of course, been inconvenienced, but inconvenience is a small price to pay for freedom."

Mr. Wirtz put it differently, but came up with the same answer: Do nothing right away. This a week after President Johnson had declared that the strike was trying "the patience of the American people" and that the time had come for a settlement. Mr. Wirtz acknowledged that the tie-up already has had "a serious, substantial, adverse impact on the national interest" and that its prolongation would bring the country to a "crisis" stage at some point.

Why the nation must wait until the hardship becomes intolerable before Congress acts, the Secretary failed to make clear. Even more obscure was his idea of how "free collective bargaining" can be secured in a dispute that has already been reviewed by a Presidential emergency board. That board, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, recommended wage increases that went beyond the Administration's anti-inflation guideposts. The President urged both labor and management to follow these proposals; the airlines not only accepted them, they bettered them. The striking machinists still say no.

Presumably what Mr. Wirtz means by his prescription that Congress send both sides "back to the woodshed" with a settlement deadline is that pressure will now be exerted on management to save the union's face by giving it more money. Such appeasement of labor under White House aegis has been the historic road to instability in industrial relations and to wage-price inflation. The airlines, as a regulated industry enjoying record prosperity, are in poor position to hold out against what the Administration wants.

The course Secretary Wirtz has charted points more surely to the destruction of "free collective bargaining" than to its preservation.

## VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the August 8, 1966, issue of Look magazine carries the views of five distinguished Americans on our present involvement in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that these stimulating views be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM: SUPPOSE THE PRESIDENT ASKED YOU "WHAT SHOULD WE DO NOW?"—FIVE EXPERTS GIVE THEIR ANSWER

(Produced by Leo Rosten)

(NOTE.—We are at war in Vietnam. Whether we should have gotten into it or not is a separate issue. We are in Vietnam.

(Americans have always backed their armies with the moral certainty that in our victory *right* would triumph. But to many today, our cause seems stained by doubt. Never, during a foreign war, have Americans debated our national policy with such passion: "Get out. . . . Escalate. . . . Negotiate. . . . 'Hole in' at coastal enclaves. . . . Blockade Haiphong. . . . Push 'hot pursuit' into Laos" The bitterness of the partisans consolidates the confusion.

(Look invited in five experts, who hold varying views about Vietnam, to answer this question: "Suppose the President today asked you, *'What should we do now?'*" We urged each to reply in the intentionally brief space of 1,000 words—for we sought not a pablum of agreement but sharp, specific proposals.

(Here are their answers. Each man presents a program that millions would no doubt support.)

(By Hans Morgenthau, distinguished service professor of political science and modern history, University of Chicago; director, Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy; has served as consultant to the Department of State and the Department of Defense; author of "In Defense of the National Interest," "The Purpose of American Politics," etc.)

President Johnson is wont to ask the critics of his Vietnam policy, *"What would you do if you were in my place?"* This is a legitimate question, and it deserves an answer. Having been a consistent critic of our Vietnam policies for more than four years, I have tried to answer that question before and am glad to do so again.

Mr. President, I would say, you must choose between two alternative policies. You can start with the assumption that in Vietnam the credibility of the United States and its prestige as a great power are irrevocably engaged; that the war in Vietnam is a test case for all "wars of national liberation"; and that in consequence, the fate of Asia, and perhaps even of the non-Communist world at large, might well be decided in Vietnam. If you believe this, then you must see the war through to victory. That is to say, you must escalate the war both in the South and in the North by committing what will amount (according to authoritative estimates) to a million American combat troops and by bombing, without restrictions, the industrial and population centers of North Vietnam. By doing this, you will destroy Vietnam, North and South, and risk a military confrontation with China or the Soviet Union or both. Yet these risks are justified by the magnitude of the issues at stake.

This is the policy that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been advocating and that you have pursued since February, 1965, even though you have been anxious to differentiate your policy from that of the Joint Chiefs. In truth, the difference between the two has not been one of kind but rather of degree. You have been escalating the war at a slower pace than the Joint Chiefs recommended. But escalate you did, and you will continue escalating because the assumptions from which you have started leave you no choice.

There is another policy, Mr. President, which you could and, in my view, should have pursued. This policy assumes that the war is primarily a civil war; that its global significance is remote; that, far from con-

taining China and communism, it opens the gates to both—by destroying the social fabric of Vietnamese nationalism, which is implacably hostile to China; and that, in consequence, the risks we are taking in the pursuit of victory are out of all proportion to the interests at stake.

We should never have gotten involved in this war, but we are deeply involved in it. The aim of our policy must be to avoid getting more deeply involved in it and to extricate ourselves from it while minimizing our losses. Recent events in Vietnam offer us the opportunity of initiating such a new policy of disengagement.

These events have clearly demonstrated two facts: The Saigon government is hardly worthy of the name; and the great mass of the people of South Vietnam prefer an end to the war rather than a fight to the finish with the Vietcong. The two main arguments with which our involvement has been justified have thus been demolished: that we have a commitment to the government of Saigon to assist it in the fight against the Vietcong; and that the people of South Vietnam want to be saved by us from the Vietcong—even at the risk of their own destruction. The prospect of elections to be held in South Vietnam provides us with the chance to use these new facts for the initiation of a new policy of disengagement. Such a policy would proceed on two fronts, the political and the military.

Politically, we ought to work for the achievement of four goals.

1. We must promote the establishment of a broadly-based government in which the elements seeking an end to the war would have decisive influence. This government would have the task of organizing elections for a constituent assembly and a legislature at an early date. It must be recognized that such elections will neither be representative nor "free." The group that organizes them is likely to win them. Hence, the crucial importance of the composition of the government presiding over the elections.

2. We must see to it that the government that emerges from these elections will negotiate with the Vietcong for a *modus vivendi*. Such a settlement would no doubt increase the risk of a complete takeover by the Vietcong. However, it is quite possible to visualize a coalition government under which different sections of the country, after the model of the Laotian setlement, would be governed by different factions. One can even visualize a South Vietnamese government that would be anxious to maintain its independence *vis-à-vis* the North.

3. We should put United States military forces stationed in South Vietnam at the disposal of the government that emerges from the elections, to be used as bargaining counters in negotiations with the Vietcong. In other words, we would honor our commitments and would leave it to the South Vietnamese Government to interpret them—in order to bring the war to an end.

4. Our ultimate goal would be the withdrawal of our armed forces from South Vietnam. Such a withdrawal would be coordinated with the progress of negotiations between the government of South Vietnam and the Vietcong. Our military forces would be gradually withdrawn, and our military presence would always be commensurate with the political purposes it is intended to serve.

Pending such a withdrawal, our military policy would come in three parts:

1. We would stop both the bombing of North Vietnam and the search-and-destroy operations in South Vietnam that seek to kill the Vietcong and occupy territory controlled by them. For the continuation of such operations in the North and South is compatible only with a policy aiming at victory, not with one seeking a negotiated settlement among the Vietnamese factions.

2. We would hold the cities and coastal enclaves that we and the South Vietnamese military now control. That is to say, we would be satisfied with a de facto division of South Vietnam.

3. We would expect the Vietcong to reciprocate by ceasing attacks upon the perimeter of our positions and by stopping sabotage within them. It can be assumed that we and the Vietcong have a reciprocal interest in maintaining the military status quo pending negotiations.

The policy here advocated, Mr. President, is anathema to the men who advise you. Yet it has always been supported by officials fairly high in your administration. It now has the support of a number of senators who in the past have been "hawks" rather than "doves."

You, Mr. President, will have to decide whether the present policy—morally dubious, militarily hopeless and risky, politically aimless and counterproductive—shall be continued or whether a better policy shall take its place. You aspire to be a great President. Whether you remain the prisoner of past mistakes or have the courage to correct them will be the test of your greatness.

(By Henry Kissinger, professor of government, Harvard, and member of the Center for International Affairs; consultant to the National Security Council under President Kennedy; author of "The Troubled Partnership," "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," etc.)

The war in Vietnam is dominated by two factors: Withdrawal would be disastrous, and negotiations are inevitable. American policy must take both of these realities into account.

1. The impossibility of withdrawal. An American withdrawal under conditions that could plausibly be represented as a Communist victory would be disastrous for these reasons:

Within the Communist world, Chinese attacks on Soviet "revisionism" have focused on the Russian doctrine of peaceful coexistence. A victory by a third-class Communist peasant state over the United States must strengthen the most bellicose factions in the internecine Communist struggles around the world.

In Southeast Asia, it would demoralize those countries—especially Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand—that have supported our effort.

The long-term orientation of such countries as India and Japan will reflect to a considerable extent their assessment of America's willingness and ability to honor its commitments. For example, whether or not India decides to become a nuclear power depends crucially on its confidence in American support against Chinese nuclear blackmail.

A demonstration of American impotence in Asia cannot fail to lessen the credibility of American pledges in other fields. The stability of areas geographically far removed from Vietnam will be basically affected by the outcome there.

In short, we are no longer fighting in Vietnam only for the Vietnamese. We are also fighting for ourselves and for international stability.

2. The inevitability of negotiation. Historically, the goal of a war, for the United States, has been the destruction of enemy forces. Negotiations could start only after the enemy had been crushed. But the primary issue in Vietnam is political and psychological, not military.

What makes the war so complicated is the existence of a Communist "shadow government," permeating every aspect of Vietnamese life. A favorable outcome depends on the ability to create a political structure that can command the loyalties of the Vietnamese people.

A purely military solution is impossible also because Vietnam directly engages the interests and the prestige of so many major powers. Finally, the Administration has stressed its unconditional readiness to respond to any overture by Hanoi for negotiations.

In these circumstances, the political program—both within Vietnam and for negotiations—is crucial. Military victories will prove empty if they are not coupled with an effort to build political structures. Negotiations will be sterile or dangerous unless we enter them with significant areas of the country substantially free of terror.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

1. Negotiations are likely when Hanoi realizes that its political apparatus in the countryside is being systematically reduced, and that this process will accelerate the longer the war lasts. It follows that the primary goal of military operations should be the creation of secure areas. It is better to have 100-percent control in 40 percent of the country than 40-percent control in 100 percent of the country. This is not to say that we should adopt a static "enclave" theory, which would leave us with three Hong Kongs and two Berlins in the midst of hostile populations. Nor does it mean that we must write off all the territory that we cannot securely control. We will always retain a capacity for preventing the consolidation of Communist control even in areas that we do not control ourselves. It does mean that the highest priority must be given to creating "secure" zones that contain a maximum of population—zones that can be expanded if the war continues and that will give us reliable negotiating counters at a conference.

2. We must understand that political instability in Vietnam reflects the transformation of an essentially feudal structure into a modern state—a process that took centuries in the West. Such a process involves a profound shift of loyalties—a task that would be searing in the best of circumstances, but is compounded by the pressures of civil war. This imposes two requirements on us: (a) We must have compassion for the travail of a society that has been wracked by war for two decades and not use its agony as an alibi for failing in our duty; and (b) we must give special emphasis to building political structures from the ground up.

3. The notion drawn from our experience in Europe, that economic assistance automatically produces political stability, does not apply in Vietnam. On the contrary, there is a danger that our enthusiasm and our concern with technical refinements will overwhelm slender administrative resources and compound political demoralization. The test should be whether a program can enlist local support and thus give the rural population an incentive to defend it. Efforts should be concentrated in areas of maximum military security and spread out from there.

4. It may prove impossible to settle the war at a large conference that deals with all issues simultaneously. If the negotiations are conducted in a forum consisting of many nations that are already rivals (e.g., the U.S.S.R. and Communist China, or the U.S. and France), energies may be dissipated in political jockeying that is peripheral to the central problems in Vietnam. It may be wiser to separate the issues into their component elements, each to be settled by the parties primarily involved. A larger conference could then work out guarantees for settlements already achieved in other forums.

5. The war in Vietnam is a crucial test of American maturity. In the lives of nations, as of individuals, there comes a point when future options are limited by past actions. The choices of 1966 are not those of 1961. We must recognize that to be on the defensive often forces us to be engaged in places chosen by opponents for their difficulty and ambiguity.

We do not have the privilege of deciding to meet only those challenges that most flatter our moral preconceptions. If we cannot deal with political, economic and military problems as an integrated whole, we will not be able to deal with them individually.

(By Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, Pulitzer Prize winner for journalism, graduate of Annapolis, war correspondent in the South Pacific, North Africa, Normandy, Korea, Vietnam)

It's the eleventh hour in Vietnam. The United States must decide to win or get out. It is not too late to win, but it soon may be.

Victory means, first of all, a Governmental and national determination to win.

Congress should declare a state of national emergency and authorize a limited mobilization. Our trained and ready military power is spread thin all over the world. Limited mobilization would provide—more quickly than any other means—a pool of at least partially trained manpower and organized logistical training and combat units to sustain a rapid buildup in Vietnam and, utimately, to strengthen our weakened positions in other parts of the world.

The President should be authorized to mobilize up to 500,000 reserves for two-year service. Draft calls should be increased as necessary. All enlistments should be extended for a minimum of six months.

South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand must be regarded as a strategic whole. The war in South Vietnam is clearly nourished from outside. Soldiers, medicines, supplies, and especially arms and ammunition, today reach South Vietnam by sea, from Cambodia, through Laos, and from North Vietnam by any and all methods. Most of the small arms now used by the Vietcong "main-force" units are standardized on the Soviet 7.62-mm caliber basis and are Chinese-manufactured. All of the heavy arms—mortars, antiaircraft guns, SAM missiles, MIG's, IL-28 bombers, and the world's largest helicopter, the Mi-6—are either Chinese- or Russian-manufactured.

We must shut off, to the best of our ability, the stream of Communist supplies *into* North Vietnam. We should turn off the faucet, not merely put a stopper in the drain. This means blocking the seaborne arms traffic to North Vietnam—by mining, bombing, naval gunfire; the sinking of a dredge in the narrow, silted ship channel to Haiphong; by so-called "pacific blockade" or "quarantine" or other means.

The land supply routes, even more important to the Communist war effort, must also be interrupted. Past limitations upon the bombing of railroads and roads, and of the choke points and communications bottlenecks in North Vietnam's extensive road network, must be removed. We must reduce the flow of supplies from North Vietnam through Laos and Cambodia. Many of these supplies move partway by truck; we have been bombing the trucks but, until recently, not the fuel-oil supplies that power them. We should bomb all the fuel-oil depots in North Vietnam. Electric power plants, which provide power for a variety of war purposes, should also be bombed.

Interdiction of the many branches of the Ho Chi Minh Trail (which leads over various passes from North Vietnam through Laos or Cambodia into South Vietnam) must be improved—by eliminating some of the restrictions that now hamper bombing and particularly by assigning more trained Forward Air Controllers, both on the ground and in the air.

Air cavalry raids by helicopter against Laotian bottlenecks on the supply route should be undertaken whenever possible. The doctrine of "hot pursuit" must be applied to any guerrilla forces that use Cambodia as a sanctuary.

At sea, the Navy's coastal surveillance and river patrols must be extended and tightened—to stop Vietcong gunrunning by junks and sampans. This will require more air and small-craft bases in South Vietnam and Thailand.

U.S. troop strength in South Vietnam should be doubled to a figure of 500,000 to 700,000 men, to enable U.S. and South Vietnamese forces to patrol areas that have been Communist sanctuaries for years. We must find and fix the main force of the enemy, and force him to expend his supplies in action, if possible. An enemy "body count" is not the proper yardstick by which to judge success in this kind of war. Even if the enemy refuses action and fades away into the jungles, or into the shadows of the U Minh Forest, the capture and destruction of his base camps, or his rice and food supplies, of his medicines and weapons and ammunition will reduce his combat capabilities. The war must ultimately be won on the ground by destroying or breaking up the main-force units of the Vietcong, and especially by destroying the enemy's bases of operations.

The final part of the strategy for victory—the part that will shape the peace—is the pacification program. The American and South Vietnamese military can launch search-and-destroy and search-and-clear operations; but only specially trained South Vietnamese administrative and paramilitary forces can *hold* the areas that are cleared. The pacification program—in the past mishandled and underemphasized—has this year started slowly but well; it must be pushed to the maximum. For one can confirm victory in a guerrilla war only if one wins the people over and protects them against the enemy.

This is a slow, a comprehensive, a tedious process. The administrative, police, educational and health authority of the central government must be built up from what Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge calls "the precinct level."

The enemy cannot win in a military sense; he is stymied on the field of battle. But political instability in Saigon, and U.S. impatience at home, may cause us to lose the struggle—politically and psychologically.

We have no easy choices—only grim alternatives. Victory, which means making it possible for a South Vietnamese government to govern without interference from outside, is possible; but it may not be possible soon.

The victory road will be long and hard and bloody. But defeat or stalemate in Vietnam will gravely impair the U.S. position in Asia and in the world; and if we lose, our children and grandchildren will face tomorrow a far worse problem than we face today.

(By Herman Kahn, director of the Hudson Institute (a nonprofit organization conducting research in the area of national security and international order); former member of the Rand Corporation; author of "Thinking About the Unthinkable, On Thermonuclear War, On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios")

I have been asked by Look to describe my personal position, rather than give an analysis of the pros and cons. The first and overwhelming point is that whether or not one agrees with the steps that led to it, our present commitment to oppose force and terror by the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam is as solemn an engagement as any modern nation has made. I do not believe that commitments must be blindly kept, regardless of costs; but just as we should be careful about making commitments, we should be very careful about honoring them.

Maintaining the credibility of our commitments is not just a matter of "saving face." Our ability to support world peace and security, particularly without using excessive force, depends in great measure upon the faith that other nations repose in American commitments. (Germany, Japan, India and Israel, for example, restrain their activities in obtaining nuclear weapons partly because of American commitments.)

To renege on commitments as serious as those we have made in Southeast Asia could be a major step in a disastrous erosion of faith in the United States. If faith in our commitments became so weak that we would have to give excessive commitments in order to make them believable—for example, giving minor states control over our policy (as the British had to do with Poland in 1939)—then the likelihood of major escalation, such as a war with China, would be dangerously increased.

The United States also has a crucial interest in dispelling two illusions that have grown up since World War II: that radical terrorists almost always win; and that radical regimes can subvert, or intervene in, a neighboring area with little risk. History is replete with examples of how a victory by terrorists in one area powerfully influenced the likelihood and the tactics of subversion in other areas. The invalidity of oversimplified "domino theories" should not lead us to underestimate the worldwide costs of letting the Vietcong succeed with their resort to violence. In addition, I am seriously concerned about the political and moral repercussions within the United States were we to "pull out" of Vietnam.

Our cause in South Vietnam is not immoral. Many think we are creating more destruction, more death, more human suffering than our cause justifies. But what would happen were we to let South Vietnam fall into the hands of the National Liberation Front? It is not likely that a victorious NLF would treat with restraint: the Cao Dai, the Hoa Hao, the Catholics (each a community of about 1,000,000 human beings); the 500,000 South Vietnamese soldiers; the many other groups that have demonstrated they are anti-Communist; the tens of thousands who would probably be labeled enemies of a Communist state. Those who dismiss this likelihood need only look at how the Chinese Communists and the Indonesian Army treated their opponents, and might ask themselves if the victorious NLF is likely to be more restrained. Nor should the West view with equanimity 15,000,000 people passing behind a Communist Iron Curtain.

What, then, should we do in Vietnam now?

1. An important aspect of the battle for "the hearts and minds of men" is this: Which side will succeed in symbolizing national identity? Many Vietnamese prefer good government to bad government, but even more prefer self-government to foreign control. We should encourage self-government, and should minimize our nonmilitary role.

2. Thus, we should accept and encourage more independence by the South Vietnamese in handling their political and economic problems. Even if a Buddhist nationalist comes to power, he is likely to be more opposed to the NLF than to the Americans; and if his government does not want our protection, or makes it impossible, we can *then* leave with honor—having fully honored our solemn commitment. (I assume we would not have connived at his election or policy.)

3. To the extent that it can be encouraged to, the Saigon government should compete with the Vietcong in promises of social reform, should launch selective but significant social-reform programs now, and should carry out pacification programs in a legal and humane way.

4. We should replace the present system of four levels of American advisers in the Vietnamese Army (which tends to result in four levels of double veto) with a simpler, more unified system.

5. We should urge the South Vietnamese Army to make promotions and assignments on the basis of merit. The efficiency of the fighting forces would be greatly increased if

the army adopted the simple expedient of promotions on the battlefield, raising enlisted men to officer rank, regardless of education—rewarding proven ability, aggressiveness and dedication.

6. The amnesty programs offered to the Vietcong should be broadened and liberalized. The counterinsurgency wars that have been won since World War II often involved generous, well-publicized amnesty programs. (The Philippine Government, for instance, promised and gave farms to many Huk guerrillas who surrendered.) Although the South Vietnamese think it wrong to treat rebels better than loyal peasants, it is clearly worth a good deal to South Vietnam to make surrender safe and attractive, and to guarantee a decent, useful life to the man who surrenders.

7. We probably do not need to escalate military activities against North Vietnam. The military tactics we have introduced—aggressive patrolling to carry out search-and-destroy and clear-and-hold operations—contain many significant benefits that have not yet been fully realized, but should soon show important results.

8. I believe we can pacify Vietnam. A stable, reasonable government there is possible. Although the political situation looks bad today, many current political problems are likely to be solved following, and as the result of, military victories. The political difficulties in South Vietnam are likely to be diminished when and after elections are held—especially if the elections follow military victories.

Our present policy is the only realistic alternative the United States really has. It is a hopeful policy. If we are patient, resolute, realistic, that policy can probably realize our goals. I have yet to hear of an alternative that is not likely to involve costs far greater, far more deplorable, far more inhumane in both the short and long run.

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Albert Schweitzer profesesor of the humanities, City University of New York; professor of history, Harvard, 1954–61; twice winner, Pulitzer Prize; winner, National Book Award; assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; author of "A Thousand Days," etc.)

The moderate critics of the administration's Vietnam policy do not question its proclaimed purposes; resistance to Communist aggression, self-determination for South Vietnam, a negotiated settlement in Southeast Asia. They do question, with the greatest urgency, the theory that the way to achieve these objectives is to intensify the war. The more we destroy Vietnam, North and South, in their judgment, the less chance there will ever be of attaining our objectives. The course of widening the war, moreover, will mire our nation in a hopeless and endless conflict on the mainland of Asia, beyond the effective use of our national power and the range of our primary interests—and may well end in nuclear war with China.

And the alternatives? Instead of supposing that a guerrilla movement can be crushed by strategic bombing, instead of using military methods to solve a political problem, we must adapt the means we employ to the end we seek.

1. Stop the Americanization of the war. The bitter fact is that the war in Vietnam can *never* be won as a war of white men against Asians. It cannot be won "unless the people [of South Vietnam] support the effort. . . . We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam" (President Kennedy, 1963). The more we Americanize the war—by increasing our military presence, by summoning Saigon leaders, like vassals, to conferences in an American state, by transforming a local war in Vietnam into a global test between America and China—the more we make the war unwinnable.

2. A civilian government in Saigon. We have never had a government in Saigon that could enlist the active loyalty of the countryside, and we certainly do not have one in Marshal Ky's military junta. Instead of identifying American interests with Marshal Ky, and rebuffing the broader political impulses of the South, *we should long since have encouraged a movement toward a civilian regime that represents the significant political forces of the country and is capable both of rallying the army and carrying out programs of social reform.* If such a government should favor the neutralization of South Vietnam, if it should want to negotiate with Vietcong, *even if it should wish to release us from our commitment to stay in Vietnam,* we cannot and should not object.

3. Reconvene the Geneva Conference. We should persevere in the quest for negotiation. Since the Vietcong are a principal party to the conflict, it would appear obvious that peace talks at Geneva are meaningless without their participation. And since they will never talk if the only topic is their unconditional surrender, we must, unless we plan to exterminate them, hold out to them a prospect of a say in the future political life of South Vietnam—conditioned on their laying down their arms, opening up their territories and abiding by the ground rules of democratic elections, preferably under international supervision.

4. Hold the line in South Vietnam. Obviously, Hanoi and the Vietcong will not negotiate so long as they think they can win. Since stalemate is thus a precondition to negotiation, we must have enough American ground forces in South Vietnam to demonstrate that our adversaries cannot hope for military victory. I believe that we have more than enough troops and installations there now to make this point.

It is an illusion to suppose that by increasing the size of the American Army we can ever gain a reliable margin of superiority; for, by the Pentagon's preferred 10:1 ratio in fighting guerrillas, every time we add 100,000 men, the enemy has only to add 10,000, and we are all even again.

Nor does "digging in" mean a static strategy with initiative relinquished to the enemy. The South Vietnamese Army of half a million men is better suited in many ways than are Americans to search operations in the villages.

We should also limit our bombing in the South. Have we really no better way to deal with guerrilla warfare than the aerial obliteration of the country in which it is taking place? If this is our best idea of "protecting" a country against communism, what other country, seeing the devastation we have wrought in Vietnam, will ever wish for American protection?

5. Taper off the bombing of North Vietnam. Secretary McNamara has candidly said, "We never believed that bombing would destroy North Vietnam's will," and thus far, bombing the North has neither brought Hanoi to the conference table, demoralized the people nor stopped infiltration. As a result, pressure arise for ever-wider strikes—first oil depots, then harbors, factories, cities the Chinese border. But these won't work either. As we move down this road, we will only solidify the people of North Vietnam behind their government, make negotiation impossible and eventually assure the entry of China into the war. And even if we bombed North Vietnam back to the Stone Age and earned thereby the hatred of the civilized world, this still would not settle the present war—which, after all, is taking place not in North but in South Vietnam.

6. A long-run program for Southeast Asia. We should discuss with Russia, France, China and other interested countries a neutralization program, under international guarantee, for Cambodia, Laos, North and South Vietnam. If these states could work out forms of economic collaboration, as in the development of the Mekong Valley, the guarantors should make economic and technical assistance available to them.

A program of limiting our forces, actions and objectives still holds out the possibility of an honorable resolution of a tragic situation. A program of indefinite escalation offers nothing but disaster; for our adversaries can, in their own way, match our every step up to nuclear war—and nuclear war would be just as much a moral and political catastrophe for us as it would be a physical catastrophe for the Far East and the whole world.

---

## THE MIRANDA CASE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in a recent issue of his column, "Capitol Punishment," Art Buchwald has made some observations in jesting guise which seem quite appropriate to the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Miranda case. Properly construed, the majority opinion in the Miranda case attempts to lay down some artificial rules which an arresting officer must repeat by rote like a parrot in order to make admissible in a criminal case the voluntary confession of the defendant that he is the party who committed the crime with which he is charged. I ask unanimous consent that Art Buchwald's observations may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. Buchwald's observations were ordered to be printed, as follows:

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT: BABY FACE—A REMAKE

(By Art Buchwald)

Ever since the Supreme Court ruling concerning the protection of a defendant's constitutional rights at the time of his arrest, the motion picture people have been in a dither. Almost every gangster movie of the last 40 years is now outdated, and will have to be remade with the rights of the defendant kept in mind.

This is probably what the remarks of Baby Face Nelson will look like. Baby Face has been betrayed by his jealous girl friend and the cops have his farm hideout surrounded. The Chief of Police says over his loudspeaker, "Now hear this, Baby Face. The farmhouse is surrounded and you don't have a chance. Come out with your hands up."

"Drop dead, copper," Baby Face shouts from the window, firing a shot at the same time.

"I must warn you, Baby Face," the Chief says, "that anything you say will be held against you."

Baby Face lets go with a burst of a machine gun. "I don't intend to be taken alive, you dirty finks."

The Chief ducks behind his car. Kneeling, he says, "Baby Face, I have to advise you that you may either have a choice of your own lawyer or we will provide you with a public defender, and you do not have to say anything to us when you come out of the farmhouse with your hands up if you do not want to."

"I got lots to say," Baby Face shouts from the window. "Ha, ha, ha."

He lets go with another burst from the machine gun.

"If you're going to talk to us, Baby Face, you'll have to sign a waiver that no one made you say anything against your will."

"I'm signing nothing, copper. I know my rights. Like the case of Gonzalez vs. the State of Oklahoma, no one can lay a finger on me until I'm brought before a magistrate and given a hot meal and a bubble bath."

"Now listen carefully, Baby Face," the Police Chief says. "We know you've killed 12 bank tellers and robbed six post offices, but constitutionally you have nothing to fear. Even if we can prove our case, you can always appeal on the grounds that, because of this gun fight, you received adverse publicity in the newspapers, and could not get a fair trial."

Baby Face fires another burst from his machine gun. "That's what you say now. I haven't forgotten what happened in the Glutz vs. the People of Peoria, Illinois, case when the coppers tricked Glutz into a confession by giving him two tickets to the Green Bay Packers-Baltimore Colts football game."

"The Third Circuit Court threw out the Glutz conviction, Baby Face," the Chief shouts over the loudspeaker. "Didn't you read about the Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in Nashville vs. Virginia Woolf?"

"I haven't seen the newspapers lately," Baby Face shouts. "I've been holed up here, and if you want me you're going to have to come and get me." Rat-a-tat-tat.

"Okay, Baby Face, have it your way, but don't say we're violating your constitutional rights."

The Chief gives the signal to charge and a hailstorm of lead fills the air. When the smoke clears, Baby Face is lying mortally wounded.

His mother rushes up to him and puts his head in her lap.

"They got me, ma. Tell Melvin Belli the cops cheated him out of a fee," Baby Face gasps.

"Don't talk, son. If the police doctor does not patch you up, we can sue him for malpractice."

"But how, ma?"

"Don't you remember, son, Dillinger vs. the People of Malibu Beach, California?"

## VISIT ALABAMA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is in the nature of a special report on a single tourist attraction in my native Alabama. As many Senators know, I have been urging visits to Alabama to see what my State really is like. I repeat that invitation today, and I want to invite attention to one of the newest national monuments, Russell Cave.

I say "newest," but this is only because this remarkable place has been a national monument for only a few years and because it is planned to open the monument formally this fall. In this cave, experts from the Smithsonian Institution and the National Geographic Society have found a record of the lives of people who lived there for about 8,000 years. We know from these records that people were living in Russell Cave 4,000 years before the building of the Great Pyramid of Egypt.

In the excavations which have been made thus far archeologists have found spearheads, arrowheads, pottery, tools, and other artifacts to recreate the lives of these people as they progressed in the degree of their civilization. The National Park Service has erected a fine visitor building and museum, and the monument area has been in part landscaped, although most of it has been left in its natural state, just as it may have been when the Indians lived in Russell Cave. Rangers at the monument demonstrate the use of the throwing stick which enabled the Indians to send their light spears several hundred feet.

In addition to its historic interest, Russell Cave is a beautiful spot in a cove amidst the mountains of Jackson County. Russell Cave is near Bridgeport and Stevenson, Ala., a few miles from U.S. 72, and is easily reached from Chattanooga, Birmingham, or Gadsden. I commend it to us all as a reminder that people were here for thousands of years before Plymouth Rock or Jamestown or St. Augustine.

Incidentally, Russell Cave is in an area where there are numerous spectacular caves, some of which have unique features. For a very pleasant tour, I suggest a few days or weeks in this mountain area on both sides of the Tennessee River in Alabama.

Come on down to the Deep South and see Alabama, where we have been making progress for at least 8,500 years, and still are moving forward. You will enjoy an Alabama vacation.

## HUNGARIAN MINORITIES IN RUMANIA

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today some 1,750,000 Hungarians are living in Rumania. This is one of the largest ethnic minorities in Eastern Europe. These people are concentrated in the area of Transylvania, which has been their home for many centuries. Yet, for years now, they have seen their rights gradually slip away at the will of the Rumanian Government.

Mr. President, as men who believe in justice for all, we must oppose the abridgement of human freedom wherever it exists. This is why I am a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 143, which protests the persecution of Hungarian minorities in Rumania.

## JETPLANE SERVICE AT NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Agency has announced yet another policy on flights from Washington National Airport. Despite the testimony of nearby residents that the noise from jet airplanes is deafening, despite the incredible congestion which followed the inauguration of jet service at National, the FAA has decided to allow long-range flights to continue.

The FAA has yielded to special interest pressure again. This continues its "weather vane" policy—whichever way the wind blows, the Agency will go.

The Administrator had said that he would stand firm by his earlier decision to restrict jet flights to a 500-mile radius. Instead, the winds changed course, and so did he.

These long-range flights will, of course, be mostly jet flights. The jets will continue to deafen area residents—but I do not suppose the FAA really cares very much about that. This latest episode proves very clearly that the FAA is really more concerned with special interests than with the public interest.

To try and obtain an objective evaluation of the public interest, I have written to the National Capital Planning Commission, asking them to begin hearings immediately on the Washington air transportation problem. I am hopeful that they can produce a firm, stable policy on metropolitan air transportation facilities.

The Washington Post, which formerly supported the introduction of jets at National, has recently editorialized against jets at National, in light of the incredible traffic congestion and noise created by this decision. Today's Post contains a very pertinent editorial on the latest FAA shift.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 28, 1966]

TRAFFIC AT NATIONAL

The Federal Aviation Agency, batted back and forth like a shuttle-cock between the airlines and Midwest members of the congressional Tuesday to Thursday club, has issued a new order limiting flights at Washington National Airport.

It provides no permanent solution either for National or for the air traffic pattern of this area. The new order will impose a limit of 40 operations an hour. This is four less than the volume desired by the airlines. And, of course, it abandons the 500 mile limit and permits several schedules in excess of 650 miles.

The daily operations will be limited to 600. Without the limitations, according to FAA, the number would have risen to 760. Within the instrument limit of 60 an hour there can be 40 airlines operations, 16 general aviation operations and four air-taxi flights.

If the airlines can agree on the allocation of the available operations—and they have not done so yet—the volume will exceed the amount of traffic that ought to be allowed in and out of National. This amount of business still will overburden the facilities at the airport, oppress the residents of the community with an intolerable amount of noise and inconvenience, those who travel by air and those who do not, throughout the metropolitan area. The time will arrive when no city will tolerate the risks and hazards of increasing traffic over built-up urban areas. This city would not do so if it had self-government. Any elected government would promptly close National or limit its use to general aviation and move the airlines to Dulles International Airport.

The new rule, no doubt, will move back to National a number of schedules that would go to Dulles under a 500 mile limitation. The finest airport in the world will continue to be only partially utilized. The convenience of Congressmen and airline operators has won out over the comfort, safety and convenience of citizens. Residents of the District are not totally without means of showing their own preference. They cannot vote, but they can "vote with their feet" by using the services available at Dulles International Airport and Friendship Airport. The last word has not yet been said on Washington National Airport. Sooner or later, the great volume of Washington traffic will be moved to an airport that is convenient, comfortable, commodious and safe.

## METTLE OF AMERICANS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the aviation editor of the Chicago Tribune provides us with a stirring portrayal of young Americans who are battling for the cause of freedom in Vietnam.

I will not attempt to sum up his answers to a series of questions concerning

the quality of men he saw in combat, except to say that he reports these brave air and ground soldiers understand clearly why they are there—and why they are risking their lives.

Before offering the article containing his observations for the RECORD, I also would like to quote Mr. Thomis' tribute to the younger generation:

When you see men like this in action, putting out the one thing that is priceless to them—their own lives—and doing it so generously and selflessly and yet with a full knowledge of the risks, I'd say that this generation is as good as there ever was in the United States.

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

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

[From the Chicago Tribune, July 20, 1966]

THE METTLE OF AMERICANS

(NOTE.—*Wayne Thomis, Tribune aviation editor, appraises the quality of the present generation of young Americans as he observed them in combat in Viet Nam. This is the conclusion of a series of editorial interviews.*)

Q. We have had some discussion of helicopter operations. How many helicopters are out there?

A. We have 1,700 in southeast Asia. Six hundred are attached to the 1st air cavalry division alone. The whole division can be moved by helicopter. These operations have added a whole new dimension to war. We have an unprecedented mobility. We can get to any given point in a hurry. We can reinforce our columns in the field which have come in contact with the enemy, and, of course, terrain is no obstacle.

Q. What about the helicopter pilots?

A. These are the youngest men in combat I have encountered—most of them under 22 or 23, some of them no more than 18. They are trained for a year at Fort Rucker and come out as warrant officers. This warrant class is a sort of special elite group. I never saw people better motivated, more dedicated, or so intelligently facing constant risks. The helicopter is highly vulnerable to ground fire. It has to go in close, and it has to come in low. When it hovers, dropping off men or supplies, it is a sitting duck, and its pilots take even longer chances on rescue operations.

Q. What's the story of these rescues?

A. The helicopter pilots go right into the teeth of enemy 50 caliber machine gun fire to get out our wounded. They have to take whatever clearing is available. If the machine is shot up and that's one down, there's another right behind and he goes right in there, too. I've known of as many as three or four helicopters in a row that have been shot up in rescue work, and the fifth one still comes right in.

Q. These have to be brave men?

A. These boys aren't any more ready for death than anyone else, and they understand perfectly the risks they are taking. Their whole attitude is that this is a job that has to be done. When I talk with them, they say, "They needed us badly and we are as expendable as anyone else." Some of them, a year or two out of college, told us they started with the idea that we shouldn't really be in this war. They had listened to the usual antiwar chatter you get around a lot of campuses.

Q. What changed their minds?

A. It's a question, they say, of understanding what Viet Nam is all about, and why they have to be there. They feel there has to be a confrontation with communism-on-the-move somewhere. If it isn't here, it will be somewhere else. They have come to feel this is a responsibility which they can't escape.

Q. How about their families?

A. Those who are married said their wives also had come to accept the stakes of this war and the responsibilities that go with them. When it came time to leave, no hysterical scenes were thrown.

Q. So there is an acceptance of the hazards?

A. These boys are out there for a year and, the way things go, there is every likelihood they will be shot down two or three times in that period. Not every one, of course, but the risks are constant, and they run them daily. They don't wear parachutes. There's no way of getting out of the copter. If, they're shot down at altitude, they are going to crash and they are going to be killed, and that happens all the time.

Q. Yet they put their necks out almost by routine?

A. Yes, and the paramedics—the recue teams that are lowered while the helicopter is hovering low—are just as unbelievable. They have enormous spirit. They are not going in there out of a conscious patriotism, or because of ideas of cutting down communism. Their morale is based on this outlook: "We are not going to let our people down. There's an American down there, and we're going to get him. We're going to bring him out." That is what drives these paramedics down into the jungle at night, and it's the same thing that drives these helicopters down into the clearing against heavy machine gun fire.

Q. You were touched by these boys?

A. I think they are a special breed. They may get in there and pull three or four or five wounded out and get away, and the next man may get it. They put themselves right on the spot, deliberately, intentionally, even tho they are scared to death.

Q. The hazards are greater than those accepted by the strike pilots?

A. I think it takes a kind of courage that's entirely different from the strike pilots, who are also doing a tremendous job and get into very tight situations. The strike pilot is in an environment where he's taking hardly any more risk—and they say so themselves—than when he is operating on the range at home. But the helicopter boys, they're out on a long limb.

Q. You have spoken very highly of the bravery and dedication of our young men. This seems to run counter to the impression that many adults have of the current generation. Will you give us your thoughts on that?

A. I have never been more impressed at any time in my life with the courage and judgment and understanding and dedication and integrity of young men than I have been in this war. There are so many in it who look to me as if they are children—teen-agers and young men in their 20s. They are so self-sacrificing, so brave, that it's heartbreaking to see, inspiring to see, and it's so universal that they aren't even aware that they're brave.

Q. And this prevails thru all arms of all services?

A. It extends from the man who is there on the ground in conditions you wouldn't believe—pestilence, heat, insects, lack of water, and danger from every possible quarter, especially an enemy who is cunning and avid to kill—and it goes right up thru all the pilot leadership which has inspired a tremendous loyalty in all the units I saw. I say that this spirit starts at the top and goes right down to the last cook, the weapons carrier, and the man who is slogging thru all that underbrush with a load of ammunition on his back.

Q. What explains it?

A. The initial motivation is that these men simply will not let their comrades down. They know that their friends are being wounded and killed. Unit loyalty begins in this way.

Q. Are they fighting for the Vietnamese?

A. They tell me, "After we take a look at the country and the people and see how poor and miserable and benighted they are, and then after we find out that the enemy is cruel and murderous and is bent on imposing his own totalitarian system on these people, we understand just what it is that we are doing."

Q. They know what war has done?

A. They've seen the work of the Viet Cong. They've walked thru the villages that have been overrun and have seen women and children who have been shot or injured by grenades or chopped up with machetes. They have heard how village chiefs and teachers have been murdered. They see that the Vietnamese are good people and have put up with a long-term war with tremendous patience and courage and even cheerfulness. They are people who tug at the heartstrings of our own men over there.

Q. So they come to understand what the war is all about?

A. Yes, they know what they are doing, and why. They believe that it's right that they should be there to help these people. And, with the dedication they have to their own outfit, they have become, I think, quite sublime in facing the strange, extraordinary situation they find themselves in.

Q. Then this is an effective fighting force, one of high morale?

A. I say this advisedly: these men have become fine, professional soldiers. There is nothing like combat to turn an army of amateurs into an army of pros.

Q. What reaction do they have to the teach-ins and anti-war demonstrations back home?

A. I have asked a lot of people this question. Some are vehement about it. They say they can't understand it at all, and that it's a form of treachery. The younger men almost invariably said, "We have heard of this. We can't understand how it can go on. The only thing we can guess is that people who do these things have simply not understood what this war is all about, and what the fighting over here means to the people who are the victims of the Viet Cong."

Q. So you give the current generation very high marks?

A. I give them as high a mark as can be given. When you see men like this in action, putting out the one thing that is priceless to them—their own lives—and doing it so generously and selflessly, and yet with a full knowledge of the risks, I'd say that this generation is as good as there ever was in the United States. They are as good as the Americans of Revolutionary days or any men in all the wars we ever fought. Their parents and friends should be extremely proud of them. I certainly am so proud of them I just can hardly express it.

---

## PERSONAL PRIVACY?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the editors of Saturday Review are to be complimented for their recent July 23, 1966, issue which is devoted to the potential of the automation revolution and its implications for our society. The Saturday Review entitled this special issue "The New Computerized Age."

One article in the issue is devoted to the question of how much individual privacy remains as we develop more and more complex computers with more and more complex programing. One question suggested by the article is whether individuals today are themselves being

treated as machines. The Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will soon send a questionnaire to all Government agencies and departments to determine the nature and amount of information which the Government currently maintains on all individuals. It is our hope that these questionnaires will result in a meaningful analysis so that the subcommittee and the Congress will finally be able to determine answers to such questions as was recently put by one author: "must the miracle of the person succumb to the order of the computer?"

I urge my colleagues to read the recent issue of Saturday Review, and ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, an article entitled "Whither Personal Privacy?" by John Lear.

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

WHITHER PERSONAL PRIVACY?

(By John Lear)

Between my resignation as an editor of the slowly dying *Collier's* and the inauguration of SR's Science and Humanity Supplement, I was for a short while a minor adviser to Thomas J. Watson, Jr., son of the founder of the International Business Machines Corporation. My experience there contradicted two popular beliefs about IBM.

The first belief was that all IBM employes were required, as a condition of employment, to wear white shirts on the job, stay sober at home, and maintain upright on their desktops identical copies of a small sign bearing the personal command of Thomas J. Watson, Sr.: Think. I wore light blue shirts, drank cocktails at lunch, and put the Think sign on the windowsill of my office whenever my secretary put it back on my desk; yet I had a standing invitation to young Tom's sanctum.

The second of my working conditions that ran against supposed IBM tradition had to do with that then-new phenomenon, the so-called "giant brain," or high-speed electronic computer. IBM has sold an enormous number of electronic computers. According to legend, a loyal IBM salesman would leave his wife if necessary to clinch another sale. The truth about IBM computer sales, as I experienced it, was that an immense share of IBM's sales investment went into persuading eager customers *to delay the purchase of computers.*

Delaying was sound business practice because a computer can do only what it is told to do; it must follow instructions literally; until the instructor himself is sure where literal pursuit of a long series of tiny steps will lead, turning the task over to a computer can be dangerous. The machine may complete its assignment before its owners realize that the outcome isn't really the one they seek.

The period of my IBM experience dates back roughly a dozen years. At that time, computers could do only one thing at a time, in sequence. Computer programers—the people who break everyday English into binary arithmetic messages (consisting entirely of numerical zeros and ones) comprehensible to the machines—were such valuable individuals that IBM allowed them to sit at the computer control consoles as long as necessary to figure out flaws in the translation process. Since then, the speed of the machines has risen, the size of components has shrunk, and computer sophistication has grown to such a state that a machine can do a number of different things at a time, not necessarily in sequence.

As a result, the computer's time is worth upwards of $300 an hour—too valuable to be wasted by a programer's head-scratching; and each programer now must figure out unexpected problems in a separate place while the computer goes on with other people's problems. In other words, it is now possible for wrongly instructed computers to make more disastrous and far-reaching mistakes in a shorter time than ever.

Paul Baran, of the Rand Corporation in Santa Monica, has studied this dilemma more searchingly than most observers of the phenomenon.

"As we pass through life," he reminds us, "we leave a trail of records, widely dispersed and generally inaccessible—except with a great deal of effort and diligence. Beginning with a birth certificate, we accumulate hospital and medical records. We become deductions on our parents' income tax. In school, we generate records of our grades, attendance, IQ tests, personality profiles, etc. (Automated teaching will add to this record keeping. The volume of data recorded per child may be expected to increase even more markedly.) After school we start accumulating employment, socal security, and selective service records. We may get a driver's license. Most of us will apply for marriage licenses, and some of us will collect divorce decrees which will end in voluminous court records. If we are lucky, we will be able to avoid having arrest and jail records.

"We move from job to job in a mobile economy creating moving-company inventory records of our goods. Even as we move from place to place we leave behind short records of our airplane reservations and, for some reason, every hotel makes a ritual of acquiring and preserving the alleged names and addresses of its guests for posterity. This is only a partial list. Think of all the records you leave as you go through life.

"Behind all this creating of records is the implicit assumption that they will some day be of use. In order to be of use, there must be some means of interrogating the files to resurrect the information sought.

"An Internal Revenue Department investigator might wish to have immediate access to the tax returns of each of the associates of a man who is being audited, in order to check on consistency of financial relationships.

"A company may wish to have rapid access to its personnel files to know whether to give a good reference to a former employee.

"A doctor may wish to trace the entire medical history of a patient to provide better input into a diagnostic computer.

"The Veterans' Administration may wish to examine a man's complete military record and possibly other previous medical records to see whether the ailment claimed as being service-connected really is service-connected.

"A lawyer for the defense of a man will wish to search for jail and arrest records, and possibly credit records of all witnesses for the plaintiff.

"Professional licensing boards may want to delve into any records to determine if an applicant has an unblemished character.

"The military in filling extremely sensitive positions may even wish a record of all books borrowed by a prospective applicant to insure that his interests are wholesome and he possesses the proper political bias desired.

"Today it is difficult to gather such information about a prospective examinee. If one went through direct channels and asked most sources for their records about a person, he would most likely be rejected, if for no other reason than that the information is not available—cheaply. Even if the records were publicly available, the investigator would have to spend a great deal of time and effort delving through to discover pertinent data. Today, as a practical matter, if one wishes to obtain certain information about a person, he hires a private detective who charges a great deal of money and expends a great amount of time obtaining a little information available from a portion of these potential records. The price for a fishing expedition for information is high and most of the fish are inaccessible."

Having thus summed up "the pleasant past," Rand analyst Baran looks into the future through a three-step review of established processes of computer storage of information. Step one: Manual records are kept by human clerks. Step two: Some of the clerks are eliminated by putting all the records into a central computer file with readout of the records controlled from a single point. Step three: Information is read into and out of the file from a large number of different points.

Baran envisages connection of one remote-access computer with other similar computers, and through this, "danger of loss of the individual's right to privacy as we know privacy today." "The composite information data base may be so large and so easily accessible that it would permit unscrupulous individuals to use this information for unlawful means," he warns. "Modern organized crime should be expected to have the financial resources and skills necessary to acquire and misuse the information."

He expresses concern not only over the possible creation of "automated blackmail machines" but over the potential addition of "inferential relational retrieval techniques" now being developed which, "when fully refined, could determine relationships of any person, organization, event, etc., to any other person, organization, or event." Noting that "humans, by their day-to-day necessity of making decisions on totally inadequate evidence, are innately prone to jump to conclusions when presented with very thin chains of inferred relationships," he predicts an increase in the already growing practice of unearthing defaming information about candidates for political office.

The Baran forecast of computer hazards is fortified by the studies of another Rand researcher, M. R. Maron.

"Consider," suggests Maron, "what could happen as machines are used to make decisions about people. For example, consider a situation where a computer is programed to decide who should get a security clearance from the government, or who should get an education loan, or whether someone's driver's license should be suspended, or who should get a passport, or who should be accepted for the Peace Corps or the Job Corps, etc.

"As larger files [of machine-language data, stored in computer memories, linked cross-country by telephone] become accessible there will be a natural tendency to use machines for the automatic selection (or rejection) of people according to some preprogramed set of criteria. Supposedly these criteria will have been carefully thought out before programing the machine. Even so, the implications are dangerous.

"In such a mechanized situation, how does an individual get an opportunity to 'tell the system' that its selective criteria don't apply to his own special case? Each individual is different, each has certain extenuating circumstances, each has information which he believes to be relevant to the selection decision and which the system does not consider relevant. And so on. If an individual does not have the opportunity to be judged on the circumstances of his own special (individual) situation, *then he is being treated as a machine!*

"Will there be a tendency in the future to create an environment where we treat each other as machines; *i.e.*, where there is no opportunity to 'change the system's mind'? How can we create a society where we treat our citizens as people and not as machines?

How can we create a society where each individual has the opportunity to explore and unfold his own special potentials—to realize what he is?

"These questions lead to further questions—to questions about who we are and what it means to be a *person*. And this brings us to the problem of *values*. What kind of a life do we want? What kind would we value—ought we to have? How can we create a society that fosters those actions and goals that we value? How define and explicate values? How measure and compare and rate values? How select among competing values? How can we estimate the impact of computers on our values?

"And if our projections into the future suggest that we are heading toward a future society which is not conducive to a 'good' life, what can be done to isolate the trouble spots and to influence those changes that will prevent the possible 'evils'? Such analysis of future prospects implies prediction, evaluation, and then some attempts at control. Can the process of control be made democratic so that a small professional elite does not dominate in influencing the shape of the future?

"Finally, there is the problem of time—the time that it takes to initiate and complete corrective action. Given an analysis of the impact of computers on society and given some corrective action that must be taken in order to avoid some future situation, how long a time lag will occur between corrective action and modification of the situation?

The positive cultural potential of computers was emphasized last January in a report to President Lyndon B. Johnson by The National Commission of Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Although this report dissented from the "almost . . . commonplace [opinion] that the world is experiencing a scientific and technological revolution" of sufficient power "to make our economic institutions and the notion of gainful employment obsolete," it proposed serious consideration of development of a computerized "system of social accounts" capable of analyzing accurately in advance the benefits and costs of any sociopolitical experiment. Such a system theoretically could grapple competently with complex problems such as water and air pollution, urban blight, the transportation tangle, integration of the Negro into American society, and the continuing spread of crime.

The Presidential Commission report defined the phrase, "system of social accounts," to include mixtures of systems analysis, simulation, and operations research in proportions required for particular cases. Systems analysis and operations research are now in wide employment in military planning and extraterrestrial space exploration. Simulation techniques are part of current plans for global weather observation and forecasting.

How close are we to a workable "system of social accounts"?

One of the best informed men on earth on the subject of computer developments is Dr. Cuthbert Hurd, chairman of the board of Computer Usage Company, Inc. In addressing the National Automation Conference of the American Bankers Association in Chicago last month, Dr. Hurd observed that no computer manufacturer today markets an "operating system" flexible enough to apply all the diverse talents of computing machines to any complex problem.

"I suppose," Dr. Hurd told the bankers, "that as much as 200 man years of effort might be required to produce a modern operating system, costing say $5,000,000."

If such a system were to be perfected, Dr. Hurd said, "it is still unclear whether proprietorship [of the system] could be maintained under the existing patent or copyright laws."

There are two ways, then, to state the challenge of computerized society. One was succinctly put in a recent issue of *The American Scholar* by Lynn White, Jr., professor of history at the University of California in Los Angeles: "Must the miracle of the person succumb to the order of the computer?" The other statement comes from Paul Baran: "What a wonderful opportunity awaits us to become involved in such problems as to exercise a new social responsibility."

## REQUEST THAT FEDERAL OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY REINSTATE FUNDS DELETED FROM NASSAU COUNTY, N.Y., PROGRAMS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the town of Hempstead, Nassau County, N.Y., requesting the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity to reinstate funds deleted from Nassau County programs.

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

[Case No. 12261, adopted July 26, 1966]

RESOLUTION No. 1720-1966

Resolution requesting Federal Office of Economic Opportunity to reinstate funds deleted from Nassau County programs

Whereas, the sum of $2,297,132.00 has been requested of the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity for use in the County of Nassau for the 1966-67 program year, including sums aggregating $689,537.00 for the use of the Town of Hempstead and various communities within the Town, as an absolute minimum necessary for the purposes of such programs; and

Whereas, the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity has advised that only $1,695,000.00 will be allocated for the purposes of Nassau County and its constituent communities, and there will necessarily be proportionate reduction in the funds to be made available to the Town of Hempstead and the communities within this Town; and

Whereas, such reduction will make it impossible for the Town of Hempstead and the communities therein needing such assistance, to carry out the minimum programs required: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That this Town Board views such reduction in funds, as aforesaid, to be completely unrealistic insofar as the needs of the Town of Hempstead and its constituent communities are concerned, to be unjustified on the grounds asserted by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, and, to be a cruel breach of faith with the people in the Town of Hempstead needing the assistance of the programs sponsored by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity; and, be it further

*Resolved*, That this Town Board respectfully urges upon the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity that it reconsider its decision to reduce such funds and reinstate the amount so reduced in the funds to be made available in the County of Nassau; and, be it further

*Resolved*, That the Presiding Supervisor be and he hereby is authorized to advise the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity of the sentiments of this Board with respect to such reduction by forwarding to said office a certified copy of this resolution.

The foregoing resolution was seconded by Mr. Easa and adopted upon roll call as follows: Ayes six (6); noes none (0).

STATE OF NEW YORK,
*County of Hempstead, ss.:*

I do hereby certify that I have compared the annexed copy of Resolution No. 1720-1966 (1 page) adopted by the Town Board on July 26, 1966, with the original, on file in the office of the Town Clerk of the Town of Hempstead, and that the same is a true and correct copy of said original and of the whole thereof:

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the official seal of the Town of Hempstead on this day of July 26, 1966.

NATHAN L. H. BENNETT,
*Town Clerk.*
GEORGE C. AHRENS,
*Deputy Town Clerk.*

## SENATOR MONDALE'S REMARKS AT GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES AT LEECH LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on July 17th, Senator WALTER F. MONDALE broke ground at Leech Lake Indian Reservation in Minnesota for the first of 50 units of low rent public housing for some 200 Chippewa Indians. The project will be followed by others which will add hundreds of additional units of decent housing for Minnesota Indians.

This occasion was truly a breakthrough. It marked the first public housing to be built on any of Minnesota's reservations. And for that, Senator MONDALE ought well to be proud. For there has been no harder worker for the Indian than the junior Senator from Minnesota. His persistent efforts have made public housing for Indians possible in Minnesota. He prevailed upon the Public Housing Administration to modify its requirements to adapt them to the needs of the Minnesota reservations. The Minneapolis Star quoted one Bureau of Indian Affairs official as saying that Senator MONDALE had "camped on the doorstep" of the Public Housing Administration, and "they found he meant business."

The result is a heartening one for Minnesota's ill-housed Indians. Approved projects vigorously sought by Senator MONDALE now total nearly $4 million and include low cost rental housing, self-help housing, and housing to be built as part of a building training program which serves the additional important purpose of giving badly needed vocational training to Indians.

Senator MONDALE's remarks on the occasion at Leech Lake are of major importance in calling for a concerted effort to place the reservations, and the Indians on them, in the mainstream of our economy. This Nation cannot afford to leave the reservations as pockets of poverty and misery, for, as Senator MONDALE states:

> No Indian can grow to have and enjoy a full life, on or off the reservation, when he is forced to live any part of his life in hopelessly substandard conditions.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MONDALE's remarks at Leech Lake Indian Reservation be placed in the RECORD.

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

LEECH LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION HOUSING,
JULY 17, 1966

This is truly a great day for Minnesota, and for its Indian citizens. I want to thank all of you who made it possible. Last April I

spoke on the floor of the U.S. Senate, tracing the history of many months of effort we all had put in to get a modest start of adequate housing for the Minnesota reservations, and I stated, in temporary despair: "I wonder when the day will come when construction of this needed housing for our Minnesota Indians will begin."

I am happy, as I know all of you are, that the day is here. We have not promises, but houses. We officially begin the first of some 50 units to house 200 persons on this Leech Lake Reservation. This 700,000-dollar project is the first low rent public housing approved for any Minnesota reservation, and will be followed by other Indian housing to make a total of nearly 4 million dollars for all Minnesota reservations. This includes the recent approval of loans totaling $390,000 for mutual self-help housing here on the Leech Lake Reservation. It is a long overdue breakthrough. And we expect approval of nearly 300 additional units soon.

This substantial Federal housing indicates a decision at last that there are Indians on the reservations now who are in grave need, and that many of them will choose to remain on the reservation. It is a decision to improve reservation life. There have been times recently when I'm afraid that our national policy seemed to be based on a wish that the reservations would simply go away overnight. I think we are finished with that, and we recognize that no Indian can grow to have and enjoy a full life, on or off the reservation, when he is forced to live any part of his life in hopelessly substandard conditions.

Housing is an important beginning. Since the Housing Act of 1937, we have recognized it as basic to our citizens. When a person is forced to live in poor housing, he can hardly be motivated to the kind of activity which makes his life productive for him and the nation. More than that, he can't stay healthy. I've seen health records kept by the Public Health Service on our Minnesota reservations, and they show a sad and shocking record of disease. There is simply no question that it is cheaper to house people decently than it is to care for the illnesses they get in bad housing. This is true for the Indians of Minnesota just as it is for anyone else.

Housing is a good beginning, but it is only a beginning. The reservations in Minnesota are in economic trouble, just like some other areas of the nation. They deserve a concerted, combined attack on their problems of poverty and economic under development—the kind of attack that is being mounted in other distressed areas.

This isn't an Indian problem—it is a problem of distressed areas anywhere. I'm reminded of the words of my good colleague and tireless worker for Indian welfare, Senator FRED HARRIS, of Oklahoma, whose wife is a Comanche. He said in Senate debate that the only "Indian problem" he knows of is the one he married. As he says, it is an American problem—a problem of people and their needs—human needs, economic needs, social needs.

We must have a massive program of economic development for the Indian Reservations, combind with a program of education to fit the modern economy. Industrial and craft training is particularly important. I'm happy to have helped bring about the home building training program here on Leech Lake Reservation. But more vocational training is needed, with parallel industrial growth. And a full range of social services are needed to make life on the reservation economically productive and socially satisfying. These programs must be tempered with recognition of the existing cultural values to be preserved.

When I first announced that a grant had been received for public housing here at Leech Lake, one commentator raised the question whether such an effort did not mistakenly create an enclave of Indians on the reservation. He asked whether we weren't making reservation life too attractive, and whether we might not better build the houses in cities to which Indians were migrating. I think that these questions miss the point.

Some of Minnesota's Indians want to leave the reservation now, and some will want to leave in the future. Our Government ought to be able to help house and train them for life off of the reservation. But many others want to stay on the reservation, and I don't think that Indians or any other citizen of this country ought to be told that they have to leave their home environment and move a few hundred miles to enjoy the basics of good housing and good education and a job. We shouldn't treat any citizen that way.

There is even more to it. Legally, the Indian has been free to leave the reservation for years. But this is a terribly hollow right when the life he leaves has failed—by lack of housing, education, health and social services—to prepare him for life in the modern economy of our cities. The sad unemployment figures of Minnesota's Indians both on and off the reservation testify to that fact. So far, the Indian has been "free" to remain in poverty on the reservation, or to go to live unemployed in a city slum. This choice is the indefensible product of a bankrupt policy.

So I think that there is only one reasonable direction open to us. It is to build on the reservations the kind of economy which will support jobs for Indians, the kind of housing which will permit a healthy life, and, above all, the kind of education which will motivate and provide skills for a productive job.

Our effort must place the reservation itself, and the Indians on it, in the mainstream of our economy. Then there will be real freedom. Freedom to leave the reservation, or to stay on it. And all America will be the better for it.

Such a program of economic and educational development will have to come, but it is not here yet. It can't be worked out from a distance, but must be done with initiative and cooperation of the Indian community here. It can't be the Washington plan; it has to be your plan. And let's not fool ourselves—it isn't going to happen overnight. It will take long, hard work by all of us, Indian and non-Indian. I want to help, and hope that you will ask me to. It is a hard job, but it can be done. And it will be worth it to make the reservation a good place to live and work. We'd better get to it. As President Kennedy said in 1963: "The American Indians hold a romantic grip on our imaginations, but I hope that they also hold a practical grip upon our efforts."

---

## REMEDIAL READING RECOMMENDED FOR JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on June 6, I informed the Senate that I saw no need to go to extremes to discredit the John Birch Society because I thought that that organization was perfectly capable of discrediting itself.

The occasion for that remark was the receipt of a letter from a John Birch Society official who accused me of going to extremes in an attempt to discredit the society. The extreme to which I had allegedly gone was the insertion in the RECORD of an editorial published in a newspaper in my State, the Rochester Courier, of Rochester, N.H., commenting on the aims of the John Birch Society.

It was my opinion at that time that the John Birch Society could be relied upon to discredit itself, and my opinion turned out to be justified. I had the letter which I had received printed in the RECORD for June 6, and commented upon one phrase which seemed to me to illustrate the society's philosophy. That phrase was:

> A benevolent dictatorship clearly implies complete justice and complete freedom.

Mr. President, the letterwriters of the John Birch Society seem to want to amuse themselves in their idle time, and this morning my mail contained yet another letter from the same society official who had written me before.

It is addressed to:

> DEAR SENATOR McINTYRE'S GHOST READER—

And it goes, in relevant part, as follows:

> On May 24, 1966, Senator McINTYRE inserted a scurrilous newspaper editorial in the RECORD. It was from the Rochester (New Hampshire) Record, and in essence accused the John Birch Society of proposing "dictatorship" as the ideal form of government for the United States of America.
>
> I replied to the newspaper with a correction, and sent a copy to the Senator, which he inserted in the RECORD on June sixth, together with his own strange remarks. Since the Senator obviously cannot read, and I do not know your name, please excuse the anonymous salutation.

The letter then goes on to some more material which is not particularly informative, and concludes as follows:

> Enclosed is $1, which I hope will initiate a fund to send Senator McINTYRE to a remedial reading class.

Now, I happen to think this is a most intriguing contribution. I am particularly interested in the fact that the John Birch Society recommends remedial reading, in view of the very clear fact that the John Birch Society official who wrote to me is apparently unable to read the text of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As can be noted from the first paragraph of his letter to me, he refers to a newspaper editorial from the Rochester, N.H., Record. I am certain that, with only the most rudimentary reading ability, this gentleman would have been able to glean from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of either May 24 or June 6 that the editorial in question came from the Rochester, N.H., Courier.

As this letter indicates, it is the John Birch Society official who has trouble reading.

I stated a few weeks ago, as I restated today, that the John Birch Society was perfectly capable of discrediting itself. Once again, the society has proved its own point, by sending me a letter about remedial reading which conclusively shows the society's own problems with reading. I feel that this is the most generous interpretation which can be placed on this matter, although at least one member of my staff has suggested that this error merely shows the John Birch Society's careless attitude toward facts.

In any event, I emerge from this correspondence $1 the richer, and, considering the source of the contribution, I feel that this is truly an embarrassment of riches. I have decided to donate this contribution to the Anti-Defamation League, where the funds gleaned from the dues of John Birch Society members, I am certain, may be used to help stem oncoming waves of extremism.

## A TIME FOR CANDOR

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for July 27, 1966, carried an editorial in which the writer made some timely observations in respect to the rioting and looting which has been going on in some of our major cities and the attempts of some persons to justify it. I ask unanimous consent that such article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A TIME FOR CANDOR

This summer's harvest of horror—murder, arson, looting in city after city, week after week—is prompting ever more insistent questioning. Why? Who is to blame? Strangely enough, the response of a good many people is that it is not the fault of the rioters but of the general society and, if you please, the Federal Government.

One editorialist was moved to express the sentiment in the following extremist fashion: "The (Federal) housing program is too small. The poverty program is too small. It is not the riots in the slums, but these lame and inadequate programs that are the real disgrace of the richest nation on earth."

We submit that attitudes of that sort are an unmerited rebuke to America and the millions whose hard work and hard thinking have made it the most abundant and just nation on earth. We are glad that President Johnson, at least, is not thus beguiled; while commiserating with the plight of slum-dwellers, he is forthright in his condemnation of riots that tear at the very fabric of of the community. "Our country can abide civil protest . . . it cannot abide civil violence."

Let us look a little more closely at the catalog of charges against the "inadequacy" of Federal efforts.

Large-scale Federal housing aid for low-income families has been going on for many years at a cost of many billions in tax dollars. It has failed indeed, but its inadequacy is not in terms of cost but in terms of concept. The same applies to the bulk of the activities launched by the more recent antipoverty program.

The fundamental conceptual flaw is a sentimental view, reminiscent of Rousseau, of the nature of man. According to this interpretation, man is inherently good and perfectible and is held down only by the external forces of society. Put him in pleasant surroundings, or give him enough money, and all will be well.

The inescapable corollary is that the society rather than the individual is responsible for his behavior, however ambitionless, venal or criminal. The doctrine has been preached with so much vigor, and not only in connection with civil rights, in contemporary America that it is hardly surprising to find some of the listeners taking it literally.

Experience, to put it mildly, lends little credence to the romantic view of man's nature; left entirely to our own devices, relatively few of us would qualify for sainthood. In that context, the political triumph of the American design of 200 years ago is that it engineered a maximum of personal liberty with a minimum of governmental compulsion. But the order is there, and it has to be, else the design falls.

Confronted with such self-evident facts, the civil rights leaders tend to retort with the argument that if they did not promote civil disobedience, nothing would be done to improve the squalid surroundings in which many Negroes live. Anyone contemplating civil disobedience, however, in a society whose existence depends on respect for law is obligated to ask himself what alternatives exist before he turns to that last resort.

Here again, the President put it well: "The ballot box, the neighborhood communities, the political and civil rights organizations—are the means by which Americans express their resentment against intolerable conditions. They are designed to reform society, not to rip it apart."

And the truth is that many individual Negroes, even before the past decade's civil rights legislation, have come up from poverty and gotten out of the "ghetto." (The term, incidentally, is a loaded one; by connotation if not denotation it suggests the falsehood that some governmental authority is compelling Negroes to stay in segregated, walled-in areas.)

Many more can be expected to make a decent living for themselves without the leaders having to rip up society. What cannot be stressed too often, and what the romanticists fail to understand, is that for the most part they will have to do it on their own; the leaders would be better occupied helping them help themselves than in creating the climate for riots. Even then, there will be some members of any society, regardless of color, who for one reason or another will not be able to make a go of life.

It's time, we think, for a little bit of common sense and candor. Neither the society at large nor the Federal Government is responsible for the violence. Those responsible are the rioters and the teachers of casual disregard for law and order.

## U.S. OBLIGATIONS IN ASIA

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Nation's press is being heard on President Johnson's significant speech on our obligations in Asia, and the early reaction is strongly favorable.

I have here editorials from three newspapers—the Baltimore Sun, Philadelphia Inquirer, and Washington Evening Star—praising various aspects of the President's speech to the American Alumni Council.

Each comments with approval on his call to Communist China for an atmosphere of conciliation.

There is firm agreement with his declaration that the United States is a Pacific power with responsibilities that cannot be shirked in Asia.

And there is hope that Hanoi and Peking will get the point.

This was a message reflecting our determination and our fervent desire for peace.

I ask that these editorials discussing the President's speech be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, July 14, 1966]

THE UNITED STATES IN ASIA

That the United States is a Pacific power, as President Johnson called in his speech on Asia, must be obvious to everybody, including the Chinese. We did not at some moment make a decision to become a Pacific power; we were forced into becoming one by the interests of our own national security, and by the vacuum left in that part of the globe after World War II. If a date is to be set, we can say that on December 7, 1941, the Japanese made inevitable the emergence of the United States as a major factor in all developments in the Pacific, among the islands of its seas and on the mainlands that border it.

It was on the fact of American power that the President built his examination of Asia and his view of its future. It is true, as he said, that Asia is now the crucial arena of "man's striving for independence and order," and true that if peace cannot be established there it cannot be secure anywhere. Mr. Johnson's listing of heartening signs in Asia, from Indonesia through Japan, and of examples of Asian cooperation, from Manila to the valley of the Mekong, was an impressive list. And his call to China to accept an atmosphere of conciliation was fervent and eloquent.

If the Chinese cannot be expected to see the sense of this, and to respond soon in the same spirit, still most of our allies will follow the President this far, in thorough agreement. What they might argue about is his statement that the Asia he sees so well "is the new Asia that is taking shape behind our defense of South Vietnam."

In the eyes of some of our allies, the defense of South Vietnam, while it may be necessary, is but one element of many in the Asian condition today. And then there is a question of how power is to be applied. Some of our allies believe that the very fact of the existence of vast American power, by sea and air, and if worst should come to worst, in nuclear terms, might suffice as a deterrent to the Chinese, without an American ground presence.

But would it serve further to persuade the Chinese toward conciliation? And where lies the point beyond which American efforts at conciliation would be taken by the Chinese as a sign of weakness, and by now-friendlier Asians as a signal of betrayal? This is the kind of tortured question the makers of policy have constantly to ask themselves. To pretend that the answers are easy is to assume an omniscience no one can possess.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, July 14, 1966]

THE PRESIDENT'S OFFER OF PEACE

President Johnson's call for reconciliation with Communist China and for peace with North Vietnam marks an important turn in U.S. policy in Asia. The President, in his televised address, made it clear that, if the proffer of peace is rejected by Hanoi and Peking, the war in Vietnam may last a long time.

Mr. Johnson, it is evident, is stepping beyond the previously stressed policy of "containment without isolation" of Red China and is looking beyond the present conflict in Vietnam to the situation in Asia after the war ends.

"A peaceful mainland China is essential to a peaceful Asia," he said. "A hostile China must be discouraged from aggression. A misguided China must be encouraged toward understanding of the outside world and toward policies of peaceful cooperation."

"The peace we seek in Asia," he said further, "is a peace of conciliation." He added that he did not mean a peace of conquest, or the simple absence of armed hostilities, but a settlement based on a broader concept of international relations.

He talked of the peace that could be sustained through international trade; through the free flow of people and ideas; through

"the full participation by all nations in an international community under law."

Meanwhile, there is the war in Vietnam. The President defined the American position in blunt terms directed at Hanoi: "Victory for your armies is impossible. You cannot drive us from South Vietnam by force. The minute that 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 to bring our men home."

President Johnson's message to the Communists was one of peace, backed by determination to press on in Vietnam, if our peace offers get nowhere.

Will Hanoi and Peking get the message? Past history furnishes little ground for optimism. We still must make the effort.

---

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 14, 1966]

AMERICA IN ASIA

President Johnson has held out the hand of conciliation to Red China, but the chances are that the response will continue to be hostile as long as the Mao Tze-tung hardliners remain in power. Not until a younger, less doctrinaire group takes over will a change for the better in Sino-American relations be likely.

Meanwhile, however, as the President has indicated to the American Alumni Council, measures can be taken by the United States, in concert with the free Asians, to prove that aggression is a losing game and to bring nearer the day when the Chinese Communists will be persuaded to come out of their self-imposed isolation, abandon force and cooperate with neighboring lands—and with America—to promote peace and economic progress throughout Asia. Among other things, our government might well go along with proposals offering Peking a seat in the United Nations, provided of course that this would not affect the membership or security of the other China, Taiwan.

In any event, with more emphasis than any of his predecessors, Mr. Johnson has proclaimed to the Chinese and the rest of the world that the United States is a Pacific power determined to meet its obligations in Asia. He has pretty well demolished the arguments of those domestic critics who hold that Europe, not the Far East, is America's main "sphere of interest" and that the Asians can be safely forgotten. In the President's words, "We are bounded not by one but by two oceans—and whether by aircraft or ship, satellite or missile, the Pacific is as crossable as the Atlantic . . . The economic network of this shrinking globe is too intertwined—the basic hopes of men are too related—and the possibility of common disaster is too real—for us to ignore threats to peace in Asia . . . Asia is no longer sitting outside the door of the Twentieth Century. She is here, in the same world with us, to be either our partner or our problem."

The President, in effect, has given Asia a status at least equal to Europe's in terms of its bearing on our country's well-being. Other Americans have made the same point in the past, but not so effectively. We think Mr. Johnson is altogether right.

---

## POLITICS AND THE FBI

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a great deal has been said in recent months about the attempted eavesdropping by agents of the Federal Government in my State of Nevada and many other places. These incidents have been carefully and systematically brought to the surface largely through the efforts of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri and the staff of the subcommittee he heads which has been holding hearings on the subject.

Of late, a distinction has been made between the term "wiretapping" which was the term used in the 1934 law and the term "bugging" which represents an application of a more sophisticated technology in the electronic age. It is clear to all that by any name or method we are talking about the same obnoxious and undesirable violation of the basic right of privacy which the Government should be guarding for all citizens. I will refrain from speculating on the negative effect in our war on crime which such lawbreaking by Federal officials engenders.

I can think of no more effective or proper move to end this practice than a law which would ban all eavesdropping or surreptitious listening whether by mechanical or other means except in cases of national security upon the issuance of a proper court order. The subject is one which demands proper clarification and I believe that the executive department should come forward with their recommendation for a law which would deal fairly and constitutionally with the rights of the public and the obligation of policing agencies to protect society.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on the subject which appeared in the Washington Daily News on July 27, 1966, appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, July 27, 1966]

POLITICS AND THE FBI

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The FBI is in trouble because an agent in Las Vegas bugged a suspected criminal back in 1963 and Sen. BOBBY KENNEDY, asked on a network television program whether he knew, as Attorney General at the time, that the gentleman in Las Vegas was being wiretapped, replied that he did not. That reply raised the question whether the FBI had acted illegally. If so, the situation is scandalous indeed, it being the job of the FBI to enforce the law, not to break it.

The relevant background: There is, under the law, a distinction between "wiretapping" and "bugging." There is no reason why this should be so, except that wiretapping was the earlier of the two inventions, and Congress acted on it, but has not got around to acting on the other.

In 1934, Congress passed a law regulating the use of the wiretap by Federal crime-prevention agencies. The law was defined by supplementary executive decrees in 1940, and again in 1965. The governing regulations are that the FBI may use a wiretap only in cases involving the national security (e.g., spies), threatening bodily harm (e.g., Murder, Inc.), or life and limb (e.g., kidnaping). But in each case the Attorney General must personally authorize the wiretap, and any prosecutions that develop as the result of overheard evidence may not introduce that evidence in any court of law.

Not knowing that technology would come around with sophisticated devices that would permit eavesdropping through the olive in a suspect's martini, Congress dealt exclusively with the wiretap. The FBI, however, has proceeded all along on the assumption that the rules governing the wiretap ought to regulate the use of the bug; i.e., the FBI has not taken advantage of the opening left by Congress. But this does not mean that Sen. KENNEDY failed to take advantage of that difference. Indeed, there are those who believe that that is exactly what the Senator did when asked whether he had authorized the Las Vegas "wiretap." No, he said—a technically correct answer inasmuch as there never had been a wiretap. It was a bug.

In the absence of an elucidation from the former Attorney General, one is left to speculate. It is reasonable to suppose that J. Edgar Hoover would not jeopardize his reputation or that of the FBI in pursuit of a felon in Las Vegas, and it is unreasonable to suppose that if asked permission to use the bug, Attorney General KENNEDY would have denied it, since he has never denied using the tap during his tenure.

Perhaps the Senator's memory is defective. Perhaps he sought refuge in the technicality. In due course the matter should be cleared up. One supposes that the FBI, which is a highly efficient organization, could, if absolutely necessary, prove that Attorney General KENNEDY had knowledge of the Las Vegas incident. One doubts it will come to that.

There is left a general issue of considerable importance. Reasonable folk agree that the FBI should utilize all technological inventions available to it in order to safeguard the national security and to frustrate the assassin or the kidnaper. The trouble is that once it sets up a bug, the FBI becomes a sort of omnium-gatherum, because the bug does not distinguish between conversation about how to steal a state secret, and conversation about how to make contact with a lady of easy virtue.

Inevitably, other branches of the Federal Government hunger to know whether the bug has picked up information of particular interest to it. For instance, Internal Revenue.

At the moment a petitioner, Fred Black Jr., has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to overturn his conviction as a tax dodger on grounds that the prosecution had available to it information gleaned by an FBI bug. The Government has maintained that nothing got up by the bug was used in the Government's case. All very well. But the fact remains that the Attorney General authorized the transmission of FBI-bugged information to Internal Revenue, and that flouts the intent of the 1934 law.

One can hardly blame Mr. Hoover for the communication of the bugged information. He did only what his superior—once again, Attorney General KENNEDY—ordered. But surely a law should be passed, and one assumes the FBI would welcome it, to the effect that no information should be given to collateral divisions of the Government which is picked up by wire tap, unless it is necessary to prevent acts of violence.

---

## NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, employment figures for the month of June show a heartening rise in the number of jobs held by teenagers. The more than 2 million youths who found jobs last month will be learning skills and accumulating earnings to help themselves and their families and in many cases, to enable the youths to return to school in the fall.

Part of this success can be traced to the Federal Government's efforts to encourage private industry, community organizations and public agencies to hire youths. The most outstanding of these efforts has been the Neighborhood Youth Corps program which put 575,000 youngsters to work in the past year.

Neighborhood Youth Corps is making it possible for young people who cannot afford to stay in school to continue on with their education by offering them part-time jobs. It helps those who have had to drop out of school to get a job and develop a useful and needed skill.

One small but highly significant project to develop such skills is being carried out by the Smithsonian Institution here in Washington. Under a Neighborhood Youth Corps grant and in cooperation with Washington's United Planning Organization, the Smithsonian is training 40 youths in skills needed in museums and laboratories.

The Washington Post recently published an article about the program. This kind of project demonstrates that training of this kind is needed, can be used, and will offer many of our youngsters an exciting and rich future. I ask unanimous consent that the Post article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 31, 1966]

SMITHSONIAN OPERATES ANTIPOVERTY UNIT, TOO

(By Stuart Auerbach)

A 19-year-old Washington girl whose horizons once stretched no farther than a clerical job bent over a microscope in a laboratory at the Smithsonian Institution and tossed out $50 words that only a botanist could understand.

On another floor in the same building, several youths were making silk screen prints for some of the Smithsonian's new exhibits and two sisters were carving up a penguin with scalpels to prepare it for scientific study.

They are among 40 youths being trained in skills that are in great demand by museums and laboratories in a small but remarkably successful anti-poverty program.

STARTED LAST JULY

The program was started last July by S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Institution, under a Neighborhood Youth Corps grant and in cooperation with the United Planning Organization.

The Labor Department supplied funds for 26 youths to work at the Smithsonian. Trainees work 32 hours a week and earn $1.25 an hour.

Many officials were dubious that the youths could fit into the Smithsonian's atmosphere.

Now, however, officials at both the Smithsonian and UPO are loud in praise of the program.

"Rather than bring these kids in and have them cut grass and pull weeds, we decided we would give them meaningful jobs," said Jack Whitelaw, who heads the program for the Smithsonian.

FEW DROP OUT

Most of the 26 who started at the Institution last July have graduated to other jobs as a result of their experience. Very few have dropped from the program.

"There is some kind of adhesive here that seems to hold people," said Don Regusters, coordinator of out-of-school programs for UPO who was counselor for the Smithsonian project.

The training given at the Smithsonian prepares the youths for jobs in other museums, store display departments and in scientific laboratories, Regusters said.

"It not only helps them find jobs," said Whitelaw, "it gives them a sense of working on something important. When they are ready to go out and get a job, they can offer references from some of the Nation's leading scientists. It's a bit different than giving the name of a couple of high school teachers."

RAISES ASPIRATION

Regusters called the Smithsonian program "the best in Washington" and said he knows of no equivalent in the United States.

"It raises the general aspiration level," he said. "Most kids never even knew these jobs existed."

Diana Newman, 19, who started with the program last July, hoped to work for the telephone company after graduation from high school.

Instead, she joined the Smithsonian program and was an instant success. Her first job was in the botany library—where she found a confused jumble of scientific books, magazines and pamphlets. Within two weeks, she and Lola Bundy "brought order out of chaos," Whitelaw said.

Diana then was hired as a research assistant by Dr. Floyd A. McClure, one of the world's authorities on bamboo who is working at the Smithsonian. Diana dissects plants and prepares slides for the scientist, freeing him from routine.

BLACKBOARD LECTURES

Diana is a favorite around the botany lab. Dr. Thomas R. Soderstrom, curator of grasses at the Smithsonian and custodian of the largest grass collection in the world, and Dr. Cleofe E. Calderon of Buenos Aires, teach Diana new techniques and give blackboard lectures that very few college students are lucky enough to get.

"It's very good for us," said Dr. Soderstrom. "We are able to find some really top-notch people. Instead of searching in the open market, we have trained assistants here that we can hire."

Regusters said the youths working in the Smithsonian's exhibits section are learning skills that can be transferred to private industry. Some are making models, others learn silk screening.

## CAPTURED U.S. PILOTS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, another indication of public outrage over Hanoi's mistreatment of captured U.S. pilots appears in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The North Vietnamese have paraded these valiant airmen through the streets of Hanoi and threatened to execute them as war criminals. Should they think such a monstrous act would discourage the American military effort, the Inquirer asserts in an editorial, they would be making one of history's monumental errors.

Secretary of State Rusk has warned that we would consider the abuse of prisoners held in North Vietnam as a very grave development. The newspaper suggests it would unite the country behind a hugely stepped-up policy of force in Vietnam.

I request that this editorial be included in the RECORD.

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

IF THEY KILL CAPTURED FLIERS

The North Vietnamese should have it spelled out for them in unmistakable terms just what the consequences will be if they carry out their threats to try and to execute captured American fliers as war criminals.

If they think for one moment that such a monstrous act of reprisal would put a stop to American bombings and otherwise discourage American military effort, they are making one of history's monumental errors.

The American public has already been shocked by the mistreatment given captured fliers by the North Vietnamese Communists. It has been angered by pictures showing the shackled prisoners paraded through menacing crowds on the streets of Hanoi.

But this reaction will be nothing compared to the horror that will sweep this country if the helpless captives are thrown to the firing squads after drumhead trials.

Secretary of State Rusk has warned that the U.S. would view as a "grave development indeed" the abuse of prisoners held in North Vietnam, and will insist on humane treatment under the Geneva accords.

If Ho Chi Minh does not want this country united behind a hugely stepped-up policy of force in Vietnam, he had better call off his would-be killers of prisoners before it is too late.

## FOREIGN AID

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, pursuant to a request made of me by it, I wrote a letter to the Forensic Quarterly on April 26, 1966, in which I set forth my views in respect to foreign aid. A copy of this letter was printed in the Forensic Quarterly for May 1966.

By way of explanation of my vote against the foreign aid authorization bill, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE OPINION OF SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

American opinion is now forcing a close reappraisal of our foreign aid policies. The time has come when the American people must adopt a harsh test of self-interest in dealing with foreign aid. Earlier, American aid sought nothing greater than to provide the war-torn countries of the world with greater economic stability in order to help these nations resist Communist pressures. At that time this policy served our self-interest and the interest of humanity. However, now that the program of rehabilitation of Western Europe and Japan has been completed, there is no reason, twenty years after the Second World War, for the United States to be giving away over three billion dollars annually for foreign aid.

Under our Constitution the power to tax and to appropriate monies raised by taxation can be exercised by the Congress only for a public purpose. Congress does not have the power to spend beyond the ambit of this constitutional authorization. Therefore, in order to justify the Congressional appropriations for foreign aid programs on the grounds that they are for a valid public purpose, these programs must strengthen either the economic, or military, or international position of the United States. Our present foreign aid program does not have a valid public purpose because it cannot be justified on either of these grounds, and for this reason I cannot support the Administration's present foreign aid policies. I maintain that our foreign aid programs do not aid the United States or the free world. On the contrary, the economy of the United States on which the defense of the free world depends, is actually weakened by these expenditures.

Foreign aid amounts to a substantial part of our federal budget. Therefore, because of our seemingly permanent policy of deficit financing, our government has actually borrowed a substantial amount of the money

which the administrators of post-war foreign aid programs have scattered among the nations of this earth. By increasing our budget deficits, foreign aid dollars have contributed to monetary inflation in this country. The buying power of our dollar constantly is being eroded. If this continues, our economy will be irreparably damaged.

Our dollars have found their way into many foreign treasuries and now these foreign governments are clamoring at our doors demanding gold in repayment for these dollars. These foreign aid dollars are claims on the goods and services produced by the industries of the United States and no one can say that the resources of this country are not being drained when we give away dollars abroad and they return as demands on our nation's wealth.

For example, since World War II we have given France approximately nine billion dollars in foreign aid. This does not include the other billions which ground their way into the French economy through the maintenance of our military forces in France. Now the French government is demanding payment of gold for this money which has been drained from our economy and added to our national debt. Our balance of payments dilemma which has largely resulted from our foreign aid policies, weakens the value of the dollar and the public welfare of the country is, of course, damaged. This is in direct violation of the requirement that money Congress appropriates for any purpose, including foreign aid, must be spent in a way to aid the public welfare.

No matter what the currently fashionable Keynesian economists say, there is a limit to government spending and if we are to continue budget deficits, certainly we have an obligation to our own poor superior to any obligation we assume year after year to care for the poor of other nations. We should satisfy this superior obligation before we look for other countries to assist.

Foreign aid does not strengthen the military position of the United States. Actually, it impairs the build-up of our own forces on which the survival of the United States and the free world may depend. Many times military leaders have come before the Congress and requested authorizations for national defense purposes in excess of those asked by the civilian authorities. They felt the appropriations were necessary to maintain our ground forces at proper levels and to equip them with modern weapons. Civilian authorities have always said on these occasions that the Congress ought not take any such action because it was essential to keep the United States fiscally sound and the actions urged by the military men were beyond the financial capacity of the United States. For example, we have been told that the United States was not financially able to develop both the B70 bomber and intercontinental ballistic missiles. The B70 project was dropped and while no one doubts the necessity for the developing intercontinental ballistic missiles, it is also a military fact that the B70 bomber had a very necessary place in our arsenal because of its flexibility. Another example is our parsimonious development of an anti-missile missile which would be so vital to our defense against a hostile intercontinental ballistic missile attack.

Every time members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services have insisted on these projects, the response of the Department of Defense has been that the United States does not have even the financial resources available to provide our ground forces with modernized weapons. In reality, the money that has not been available for maintaining adequate ground forces and obtaining essential weapons has been devoted to foreign aid.

The inevitable conclusions one must draw from these facts is that foreign aid has actually prevented the United States from building up the armed forces and acquiring weapons which are absolutely essential for the survival of the United States and the free world.

Also, running directly against our military strength is the military and economic aid we have given our non-allies. Millions of dollars have been given to aid countries such as Yugoslavia and Egypt. This aid could certainly come back to haunt us much as the scrap metal we gave Japan before the Second World War.

Foreign aid programs do not strengthen the international position of the United States. On the contrary, they present the United States to the world as a bewildered nation which labors under the delusion that it can buy friends and purchase peace with dollars. They present the United States to the world as an intermeddler constantly disrupting the internal affairs of other nations.

Additionally, foreign aid has operated as an inadequate substitute for wise diplomacy and sound foreign policy. Instead of engaging in creative diplomacy, the State Department has too often accepted the foreign aid program as a panacea for all of our diplomatic ills. Instead of engaging in constructive foreign policy decisions, we have merely given money away. Our philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson recognized the universally mistrusted position of a giver when he said, "we do not quite forgive a giver."

Even the very purpose of building up the free world is undermined by our insistence to aid neutral and communist countries in the world. Any aid which has to be administered to the communist governments of the world does not strengthen the Free World. It does not hold a promise of freedom to the people who are subjected to the rule of these communist governments. I am sure many shrewd governments have rightly summarized our position as being one of a bewildered nation, suffering from the delusion that it can buy friends and purchase peace with dollars and these governments have not hesitated to take advantage of our bewilderment.

Have we strengthened our position internationally with foreign aid when we have collaborated in administering foreign aid with dictatorial governments and with governments which were extremely unpopular with their own people? The people of these countries have identified our nation as being an abettor and aider of their dictatorial or unpopular governments, and, as a result, we have earned the hatred of many of the peoples of the earth. We have been pictured as being against progress and on the side of the oppressor. All too often, our foreign aid has been given for the purpose of perpetuating governments such as the Batista regime in Cuba.

In many instances, United States aid is subsidizing unprofitable industrial progress, many unpopular governments, and in reality pouring dollars down the drain. Many undeveloped nations, because of America's foreign aid, have failed to initiate programs and policies of land and tax reform in their countries. The self-help ingredient which is vital to the success of our foreign aid program is lacking. Many governments have declined to increase their agricultural production but, instead, have used our foreign aid to build up vast industrial complexes which their economy was not developed enough to support. For example, the Indian government has shown very little interest in increasing its fertilizer industry but a great deal of interest in buying advanced weapons from the Soviet Union and in building an unrealistic heavy industrial empire. Even our free food program does not have the desired effect on governments of undeveloped nations. It enables countries, such as India, to continue to attempt to make their countries into industrial giants by concentrating on heavy industry while their nation's birth rate continuously outpaces their country's food production.

In reality, therefore, Congress is not serving the best interests of the American people when it appropriates money for foreign aid. Also, from a practical standpoint our aid policy is not having its intended effect on foreign countries. If we are to continue these programs, the number of foreign aid recipients should be reduced to those five or six countries whose stability is most directly related to America's own interest. At least, we would not be subsidizing those countries which give no support to our struggle to defend the Free World.

---

## HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT CRISIS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, I have received much correspondence and personal visits from constituents who are affected by the lack of adequate funds for home mortgages and they include homebuilders, householders, and other businesses that are directly affected by the housing market.

New housing starts in Louisville and Jefferson County, in Lexington and in Paducah, and other communities, are currently, in some cases, as much as 50 percent below the number of new construction starts of last year. I note with interest that the Senate Housing Subcommittee yesterday approved a bill that would allow the Federal National Mortgage Association to inject $2 billion or more into the current housing market which is so sorely short of cash. This bill would authorize Fannie Mae to increase its own borrowing ratio from 10 to 1 to 15 to 1; secondly, it would authorize Fannie Mae a new $1 billion fund for direct purchases of Government-insured mortgages of less than $15,000 each.

I am a cosponsor of S. 3482, introduced by Senators TOWER and BENNETT on June 8, which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe to an additional $110 million of preferred stock of the Fannie Mae and, thus, with a 10-to-1 borrowing ratio, provide $1.1 billion of additional borrowing authority to the agency.

I believe this bill is more fiscally responsible that the approach taken by the subcommitte yesterday in increasing the borrowing ratio from 10 to 1 to 15 to 1. I am concerned that such an approach might weaken Fannie Mae's basic credit by reducing proportionately the equity supporting its debt position. At the present time, there is a 10-percent equity supporting its debt. Under this bill, on a 15-to-1 borrowing ratio, the equity ratio would be reduced to 6⅔ percent. It is understandable that the administration favors the subcommittee bill since an increase in the borrowing ratio would not have an adverse effect on the administrative budget.

As I stated, I would prefer the approach contained in S. 3482. However, I think it extremely important that a bill be reported from the committee and come before the Senate and I shall support the bill as reported by the sub-

committee should the full committee take action on it.

## TRIBUTE TO CHARLES S. MURPHY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Saturday marks the anniversary of 30 years of dedicated service to the Federal Government by a man who has served in positions of distinction and responsibility under three different Presidents and who served the Members of this body for many years in the Office of Legislative Counsel.

It is with pride and admiration that I salute today the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, now Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this remarkable public servant.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a biographical sketch listing the many achievements and distinctions attained by Mr. Murphy over the years.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman, Charles S. Murphy, completes 30 years' service in the Federal Government this July 31. His career includes statutory appointments by two Presidents and service as Administrative Assistant and Special Counsel to a third President.

President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed Mr. Murphy to the CAB on June 1, 1965. Prior to this he had served as Under Secretary of Agriculture for more than four years, this appointment having been made by the late President John F. Kennedy shortly after his inauguration.

In 1947, after many years service in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate, Mr. Murphy became Administrative Assistant to President Harry S. Truman, and in 1950 was advanced to the position of Special Counsel to the President.

Following graduation from Duke University's School of Law in 1934, he received an appointment as law assistant in the office of the Senate Legislative Counsel. He served in this post two years when he was selected as Assistant Legislative Counsel to the Senate, a position held 11 years. As a legislative draftsman he worked with members of both the Senate and House of Representatives in writing numerous pieces of legislation, including the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Many of its provisions have been carried forward into the Federal Aviation Act which today governs aviation in the United States and which Mr. Murphy, as CAB Chairman, now helps administer.

It was while on the Senate staff, that Mr. Murphy was selected by President Truman to serve as Administrative Assistant and later Special Counsel in the White House.

From 1953 to 1961, Mr. Murphy practiced law as a member of the Washington, D.C., firm of Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams. From 1957–60, he was counsel to the Democratic National Advisory Council.

President Kennedy, immediately after his inauguration January 20, 1961, selected Mr. Murphy as Under Secretary of Agriculture.

As Under Secretary of Agriculture from 1961–1965, a period when the Department made its greatest strides in efficiency and effectiveness, Mr. Murphy had general supervisory responsibility for all USDA agencies and for the administration of its many widespread programs. He coordinated and reviewed the Department's staff work on many pieces of major legislation. The measures enacted stamp this half decade in the Agriculture Department as one of the most progressive in American history. As President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, he had special responsibility for supervising the commodity programs that broke the back of the mountainous feed grain and wheat surpluses. He successfully represented the United States in international discussions on foreign agricultural trade. These discussions played an important part in raising U.S. farm exports to record highs.

Mr. Murphy was sworn in by President Johnson as a CAB Member and Board Chairman June 1, 1965. The term ends December 31, 1968.

From 1956 to 1958 Mr. Murphy was President of the National Capital Democratic Club. He belongs to the Order of the Coif, Delta Sigma Phi, Pi Gamma Mu, and Omicron Delta Kappa. He was admitted to the North Carolina Bar in 1934, the Supreme Court Bar in 1944 and the District of Columbia Bar in 1947.

Mr. Murphy is a member of the American Bar Association, the North Carolina Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association and the District of Columbia Bar Association. Married to the former Kate Chestney Graham of Durham, they have three children. A daughter, Courtenay, is married to Whitney Slater. A son, Westbrook, a 1965 graduate of Yale University School of Law, is a career government employee in the Justice Department. Another daughter, Betty, lives with her parents in Washington, D.C., and will graduate from high school this June.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, many Members of this body will recall Mr. Murphy when he was in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the U.S. Senate. Those who did not know him then may perhaps remember him when he served as administrative assistant and finally special counsel to President Truman. Others will recall Mr. Murphy for his distinguished service as Under Secretary of Agriculture for President Kennedy.

My associations with Mr. Murphy go back through virtually his total period of service to the United States. His record in all his different positions in the past is one of which he can justly be proud. As chairman of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, I can personally state that his performance as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board has met with praise from the airlines which are regulated by the Board and from communities and traveling citizens who must look to the Board to assure them safe and adequate air transportation.

The U.S. Government is the better for having had a man like Charlie Murphy serve it these many years. He deserves our tribute, our thanks, and our admiration. I only hope that he will continue to serve for many more years to come.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Saturday, July 30, marks the occasion of the 30th anniversary of Charles S. Murphy's distinguished, effective, and dedicated career in the Federal service.

Charlie Murphy believes strongly that no career is available today that allows a man to contribute more that is socially significant to the orderly growth of our Nation and the betterment of our people than a career in the Federal service.

Charlie Murphy has made tremendous contributions to the betterment of this country in the 30 years he has been in the Federal service.

All of us in Congress recognize Charlie's contributions to both the legislative and executive branches of our Government.

It is difficult to highlight the high point in Charlie Murphy's career. As a legislative draftsman, he assisted both the Senate and House of Representatives in writing numerous pieces of legislation, including the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Many of its provisions have been carried forward in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, which today governs aviation in the United States and which Charlie Murphy, as Civil Aeronautics Board Chairman, now helps administer.

Charlie Murphy has been a distinguished counselor to President Truman. He has been Under Secretary of Agriculture during the period when that Department made its greatest strides in efficiency and effectiveness.

At present, as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, he is guiding the fastest-growing segment of our national economy, the airline industry.

During his 30 years in the Federal service, Charlie Murphy has contributed much to the orderly growth of our Nation and the betterment of its people. He certainly deserves recognition as an outstanding career government employee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, on Saturday, July 30, Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, will complete 30 years of outstanding service with the Federal Government.

Charlie Murphy is recognized throughout the Government as one of our most dedicated and able public servants.

In this connection there appeared in the June 1966 issue of the Duke University Alumni Register an article on Charlie Murphy and his career in the service of his Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "He Keeps Watch Over Our Civil Aviation," appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

Charles S. Murphy '31, LLB '34, believes that no career is more fulfilling than one in the federal government. Since June 1, 1965, Mr. Murphy has been chairman of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, an organization responsible for the promotion and regulation of commercial aviation. However, his government career spans almost thirty years and includes statutory appointments by two Presidents as well as service in the White House as administrative assistant and later special counsel to a third President.

"It's true that rewards are not always monetary," Chairman Murphy says, "and no career is available today that allows a man to contribute more that is socially significant to the orderly growth of our nation and the betterment of our people than the federal service."

Mr. Murphy worked as a postal clerk while attending Duke. His first government position after graduation from the School of Law was legislative counsel. Within two years he became assistant legislative counsel to

the Senate. As a legislative draftsman Mr. Murphy worked with members of both the Senate and House of Representatives in writing numerous pieces of important legislation, including the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. Many of its provisions have been carried forward into the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which today governs aviation in the United States and which Mr. Murphy, as CAB chairman, now helps administer.

While on the Senate staff President Harry S. Truman selected Mr. Murphy as his administrative assistant, and three years later the nation's chief executive selected his aid to be special counsel in the White House.

In a recent address to Duke's School of Law, Mr. Murphy remarked: "Work at the White House level is exciting, demanding, and consuming—perhaps a little like living in the eye of a hurricane." But in a few brief moments with him you quickly realize that he considers this period in his life as his career highlight.

When President Truman left the White House, Mr. Murphy started to practice law. At the age of forty-three he joined the law firm of Morison, Murphy, Clapp and Abrams, but there was litle question that he would exchange his shingle for a federal government position at some later date. That date arrived eight years later when President John F. Kennedy appointed him under secretary of agriculture.

"The Department of Agriculture," Mr. Murphy says, "is one of the finest—and one of the least understood—institutions in the world. The volume of business annually done by this department is greater than the gross volume of the entire air transportation industry."

As under secretary of agriculture from 1961 to 1965, a period when the department made its greatest strides in efficiency and effectiveness, Mr. Murphy had general supervisory responsibility for all USDA agencies and for the administration of its many programs. He coordinated and reviewed the department's staff work on many pieces of major legislation. The measures enacted stamp this half decade in the Agriculture Department as one of the most progressive in American history. As president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, he had special responsibility for supervising the commodity programs that broke the back of the mountainous feed grain and wheat surpluses. He successfully represented the United States in international discussions on foreign agricultural trade. These discussions played an important part in raising U.S. farm exports to record highs.

Just about a year ago President Lyndon B. Johnson summoned Mr. Murphy to the White House and announced in a nationwide news conference that he was selecting the North Carolinian to be chairman of the CAB. In the specialized field of aeronautics Chairman Murphy now is an important cog in the machinery that is shaping the fastest growing form of transportation.

His activities as board chairman directly affect the lives of all Americans, for civil aviation today is a vital part of our national and international trade and travel, and is equally vital as a logistics backup for our military services in times of emergency or war.

University and college graduates have many more job opportunities than Mr. Murphy had in 1934 when he completed law school; Mr. Murphy makes it clear, however, that he would choose a government career again today. Enthusiastically he'll tell you: "Government service offers a lot more living in one lifetime—it's harder work, better work, and more interesting work—there's less money, but enough to live on—there's more frustration and more satisfaction—there's more criticism but greater accomplishments."

Mr. Murphy is a member of the American Bar Association, the North Carolina Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, and the District of Columbia Bar Association. He and his wife, the former Kate Chestney Graham of Durham, have three children. A daughter Courtenay is married to Whitney Slater. A son Westbrook, a 1965 graduate of Yale University School of Law, is following his father's footsteps and advice by becoming a career government employee in the Justice Department. Another daughter, Betty, lives with her parents in Washington, D.C., and graduated from high school this June.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very happy to associate myself with the tributes being paid today to my very good friend, Charles S. Murphy. I recall that Charles Murphy worked with us here for several years ably and quietly drafting and interpreting legislative proposals in very many key areas of public policy.

I recall when, in 1961, Charlie Murphy was appointed Under Secretary of Agriculture. He came to the Department at a time when American agriculture was under the cloud of many burdensome surpluses, and when some fresh viewpoints and approaches were needed.

Charlie Murphy's earlier experience in drafting agricultural legislation stood him and stood us all in good stead during his 4 years in the Department. Secretary Orville Freeman has repeatedly expressed his appreciation for the wise and loyal counsel of his Under Secretary, Charles Murphy. Also, it is no secret to any of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that Charlie Murphy's discerning and reconciling mind and hand were to be found in the constructive legislation enacted by the Congress during that time.

Within the Department, his interest in all its many programs was unlimited. Charlie Murphy brought a wholesome and forthright candor to the reexamination of agricultural policy alternatives. Concerned with and responsible though he was for the oversight of Commodity Credit Corporation activities, he did not permit the immensity of this task to get in the way of attending to the needs of agricultural research and extension, of putting the facts gathered by the economists and statisticians to better use, and of doing all he could to strengthen the Department's programs in forestry, conservation, marketing, and rural improvement.

As the nature of his office implied, Charlie Murphy became the general program manager of the Department. I did not always agree with him, but I and my distinguished colleagues on the committee could always rely on him to present to us the relevant facts in a constructive way. I have always felt that Charlie Murphy was—and is—a public servant's public servant—in its best and most practical sense. Agriculture's loss was aviation's gain. I send him an affectionate salute today.

---

## RESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to discuss what I consider a pressing and important domestic issue. This issue was highlighted today by the release of the 1965 Uniform Crime Reports by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

It is an issue, and therefore a problem that leaves me deeply troubled, as I am convinced it troubles many Americans. I think it deserves the serious and concentrated consideration of this body.

To do so we must temporarily turn our eyes and our thoughts away from Vietnam. A nation engaged in conflict with foreign enemies is understandably concerned with dangers from outside our system. However, I am afraid that in our preoccupation with the international scene we are guilty of overlooking a potentially equal danger to our system of government, residing within our own shores.

I speak of the ominous increase of crime in the United States and the concurrent decrease in respect for law and order.

Certainly no one has denied that crime is a problem; but I believe that what we have failed to do is to comprehend the size of the problem, the responsibility for the problem, and possible solutions to the problem. The time to do this is now. Lawlessness acts as a cancer in a system which was founded upon the constitutional principles of the sanctity of the law and freedom under the law. The growth of this disease, therefore, must be stopped before it multiplies throughout our social structure, ultimately bringing down the system itself.

How serious this is and how fast the rate of crime is growing can be illustrated by the following figures:

More than 2,780,000 serious crimes were reported during 1965; a 6-percent increase over 1964. There were 14 victims of serious crime per 1,000 inhabitants in 1965; an increase of 5 percent over 1964 and 35 percent over 1960. There were more than 5,600 murders; 34,700 aggravated assaults with a gun; and over 68,400 armed robberies in 1965. There were 118,900 robberies; 1,173,000 burglaries; 2,500,000 larcenies; and 486,600 auto thefts which resulted in total property stolen in excess of $1 billion.

I should like to point out to Senators that the problem is not limited to any particular geographical region, nor to the large urban areas, although they remain the largest contributor to the crime rate. When viewed geographically, all regions experienced crime increases in 1965 with a rise of 10 percent in the Western States, 8 percent in the Northeastern States, and 4 percent in the North Central and Southern States. All city population groups had increases in 1965, led by a 7-percent rise in the group of cities having less than 50,000 inhabitants. The group with 500,000 or more population showed a 4-percent upward trend. City groups in the intermediate population range from 50,000 to 500,000 had increases from 4 to 6 percent. Suburban areas having an 8-percent rise again had a sharper percentage increase in the volume of crime than cities over 250,000 population, which were up 4 percent as a group and rural areas which were up 3 percent.

But the statistics themselves fail to tell the brutality or the horror of the

crimes involved. Eight nurses killed in a Chicago dormitory. A U.S. Congressman working late in his congressional office is stabbed and robbed. An Army Reservist from Washington murdered while driving through a Southern State. A Los Angeles delivery man killed while making his rounds. A Washington woman kneeling in prayer raped in her church.

These are not pretty stories nor encouraging statistics. They reflect, nevertheless, the challenge of our times and we must be equal to it. As the elected leaders of the Nation we are commissioned by the people to protect their rights—one of the most sacred of which has always been the security of the individual and his property. We should all remind ourselves that one of the very purposes of organizing our system of Government and writing our great Constitution was set out by our constitutional fathers as being "to insure domestic tranquillity." When we have a situation in which law-abiding citizens are unsafe in their homes and businesses and are denied the privilege of using public streets and parks for fear of their personal safety, we are neglecting these rights.

In searching for the answer it may be necessary to question some accepted procedures and step on the toes of heretofore "sacred cows." But our overriding obligation is to all men, and not some men; it is to the preservation of an orderly society, not a favored one. This objective can be obtained only by applying the law equally to all individuals and all groups.

In the course of my remarks I intend to comment upon what I consider the laxness of an institution of our society, the shortsighted tactics of a group of Americans, and the dubious policies of a branch of our Government. I do so not because I consider myself an oracle of wisdom on these subjects but because I believe many thinking Americans question the direction in which our country is moving. Therefore, I think it is incumbent upon us to speak out in their behalf for surely history will as harshly judge those who remain silent in the face of this trend as those who acted, even if incorrectly.

I do not say that these are the only reasons for the increase in crime. I do say, however, that they substantially contribute to it and that we must make corrections in these areas if we are to reverse this trend.

Mr. President, before I turn to what I consider some of the inbred weaknesses in our war against crime let me dwell briefly on the principles of government and society that serve as a foundation for this inquiry into our system of law.

The basic conflict lies between balancing the safety of society against the rights of the individual. In other words, the mission of a government under a democracy is to protect the life and property of the citizenry while preserving the peace of the community and at the same time insure the basic rights of all individuals who are separate members of that community.

The cornerstone of such an orderly arrangement must be the law, for without the law there can be no order. Such law, or laws, must be clear to everyone and justly drawn for everyone if we expect everyone to live underneath them. In addition, all laws must be enforced for and against everyone.

This function, enforcing the law, can be fulfilled in two ways: It can be done through gaining public support for compliance with the law by promoting a public willingness to cooperate and conform by choice. Or, when this fails, it can be fulfilled by direct police action.

Against this background, then, we must view our present-day situation and determine why a system of maintaining law and order which has worked for almost 200 years in this country—and many decades before that in our Western civilization—is rapidly falling apart.

Let us look first to something most of us would rather dismiss and yet we cannot overlook. That most basic and most important of all institutions—the family. As I will point out later, it is more the victim than the cause of our problem; and, yet, in the final analysis, it is the solution of the predicament in which we find ourselves.

It is here that the first corrective steps must be taken for it is here that the seeds of lawlessness are often born.

The result is obvious to all who read the newspapers. Gangs, many of which are no longer juvenile in any sense but their behavior, engage in a gunfight in a Washington suburb; students whose principal cause is the freedom to use a four-letter word demonstrate and disrupt one of our leading universities; teachers live in fear of their high-school students; and youngsters of 10 and under loot and participate in a riot.

Are these isolated instances? I think not. Not unless these statistics could be called isolated: One out of every nine juveniles will find himself in court before he reaches the age of 18; in suburbia, the fastest growing segment of our population, 54 percent of all those arrested for serious crimes are under 18; and, as an indication of our lack of progress in this field, arrests of persons under 18 for serious crimes increased 47 percent in 1965 over 1960. The increase in this age group, populationwise for the same period, was only 17 percent.

Unfortunately, there will be no reversal in this trend until we realize that rules that are broken as a child become laws that are broken as an adult. Until that time we will find that small offenses uncorrected in the home lead to much larger offenses and, ultimately, to the commission of a serious crime.

As soon as the American people can tear themselves away from the pursuit of the almighty dollar, the press of business and community affairs, the social whirl and their self-centered entertainment and return to the basic fundamentals of family life, the devotion of time to raising their children in an atmosphere of love and understanding while instilling in them the responsibility and respect for the rights of others, they will reverse this trend—but not until then.

All children need a framework of rules backed by discipline under which to live. Without these they will meander in their own way, pampered and indulged, not knowing how far they can or should go, not prepared for life in an orderly society, expecting the privileges of that society but unwilling and unprepared to shoulder the responsibilities expected of them.

Mr. President, I realize that this is a condemnation of the Nation itself, but somewhere along the line, as a nation, we have failed in the raising of our future generation. We are paying for it in the sense that we stand on the threshold of having produced a generation which includes an element composed of rebellious, lawless, hostile youths who have no respect for themselves nor for us. This disrespect has carried through in a chain reaction to disrespect for policemen and for the law generally.

They have adopted the policy that they are above the law and that no one can touch them. As I have indicated, certainly some of this can be explained on sociological grounds. I would not deny that deprivation, poverty, lack of education, and lack of understanding contribute significantly to our troubled teenage society. But I also believe that these same reasons are as often as not used as excuses and that the statement "I am misunderstood and disadvantaged" is simply becoming the juvenile equivalent of the fifth amendment plea.

And yet, in a larger sense, it is possible to understand why they could adopt such a philosophy toward the law. They are, as I indicated earlier, as much the result of lawlessness as they are the cause. I say this because in their eyes we have failed to uphold the law when their elders are involved and, in fact, we have weakened the ability of the law enforcement agencies to perform their duty.

I am afraid that by failing to crack down on violators in the past, society has given the impression to its citizens and in particular its young citizens that there is a "right" to break the law. Of course, no such right exists. There can be no law to which obedience is optional.

To illustrate our failure of responsibility in this field I need only point to what has happened in the past few weeks. This Nation has been racked by riots in several of our larger cities. Night after night, people were murdered, stores were looted, and buildings were burned in a situation that bordered on anarchy.

It has been a black mark on our Nation's history. Several of us in Congress have criticized these happenings, as well we should, for certainly everyone agrees that there can be no justification for violent disobedience under our constitutional system. Those responsible for the killings, for the burnings, and for the lootings are criminals and should be prosecuted accordingly. Heat, deprivation, frustration, and all the other excuses and rationalizations cannot and should not be used to justify their behavior. When we have clearcut violations of the law, we must prosecute those responsible if for no other reason than to make it abundantly clear that we are

a Nation of laws and not of men. Only when we make a forthright stand behind our laws will we prove to others who may follow that they cannot take the law into their own hands and let them know that we will not tolerate lawlessness and insurrection under the guise of demonstrations.

I believe, however, that in seeking out the catalyst for these riots we should go back even further—back to the immediate predecessor of violent disobedience, the philosophy of nonviolent disobedience or more commonly called civil disobedience.

Mr. President, I have no intention of slandering the civil rights movement. It has performed a needed service to this country. Nor can anyone say that I am an opponent of the civil rights cause or a bigot. I stand before this body as one who supported both the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Nevertheless, I feel it is necessary to speak out against one of their chief weapons because civil rights leaders in pursuit of worthy aims have perhaps unwittingly bred disrespect for the law and must assume the responsibility for it.

In this respect, I add that I am not speaking alone to those leaders closely associated with the so-called black power movement. For to these latter individuals I think it should be made crystal clear to them that I despise and reject their philosophy. In the context that it has been used, the cause that they proclaim does not fly the flag of equality but rather the banner of racism and their activities threaten to set back the civil rights movement rather than advance it. This Nation is devoted to freedom under the law, not to anarchy. Whether the tactics be advocated by demagogs in the civil rights movement or white supremists in the South, the ends of neither group justify the means that they employ.

I do speak, however, to those rational leaders of the civil rights cause who have led it for many years but who now find themselves, like the leaders of the French Revolution, in danger of being devoured by the very movement that they created.

If we are to return to an orderly, civilized society, we must go back to the law—imperfect though it may be. The law must be returned to its position where it is respected and obeyed.

The theory of obeying only the laws a person likes is a dangerous doctrine in a civilized society. At best, it is an imperfect and secondary method for obtaining changes in the law under a system which more than any other in the world provides for orderly change. At its worst, it encourages other groups with less noble purposes to adopt this policy for their own ends and leads the uninformed to believe that this is not only an acceptable way to secure changes in our laws but also the most desirable. As Thomas Paine said in "The Rights of Man":

> It is better to obey a bad law, making use at the same time of every argument to show its errors and procure its repeal, than forcibly to violate it; because the precedent of breaking a bad law might weaken the force, and lead to discretionary violation, of those which are good.

Let me make it clear that I am not advocating the elimination of the right to dissent. This freedom, by implication, is deeply imbedded in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and it is a valued part of democracy. Peaceful picketing and even peaceful demonstrations are a proper way for free citizens to express their attitudes.

Civil disobedience and the willful violation of the law is another matter. This tactic, as utilized by many of our present-day civil rights leaders, has done more harm to the cause of democracy than it has good. By instilling in the populace the idea that there is an absolute "right" to break the law unless demands are met immediately is dangerous. Aside from the fact that the cry for immediacy is often the cry for impossibility, by insisting on this so-called right they have left the impression, not only among their followers, but with many leaderless groups in other areas of the United States that there is an inherent right to express dissatisfaction by physical means.

It is little wonder, then, that the right to demonstrate and break the law has now been interpreted as the right to riot.

In a sense, we are reaping the bitter harvest from the seeds we have sown these past few years. We stand now on the bridge of mobocracy that separates democracy from anarchy. Mr. President, it is not too late for the civil rights leaders to take their cause back to the arena in which they gained their greatest triumph—the courtroom. This should be done not only because more lasting results will flow from settling their grievances in the court and not in the street, but because, if we are to reverse this trend, we must reestablish the sanctity of two cardinal principles of constitutional government—the respect for law and order and the recourse to orderly process of law to seek redress of any wrongs.

Finally, I would like to comment upon the activities of the judicial branch and some of their decisions in another area that affects our rising crime rate. In recent years we have witnessed many historic opinions which have strengthened significantly the rights of the accused persons. They have also rendered the task of law enforcement more difficult.

I speak in particular of the decisions by the Supreme Court in Escobedo against Illinois and Miranda against Arizona. These rulings have drastically limited police investigative powers and have forbidden the use of voluntary confessions by the accused in many instances. These rulings were received with dismay by many citizens across the land. One segment of society—the criminals—received them with joy.

Basically, the Miranda decision set forth the following points: Henceforth, once the police have taken a suspect into custody, they cannot lawfully ask him any questions unless four warnings have been given.

First. The suspect must be plainly advised that he need not make any statement.

Second. He must be informed that anything he says may be used against him in a trial.

Third. He must be told that he has a right to have an attorney present throughout the questioning.

Fourth. If the suspect is an indigent, he must be assured that he will be furnished a lawyer free of charge. Unless all of these conditions are met, no confession or other evidence obtained during an interrogation can be used against the suspect.

Many legal minds challenge the correctness of this opinion. In fact, four members of the Court itself dissented from the majority. Some say that the majority will be proven correct and that these decisions, in the perspective of history, will be viewed as significant milestones in our legal heritage.

Viewed in the climate of today's rising crime rate, however, I think it is clear that in attempting to protect the rights of the individual we have sacrificed the rights of society and have placed additional shackles on the ability of the police to perform their duty.

I am particularly disturbed because under the guidelines now controlling the interrogation process—that part of police procedure responsible for 80 percent of the crimes now solved—it will be almost impossible for our law enforcement officials to obtain convictions in the most vicious types of crimes—crimes such as murder and murder accompanied by rape and yokings on a lonely street. With no witnesses and without a confession the obstacles facing the police are staggering.

As Justice White pointed out in his dissent in Miranda:

> There is, in my view, every reason to believe that a good many criminal defendants, who otherwise would have been convicted on what this Court has previously thought to be the most satisfactory kind of evidence, will now, under this new version of the Fifth Amendment, either not be tried at all or acquitted if the State's evidence, minus the confession, is put to the test of litigation.
>
> I have no desire whatsoever to share the responsibility for any such impact on the present criminal process.

I share his view.

Mr. President, one could go on for some length on the questionable aspects of the Court's decisions in recent years and their effect on society. Suffice it to say, however, that I believe there is a direct correlation between them and the rise of crime in this country.

I was happy to see, therefore, that recently the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary has begun hearings on the impact of the Miranda. Something must be done to restore a sense of balance in this area. The pendulum has swung too far and the rights of law-bidding citizens, the potential victims in the crime wave, have been subordinated in our efforts to strengthen the rights of the accused.

It could be that Congress will be forced to consider legislation amending the Constitution in this area. I say "forced" because I think we should approach with caution attempts to amend the Bill of Rights, and I therefore hope

that this matter is pursued only after the most careful consideration. But when unrealistic decisions by the Court leave us no other alternative to protect the people, we must examine this method.

In the meantime, there are steps Congress can take in a positive effort to aid our law enforcement officials. The Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 should be only the beginning.

We must upgrade both the caliber of men on our police forces and the weapons that they have available. This will entail increasing the average salaries so that we can attract more and better men. It will entail more money to supply them with updated weapons such as helicopters and computers. But when we consider that the annual cost of crime in America has been estimated by J. Edgar Hoover as over $20 billion a year, can we do less?

In the long run, however, even these steps will not insure victory, although they may enable the forces of justice to stay even in the race with organized and unorganized crime. If we are to win, we must have the help of the parents, the civil rights leaders, the churches, and the courts. Without their assistance, delinquency, disobedience, mobocracy, and judicial experimentation will become the modern four horsemen of crime, sweeping across the Nation and destroying everything in their path.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to quote Abraham Lincoln on the subject of law. With the eloquence and the wisdom so closely associated with him, he put his finger on the problem with these words:

> Let every American, ever lover of liberty, every well-wisher to his prosperity, swear by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country. . . . Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the character of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in Almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the *political religion* of the nation; and let the old and young, rich and poor, the grave and gay, of all sexes, tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

## EFFECT OF FOREIGN AID ON FEDERAL PROJECTS IN ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during the debate on the foreign aid bills, I mentioned the effects which the war in Vietnam and foreign aid are having upon the domestic programs. I called attention to the fact that the budget for fiscal year 1967 requested only enough funds to operate the Greers Ferry National Fish Hatchery at 14 percent of capacity. This hatchery was dedicated last month and only $141,000 would be required for full operation. The budget requested less than $40,000 and this new facility, so important to the economy of Arkansas, will remain 86-percent idle unless supplemental funds are appropriated, or unless administrative action is taken to reallocate funds presently available.

I have obtained additional information about loans and grants for projects in Arkansas which are under consideration in various agencies of the Federal Government. I do not suggest that the foreign aid bills would adversely affect these pending projects. I am fearful, however, that continued expansion of foreign aid and the war in Vietnam will inevitably reduce the dimension and effectiveness of many domestic programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD communications I have received from the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Army; Housing and Urban Development; Commerce; and the Interior; the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Small Business Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
*Washington, D.C., July 21, 1966.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: The Secretary has asked me to respond to your recent telegram requesting information on applications pending from Arkansas institutions as of June 30, 1966, primarily because of lack of funding. I am enclosing a list of these institutions. I should like to point out, however, that in many cases the requests have merely been deferred until new funds become available in 1967. At that time the applications meetings program requirements will be considered with others of the same type and appropriate action taken.

If you wish any additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES F. KELLY, *Comptroller.*

Enclosure.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

*Applications not approved as of June 30, 1966, primarily due to inability to fund during fiscal year 1966* [1]—*State of Arkansas*

| Institution | Requested | Obligated |
|---|---|---|
| Vocational Education Act of 1963: | | |
| Research: | | |
| University of Arkansas, Fayetteville | $84,714 | $41,457 |
| Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Heights (project is currently under review) | 31,080 | |
| Higher Education Act of 1965: | | |
| Title III: Strengthening developing institutions ($263,375 disapproved for lack of funds) | 456,665 | 193,290 |
| Title VI: Improvement of undergraduate instruction ($55,652 disapproved for lack of funds) | 196,248 | 139,596 |
| Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963: | | |
| Title III: Loans ($795,000 deferred until fiscal year 1967 because lack of funds) | 4,144,000 | 3,349,000 |
| Total | 4,912,707 | 3,723,343 |
| Difference | | 1,189,364 |

[1] Inability to fund in 1 year does not necessarily mean disapproval of the project. In most instances, the project is reconsidered in the next fiscal year when new funds become available.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

*Applications not approved as of June 30, 1966, primarily due to inability to fund during fiscal year 1966* [1]

STATE OF ARKANSAS

| *Institution* | *Amount* |
|---|---|
| Research grants: | |
| University of Arkansas (both Fayetteville and Little Rock) | $87,562 |
| University of Arkansas School of Medicine and Medical Center, Little Rock | 208,602 |
| Total, training grants | 78,728 |
| Little Rock University, Little Rock | 14,767 |
| Total, research grants | 310,931 |
| Training grants: | |
| University of Arkansas Medical Center, Little Rock | 47,272 |
| University of Arkansas School of Medicine, Little Rock (requested $105,500 reduction to $74,044) | 31,456 |
| Project grants: Arkansas Rehabilitation and Research Training Center, Hot Springs | 8,975 |
| Total | 398,634 |

[1] Inability to fund in one year does not necessarily mean disapproval of the project. In most instances, the project is reconsidered in the next fiscal year when new funds become available.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
*Washington, D.C., July 19, 1966.*

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Your telegram of 15 July requested a listing of Corps of Engineers projects in Arkansas which could be accelerated in Fiscal Year 1967 if sufficient funds were to be appropriated.

The inclosed table furnishes data on Corps of Engineers Civil Works projects in Arkansas which could be started or on which construction could be accelerated in Fiscal Year 1967 if sufficient funds were appropriated. For each project, these data include name, purpose, location by county, funds needed to complete, funds included in the Fiscal Year 1967 budget and the total capability for Fiscal Year 1967.

The capability indicated for each project is from the strictly engineering standpoint, considering each project by itself without reference to our overall program, our overall capability or fiscal considerations.

I trust this information will serve your present needs.

Sincerely yours,
ALFRED B. FITT,
*Special Assistant (Civil Functions).*

1 incl. (in dupe).

*Civil works projects in Arkansas*

| Project | Location (counties) | Amount needed to complete | Total capability, fiscal year 1967 [1] | Amount in fiscal year 1967 budget |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PLANNING PROJECTS | | | | |
| Flood control: | | | | |
| Little Rock levees | Pulaski | $363,000 | $31,000 | 0 |
| Pine Mountain Reservoir | Crawford | 10,000,000 | 200,000 | $75,000 |
| Village Creek, Jackson and Lawrence Counties | Jackson and Lawrence | 1,968,000 | 205,000 | 0 |
| Subtotal, planning | | 12,331,000 | 436,000 | 75,000 |
| CONSTRUCTION | | | | |
| Navigation: Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La | Ashley, Bradley, Union, Calhoun, and Ouachita | 77,846,000 | 7,600,000 | 6,500,000 |
| Flood control: | | | | |
| Dierks Reservoir | Sevier and Howard | 10,098,000 | 1,000,000 | 0 |
| Gillham Reservoir | Howard and Polk | 10,791,000 | 2,200,000 | 1,400,000 |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. | Hempstead, Lafayette, and Miller | 5,084,000 | 2,000,000 | 200,000 |
| Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts | Jackson and Woodruff | 920,000 | 620,000 | 0 |
| Multiple purpose including power: DeGray Reservoir | Hot Spring and Clark | 35,195,000 | 8,700,000 | 8,000,000 |
| Subtotal, construction | | 139,934,000 | 22,120,000 | 16,100,000 |
| FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES | | | | |
| Planning projects: | | | | |
| Cache River | Clay, Craighead, Greene, Jackson, Lawrence, Monroe, Poinsett, Prairie, and Woodruff. | 25,500,000 | 175,000 | 0 |
| Lower White River, Big Creek, and tributaries | Lee, Monroe, Phillips, and St. Francis | 7,810,000 | 50,000 | 0 |
| Lower White River, Clarendon levee | Monroe | 190,000 | 20,000 | 0 |
| Subtotal, planning | | 33,500,000 | 245,000 | 0 |
| Construction projects: | | | | |
| Channel improvement, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Texas. | Chicot, Crittenden, Desha, Lee, Mississippi, and Phillips | 378,838,000 | 39,000,000 | 26,700,000 |
| Lower Arkansas River | Arkansas, Desha, Jefferson, and Lincoln | 3,332,000 | 300,000 | 200,000 |
| Mississippi River levees, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Texas. | Chicot, Crittenden, Desha, Lee, Mississippi, and Phillips | 50,226,000 | 5,180,000 | 3,000,000 |
| St. Francis Basin, Ark. and Mo | Clay, Craighead, Crittenden, Cross, Greene, Lee, Mississippi, Phillips, Poinsett, and St. Francis. | 66,852,000 | 4,800,000 | 3,800,000 |
| Tensas Basin, Ark. and La | Ashley, Chicot, and Desha | 53,869,000 | 2,100,000 | 1,700,000 |
| Subtotal, construction | | 553,117,000 | 51,380,000 | 35,400,000 |
| Grand total | | 738,882,000 | 74,181,000 | 51,575,000 |

[1] From the strictly engineering standpoint, considering each project by itself without reference to our overall project, our overall capability, or fiscal considerations, the amount shown could be utilized for the applicable project in fiscal year 1967.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
*Washington, D.C., July 20, 1966.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Further with regard to your telegram requesting a list of grants and loans pending in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We have now compiled this list and it is enclosed.

It is a pleasure to be of assistance to you. Please let us know whenever we can be of further service.

Sincerely,

SIDNEY SPECTOR,
*Acting Congressional Liaison Officer.*

Enclosure.

*Department of Housing and Urban Development, urban renewal title I grant program—Projects in pipeline as of June 30, 1966, Arkansas*

[Dollars in thousands]

| Locality | Project No. | Type of project | Status of application | Federal funds requested |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Osceola | R-56 | Survey and planning. | In central office | $214 |
| Pine Bluff | R-69 | General neighborhood renewal program. | In regional office | 3,726 |
| Total (2 projects). | | | | 3,940 |

*Department of Housing and Urban Development, open space land and urban beautification grant program—Projects in pipeline as of June 30, 1966, Arkansas*

[Dollars in thousands]

| Project No. | Locality and applicant | Application received | Federal funds requested | Total cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B-1 | Cotter School District No. 60, town of Cotter | June 1966 | $10 | $20 |
| | Total (1 project) | | 10 | 20 |

Purpose: Landscaping.

*Department of Housing and Urban Development, urban planning assistance grant program—Projects in pipeline as of June 30, 1966, Arkansas*

[Dollars in thousands]

| Localities | Project No. | Status | Federal funds requested |
|---|---|---|---|
| Small areas: Fayetteville | P-61 | In central office June 1966 | $32 |
| Redevelopment areas: | | | |
| De Queen | P-59 | In regional office June 1966 | 16 |
| Morrilton and Russellville. | P-60 | In central office May 1966 | 20 |
| Total (3 projects) | | | 68 |

*Department of Housing and Urban Development, Federal Housing Administration—Multifamily project mortgages, projects in pipeline as of June 30, 1966, Arkansas*

[Dollars in thousands]

| Program and locality | Name of project | Number of units | Mortgage amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Applications in process—Sec. 207, rental housing: | | | |
| Little Rock | Summit Avenue Apartments | 14 | $150 |
| North Little Rock | Shorter College Gardens | 150 | 1,618 |
| Total (2 projects) | | | 1,768 |

Commitments outstanding: None.

*Department of Housing and Urban Development—Water and sewer facilities grant program projects in pipeline as of July 7, 1966—Arkansas*

[Dollars in thousands]

| Location | Name of applicant | Type of project | Date of | | | Federal funds requested |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Inquiry | Application | Fund reservation | |
| Total, 24 projects | | | | | | $12,076 |
| North Little Rock | City of North Little Rock | Storm sewer | February 1966 | April 1966 | May 1966 | 916 |
| Do | Rixey Water District | Water storage and transmission | do | | | 18 |
| El Dorado | City of El Dorado | do | January 1966 | April 1966 | | 150 |
| Little Rock | Brodie Creek District | Sanitary sewer | February 1966 | | | 150 |
| Benton | Benton | Water distribution | do | June 1966 | | 224 |
| Hot Springs | Hot Springs Waterworks Commission | Water treatment, transmission and distribution. | do | do | | 1,254 |
| North Little Rock | North Little Rock Sewer Department | Sanitary sewer | do | | | 1,300 |
| Stuttgart | Board of commissioners | Water treatment | do | June 1966 | | 112 |
| Barling | Town of Barling | Sanitary sewer | March 1966 | | | 251 |
| White Hall | City of White Hall | Water treatment and sanitary sewer | do | | | 169 |
| Harrison | City of Harrison | Sanitary sewer | February 1966 | | | 186 |
| Batesville | City of Batesville | Storm sewer | do | | | 1,250 |
| Lavaca | City of Lavaca | Waste treatment | March 1966 | | | 80 |
| Hackett | Hackett-Bonanza Water District | Water storage and distribution | do | | | 159 |
| West Fork | City of West Fork | Waste treatment | do | | | 145 |
| Forrest City | Board of public utilities | do | do | | | 1,130 |
| Batesville | Batesville Sewer Improvement District | do | February 1966 | | | 420 |
| Clarksville | Clarksville | Water distribution and storage | do | | | 124 |
| Russellville | Russellville | Sanitary sewer | April 1966 | | | 94 |
| Van Buren | Dora Rural Water District | Water storage and transmission | March 1966 | | | 60 |
| Wynne | Wynne | Water and sewer | May 1966 | | | 102 |
| Little Rock | Pulaski County | Storm sewers | June 1966 | | | 1,500 |
| Do | do | do | do | | | 959 |
| Do | do | do | do | | | 1,323 |

*HAA-assisted public housing program in the State of Arkansas—Number of units in applications and reservations not under approved preliminary loan or annual contributions contract as of June 30, 1966*

| Locality | Total | Applications in process | Reservations approved | | Total units designed for elderly | Locality | Total | Applications in process | Reservations approved | | Total units designed for elderly |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | PLC not required | PLC required | | | | | PLC not required | PLC required | |
| Total | 1,361 | 1,205 | | 156 | 237 | Magnolia | 70 | | | 70 | 70 |
| | | | | | | Malvern | 125 | 125 | | | 75 |
| Alma | 60 | 60 | | | | Marianna | 124 | 100 | | 24 | 20 |
| Arkadelphia | 16 | | | 16 | 16 | Marked Tree | 50 | 50 | | | |
| Blytheville | 100 | 100 | | | | Marvell | 100 | 100 | | | |
| Caraway | 30 | | | 30 | 20 | Russellville | 60 | 60 | | | |
| Decatur | 150 | 150 | | | | Trumann | 110 | 110 | | | 24 |
| Helena | 150 | 150 | | | | Tyronza | 50 | 50 | | | |
| Hickory Ridge | 16 | | | 16 | 12 | Wynne | 50 | 50 | | | |
| Luxora | 100 | 100 | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Department of Housing and Urban Development, Housing Assistance Administration, Program Planning Division, Statistics Branch, July 18, 1966.

*Department of Housing and Urban Development—Pending projects in the State of Arkansas as of July 8, 1966*

COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM

| City | County | Institution | Project No. | Type | Amount of Federal loan | Estimated total project cost | Scope | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Men | Women |
| Arkadelphia | Clark | Henderson State Teachers College | 82 | Student union | $500,000 | $500,000 | | |
| Do | do | do | 83 | Dormitory | 1,500,000 | 1,500,000 | 400 | |
| Do | do | Ouachita Baptist University | 79 | Dormitory, addition to cafeteria | 100,000 | 100,000 | 169 | 170 |
| Conway | Faulkner | Arkansas State Teachers College | 85 | Dormitory | 2,400,000 | 2,400,000 | 252 | 252 |
| Fayetteville | Washington | University of Arkansas | 80 | Dormitory/dining | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 413 | 409 |
| Little Rock | Pulaski | Philander Smith College | 75 | Dormitory | 572,000 | 572,000 | | 122 |
| Jonesboro | Craighead | Arkansas State College | 77 | Dining hall | 1,576,000 | 1,576,000 | | |
| Total, 7 projects | | | | | 10,648,000 | 10,648,000 | 1,234 | 953 |

PUBLIC FACILITY LOAN PROGRAM

| City | County | Applicant | Project No. | Type | Amount of Federal loan | Estimated total project cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alma | Crawford | City of Alma | 181-220GL | Sewer and water | $574,000 | $2,140,000 |
| Amity | Clark | City of Amity | 188 | Sewer | 148,000 | 165,000 |
| Arkansas City | Desha | City of Arkansas City | 171-208GL | Sewer and water | 168,000 | 336,000 |
| Biggers | Randolph | Town of Biggers | 162-199GL | Water | 53,000 | 105,000 |
| Delaplaine | Greene | Town of Delaplaine | 160-19GL | do | 41,000 | 82,000 |
| Elaine | Phillips | City of Elaine | 140-155GL | do | 29,000 | 57,000 |
| Eureka Springs | Carroll | City of Eureka Springs | 179-219GL | Park, playground, and pool | 977,000 | 1,953,000 |
| Do | do | do | 180 | do | 1,479,000 | 1,479,000 |
| Hartman | Johnson | Town of Hartman | 151-168GL | Water | 33,000 | 65,000 |
| Jasper | Newton | City of Jasper | 158-145GL | Sewer | 50,000 | 143,000 |
| Marianna | Lee | City of Marianna Water Commission | 189-229GL | Water | 398,000 | 926,000 |
| Montrose | Ashley | Town of Montrose | 156-179GL | do | 65,000 | 138,000 |

*Department of Housing and Urban Development—Pending projects in the State of Arkansas as of July 8, 1966*—Continued

PUBLIC FACILITY LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

| City | County | Applicant | Project No. | Type | Amount of Federal loan | Estimated total project cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Norfold | Baxter | Town of Norfold | 168-205GL | Water | $77,000 | $156,000 |
| Ogden | Little River | City of Ogden | 124-115GL | do | 22,000 | 90,000 |
| O'Kean | Randolph | Town of O'Kean | 161-197GL | do | 36,000 | 72,000 |
| Parkdale | Ashley | Town of Parkdale | 187 | Sewer and water | 117,000 | 134,000 |
| Reyno | Randolph | Town of Reyno | 157-163GL | Water | 62,000 | 123,000 |
| Russell | White | Town of Russell | 163-200GL | do | 47,000 | 95,000 |
| Sedgwick | Lawrence | Town of Sedgwick | 170-82GL | do | 44,000 | 86,000 |
| Shirley | Van Buren | Town of Shirley | 164-181GL | do | 41,000 | 80,000 |
| Thornton | Calhoun | City of Thornton | 172-209GL | Sewer and water | 96,000 | 188,000 |
| West Fork | Washington | City of West Fork | 190 | Water | 182,000 | 182,000 |
| Winthrop | Little River | City of Winthrop | 123-118GL | do | 25,000 | 100,000 |
| Total, 23 projects | | | | | 4,764,000 | 8,895,000 |

PUBLIC WORKS PLANNING ADVANCES PROGRAM

| City | County | Project No. | Type | Amount of Federal advance | Estimated total project cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bates | Independence | 3132 | Roads | $27,500 | $3,000,000 |
| Fayetteville | Washington | 3155 | Educational facility | 15,250 | 27,018,000 |
| Little Rock | Pulaski | 3156 | Sewer | 60,000 | 1,964,000 |
| Marshall | Searcy | 3079 | Convalescent home | 4,500 | 310,000 |
| Mulberry | Crawford | 3144 | Streets | 14,500 | 300,000 |
| Quitman | Cleburne | 3093 | Sewer | 3,000 | 160,000 |
| Stephens | Ouachita | 3141 | Water | 9,410 | 195,000 |
| Total, 7 projects | | | | 134,160 | 32,947,000 |

ALL PROGRAMS

| | Number of projects | Amount of | | | Estimated total project cost |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Advance | Loan | Grant | |
| Total | 37 | $134,160 | $15,412,000 | | $52,490,000 |

Senior citizens housing loan program (none).

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D.C., July 18, 1966.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in response to your telegram request of July 15, 1966, for information on Department of Commerce grant and/or loan applications in the State of Arkansas.

The information requested is shown on the attached schedules for the Office of State Technical Services and the Economic Development Administration.

I hope the data will be of assistance to you. If I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE E. IMHOFF,
*Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration.*

Attachments.

---

*U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration pending projects—State of Arkansas, fiscal year 1966—applicant and description*

[Amounts in thousands]

ASHLEY COUNTY

| | *Investment* |
|---|---|
| Ashley County: Public works direct grant for sewer system | $482 |
| City of Crossett: Public works direct grant for street improvement | 147 |
| City of Crossett: Public works supplemental grant for sewerage improvements | 85 |

BAXTER COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Bull Shoals State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 305 |

*U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration pending projects—State of Arkansas, fiscal year 1966—applicant and description*—Continued

[Amounts in thousands]

CHICOT COUNTY

| | *Investment* |
|---|---|
| Lake Chicot State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | $281 |

CLARK COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| City of Arkadelphia: Public works direct grant for water and sewer expansion | 135 |
| Arkansas Children's Colony: Public works direct grant for retarded children facility | 1,092 |
| Forty for the Future: Technical assistance to study tourism/recreation | 133 |

COLUMBIA COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| City of Magnolia: Public works direct grant for water system improvement | 1,004 |
| Strategic Chemical Ext.: Technical assistance to study bromine | 50 |

CONWAY COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Conway County: Public works supplemental grant for 76 bed hospital | 368 |

CRAWFORD COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Mountainburg State Park: Public works direct/supplemental grant for tourism complex | 182 |
| Crawford County Industrial Development Corporation: Public works direct/supplemental grant and loan for facilities to industrial park | 526 |

*U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration pending projects—State of Arkansas, fiscal year 1966—applicant and description*—Continued

[Amounts in thousands]

| | *Investment* |
|---|---|
| City of Alma: Public works supplemental grant and loan for water and sewage facilities | $1,297 |
| Farmers Co-op of Arkansas/Oklahoma: Business loan to establish feed mill and storage plant | 350 |

DESHA COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| City of McGehee: Public works direct grant for streets | 316 |
| City of Dumas: Public works direct grant for streets/drains to industrial park | 17 |
| City of Arkansas City: Public works supplemental grant and loan for water and sewerage facilities | 327 |

FAULKNER COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Arkansas Children's Colony: Public works direct grant for retarded children facility | 1,408 |

FULTON COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Mammoth Springs State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 412 |
| Fulton County Development Corp.: Technical assistance to study Fulton County Industrial Park | 23 |

GREENE COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Crowleys Ridge State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 406 |

*U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration pending projects—State of Arkansas, fiscal year 1966—applicant and description*—Continued

[Amounts in thousands]

HEMPSTEAD COUNTY

| | Investment |
|---|---|
| Southwest Arkansas Water District: Public works direct grant and loan for five-county water line | $9,500 |
| Hempstead County Judge: Technical assistance study of tomato processing | 12 |

HOT SPRINGS COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Lake Catherine State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 256 |
| City of Malvern: Public works supplemental grant for water and sewer systems | 546 |
| City of Perla: Business loan to establish brick manufacturing plant | 650 |

INDEPENDENCE COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Batesville Sewer Commission: Public works supplemental grant for sewage treatment expansion | 157 |

LEE COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| City of Marianna: Public works direct/supplemental grant and loan for water and sewer systems | 1,517 |
| St. Francis State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 1,328 |

LONOKE COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| City of Lonoke: Public works supplemental grant for water and sewer improvement | 213 |
| Lonoke County: Technical assistance study of plastic moulding plant | 2 |

MADISON COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Withrow Spring State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 282 |

MARION COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Bull Shoals Ferry Corp.: Business loan to establish ferry service | 35 |

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Osceola Riverport Authority: Public works direct grant and loan for riverfront to industrial park | 4,500 |
| County of Mississippi: Public works direct grant for water supply and sewage disposal | 43 |
| City of Osceola: Public works direct grant for water system improvement | 329 |
| City of Blythesville: Public works supplemental grant for developing industrial park | 68 |
| City of Osceola: Public works supplemental grant for waste treatment improvement | 159 |
| Osceola Riverport Authority: Public works supplemental grant and loan for sewage treatment plant | 42 |

PERRY COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Perry County Judge: Technical assistance to study industry oriented services | 12 |

PIKE COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Daisy State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 208 |
| Queen Wilhelmina State Park: Public works direct grant for tourism complex | 390 |

SEARCY COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| City of Marshall: Public works direct grant and loan water and sewer extension | 632 |

*U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration pending projects—State of Arkansas, fiscal year 1966—applicant and description*—Continued

[Amounts in thousands]

SHARP COUNTY

| | Investment |
|---|---|
| Sharp County Medical Center: Public works direct grant for clinic building | $17 |

WOODRUFF COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| City of McCrory: Public works direct and supplemental grant for water/sewer/streets/drainage | 77 |

YELL COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Dardanelle Industries: Technical assistance to study city planning | 60 |

NEVADA COUNTY

| | |
|---|---|
| Robbins Products Incorporated: Business loan to establish vinyl floor covering plant | 195 |

BERRYVILLE AREA

| | |
|---|---|
| Eureka Springs: Public works directs grant for tourism complex | 1,479 |

BENTON COUNTY (NONDESIGNATED) AREA

| | |
|---|---|
| Benton and Washington Counties: Technical assistance to study airport | 55 |

STATEWIDE

| | |
|---|---|
| Chamber of Commerce: Technical assistance study of forest related industrial potentials | 49 |

*U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration pending projects—State of Arkansas, fiscal year 1966—applicant and description*—Continued

[Amounts in thousands]

| | Investment |
|---|---|
| Arkansas Geological Commission: Technical assistance feasibility of aeromag map for mineral expansion | $130 |
| Total | 32,289 |

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, D.C., July 15, 1966.*

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have been requested to respond to your telegram of July 15, 1966, regarding grants or loans to Arkansas applicants.

Please find attached a listing of the grants to the State of Arkansas for three years of 1965, 1966 and 1967. With the exception of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, these amounts represent grants to the State.

There is a summary tabulation for Federal Water Pollution Control Administration showing the breakdown insofar as we can comply with the request in your telegram.

If there is any further information needed, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY D. LARSON,
*Director of Budget.*

Enclosures.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

*Federal grants-in-aid and loans to States and State agencies, fiscal years 1965–67—Grant program for Arkansas*

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

| Appropriation and activity | Fiscal year 1965 actual | Fiscal year 1966 estimate | Fiscal year 1967 estimate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Federal aid in fish restoration and management, total | $146,833 | $120,421 | $103,397 |
| Federal aid in wildlife restoration, total | 392,329 | 326,475 | 263,500 |
| National wildlife refuge fund: Payments to counties, total | 78,186 | 61,782 | 80,000 |
| Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife | 617,348 | 508,678 | 446,897 |

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grants-in-aid to States for outdoor recreation projects | | $192,386 | $1,754,882 |

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Annual allotments to State water resources research institutes | $75,000 | $87,500 | $87,500 |
| Matching grants to State water resources research institutes | | | 28,054 |
| Total | 75,000 | 87,500 | 115,554 |

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Water supply and water pollution control: | | | |
| Research grants | $18,000 | $21,173 | $22,661 |
| Fellowship grants | | | |
| Training grants | 22,738 | 28,423 | 33,084 |
| Demonstration grants | | | |
| Grants for State and interstate water pollution control programs | 60,900 | 61,000 | 61,400 |
| Grants for waste treatment works construction and sewer overflow control: | | | |
| Waste treatment works construction | 1,779,500 | 2,045,560 | 2,259,300 |
| Total | 1,881,138 | 2,156,156 | 2,376,445 |

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., July 18, 1966.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: As requested in your telegram of July 15, this is to report that as of June 30, 1966, there were 117 applications for direct home and farmhouse loans under consideration for approval by our Regional Office in Little Rock. These applications aggregated $1,378,100, in terms of the loan amounts requested. Funds for making the loans had been earmarked or reserved in each of the 117 cases.

In addition to the funds so reserved, the Regional Office in Little Rock had an unreserved fund balance of approximately $1.5 million with which to entertain additional loan applications.

As of June 30, 1966, there was one application pending for a housing grant to a paralyzed veteran. The grant applied for amounted to $10,000.

In accordance with telephone advice from Mr. Cash, information concerning names and addresses of direct loan applicants is not being supplied.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,
*Administrator.*

---

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
*Washington, D.C., July 18, 1966.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Administrator McKee has asked me to reply to your telegram requesting a report regarding applications from the State of Arkansas for grants or loans pending with the Federal Aviation Agency as of June 30, 1966.

As of June 30, 1966, there were pending before FAA applications from nine municipalities within the State of Arkansas for grants of funds for airport development under the Federal-aid Airport Program. Grants of Federal funds made pursuant to this Program in the State of Arkansas are matched on a fifty-fifty basis by the local communities.

Set forth below are the municipalities which have applications pending and the amount of Federal funds requested:

| *Location and Federal funds requested* | |
|---|---|
| Alma | $105,000 |
| North Little Rock | 94,500 |
| Marked Tree | 36,750 |
| Hot Springs | 509,250 |
| Little Rock | 1,400,000 |
| Jonesboro | 499,000 |
| Warren | 25,400 |
| DeQueen | 65,000 |
| Waldron | 65,655 |
| Total | 2,650,555 |

We trust the foregoing will furnish you the information you have requested.

Sincerely yours,

COLE MORROW,
*Director, Airports Service.*

---

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D.C., July 15, 1966.*

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Administrator Bernard L. Boutin has asked that I reply to your telegram of July 15, 1966, asking for a list of pending Small Business Administration loan and grant applications for the State of Arkansas.

The attached list is current as of July 15, 1966.

If we can be of further assistance, please let me know.

With very best regards,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. COCHRAN, Jr.,
*Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs.*

Enclosure.

| Name and address of applicant | Amount of loan request | Purpose of loan |
|---|---|---|
| Arkansas School of Business & Training, Inc., Little Rock, Ark | [1] $27,000 | Equipment and debt payment. |
| Buddy's Amoco Station, Rison, Ark | [1] 4,000 | Working capital. |
| Coleman Mobil Station, North Little Rock, Ark | [1] 3,000 | Equipment. |
| Harris Auto & Repairs, Forrest City, Ark | [1] 1,000 | Working capital. |
| C & L Rice Mill, Inc., DeWitt, Ark | [2] 255,000 | Construction and working capital. |
| Chetuck Corp., Jonesboro, Ark | [2] 135,000 | Debt payment. |
| Piggly Wiggly Stores, El Dorado, Ark | [2] 80,000 | Working capital. |
| White Oil Co., Amity, Ark | [2] 40,000 | Construction. |
| Harton Super Market, North Little Rock, Ark | [3] 26,000 | Do. |
| Hurlon Barker Produce, North Little Rock, Ark | [3] 7,500 | Equipment. |
| Willis Barber & Beauty Supply, Little Rock, Ark | [3] 3,000 | Do. |
| Calico Rock Development Corp., Calico Rock, Ark | [4] 112,000 | Construction. |
| Sparkman Development Corp., Sparkman, Ark | [4] 24,000 | Do. |
| Total | 717,500 | |

[1] Direct loan request.
[2] Loan request under loan guarantee program.
[3] Loan request under displaced business loan authority.
[4] Local development company loan request.

NOTE.—All of the above applications are for loans. There are no grants involved.

*Office of Economic Opportunity—Arkansas applications pending as of July 8, 1966*

| Applicant | Project description | Federal funds requested |
|---|---|---|
| Monroe County Community Action Committee, Inc., Clarendon, Ark | Program development | $8,905 |
| Drew County Economic Opportunity Corp., Monticello, Ark | do | 14,765 |
| Lonoke County Action Committee, Cabot, Ark | do | 11,315 |
| Grant County Economic Opportunity Council, Sheridan, Ark | do | 6,844 |
| Arkansas County Economic Development Council, Inc., Dewitt, Ark | do | 17,142 |
| Columbia County Economic Development Council, Inc., Magnolia, Ark | do | 15,490 |
| Van Se Boo M, Harrison, Ark | do | 29,939 |
| Mississippi County Economic Opportunity Commission, Inc., Blytheville, Ark | Conduct and administration | 53,726 |
| Desha County Community Action Committee, Inc., Arkansas City, Ark | Program development | 22,848 |
| Pike County Economic Development Council, Inc., Murfreesboro, Ark | do | 9,991 |
| Leslie Public School, Leslie, Ark | Follow through HS | 5,696 |
| Howard County Economic Opportunity Corp., Nashville, Ark | Program development | 10,720 |
| Woodruff County Economic Opportunity Corp., Augusta, Ark | do | 18,232 |
| Bradley County Community Action Corp., Warren, Ark | do | 18,330 |
| Ashley County Economic Opportunity Corp., Hamburg, Ark | do | 19,668 |
| Craighead County Community Action Agency, Inc., Jonesboro, Ark | do | 20,401 |
| Cleveland County Community Action Agency, Inc., Rison, Ark | do | 14,964 |
| Nevada County Community Action Program, Prescott, Ark | do | 15,933 |
| Sevier County Economic Opportunity Corp., DeQueen, Ark | do | 14,986 |
| Prairie County Community Action Corp., Des Arc, Ark | do | 15,014 |
| Polk County Community Action Agency, Inc., Mena, Ark | do | 14,517 |
| Dallas County Community Action Agency, Inc., Fordyce, Ark | do | 18,278 |
| Montgomery County Community Action Agency, Inc., Mount Ida, Ark | do | 9,453 |
| Leslie Public Schools, Leslie, Ark | Headstart | 20,064 |
| Calhoun County Community Action Program, Hampton, Ark | Program development | 12,496 |
| Poinsett County Community Action Agency, Inc., Harrisburg, Ark | do | 14,501 |
| NC Arkansas Economic Opportunity Action Corp., Batesville, Ark | Conduct and administration | 41,327 |
| Ouachita Area Development Corp., Camden, Ark | Legal aid | 37,344 |
| Council of Economic Opportunity of Hot Springs and Garland County, Hot Springs, Ark | Conduct and administration | 31,677 |
| Crawford County CA Development Council, Inc., Van Buren, Ark | do | 29,645 |
| Economic Opportunity Council of the Ozarks, Inc., Cotter, Ark | do | 32,913 |
| Clark County Community Action Agency, Inc., Arkadelphia, Ark | Program development | 23,394 |
| Carroll-Madison Corp., Huntsville, Ark | Conduct and administration | 24,146 |
| Council of Economic Opportunity of Hot Springs and Garland County, Hot Springs, Ark | Headstart day care centers | 161,537 |
| Arkansas Farmers Union | Community activity for seniors | 149,100 |
| Pulaski County | Operation Second Chance | 27,778 |
| Philander Smith College | Neighborhood leadership | 64,000 |
| Central Arkansas Development Council | Neighborhood Youth Corps | 284,480 |
| Total (38 projects) | | 1,341,589 |

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have attempted unsuccessfully since July 15 to obtain similar information from the Department of Agriculture. When these data are received, I will bring them to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, the cost of the war in Vietnam—estimated at $2 billion per month—is also causing a crisis in the homebuilding industry. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several statements recently issued by the National Association of Home Builders.

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

BACKGROUND

The home building industry expected to build approximately 1.6 million housing units in 1966.

But a great competition for money began last Fall when the Government relied on monetary policy measures alone to check inflationary pressures. This has resulted in a disastrous interest rate war and a violent shift of funds away from Savings and Loans and other institutions that finance home mortgages.

The home building industry has been seriously crippled as a consequence.

The effects are now being felt in other sectors of the economy that are related to the home building industry, and more importantly, by the general public.

The blow to the industry is one from which a long recovery time will be needed. Action is needed now to begin that recovery.

WHAT IS HAPPENING

Annual rate of starts and permits lowest in 6 years—only during the last two recessions in the fifties has rate been this low.

4 million families who buy new or used homes each year are already affected.

Building permits—indicators of future activity—down 25 percent from June 1965.

Actual June housing starts—20 per cent behind June 1965.

FHA starts in June down 25 per cent from June 1965.

VA starts in June down 22 per cent from June 1965.

Mortgage commitments of mutual savings banks in June 1966 down approximately 63 per cent as compared to June of last year.

Mortgage commitments for savings and loan associations in May 1966 down 51 per cent as compared to May 1965.

WHAT THIS MEANS

Based on current trend projections, the next 12 months could see a loss of 400,000 units—the economic impact of such a loss would be:

800,000 man years of employment.

$7 billion in construction expenditures.

An additional $14 billion in related expenditures.

Nearly 5 billion board feet of lumber.

2 billion bricks.

8 million gallons of paint.

Nearly a million tons of steel.

2 billion square feet of gypsum board.

Nearly 5 million doors.

More than 600,000 bath tubs.

And many others—such as miles of electric wiring, switches, appliances, cabinets, tile, cement, etc.

Also, this drop will mean lower local government real estate tax collections, and a reduction in sales taxes, transfer taxes, etc.

WHAT TO EXPECT

If the present situation is not corrected, the expressed housing goals of the Administration and Congress will be empty phrases.

If we are to meet the needs of new families, replace housing lost from the market each year, and at the same time rebuild our cities and eliminate sub-standard housing, the production rate of housing will have to be far in excess of this year's hoped for rate of 1.6 million units.

In this mortgage credit crisis, production capacity is being reduced to far below requirements for the future.

New housing programs, which raise the hopes of millions for getting out of substandard housing, cannot get off the ground.

Low and middle income families are the most severely affected.

The ability of people to sell their homes or buy new homes is being severely restricted. This means loss of the ability of the people to realize a return from their investment in housing, and reduction of their ability to move.

The capacity of the industry to produce the needed housing is being crippled now. That capacity, once reduced, cannot be quickly or easily restored.

WHAT WE SUPPORT

These bills which would help put money back into home building:

H.R. 15639 (the Hanna bill) authorizing FNMA to increase its borrowing power from ten to fifteen times or about 2.2 billion dollars. We also endorse H.R. 15288 (the Widnall bill) which would have the same result but to a lesser degree.

S. 3529 (the Sparkman bill) and H.R. 16352 (the Barrett bill) which would put a billion dollars of special assistance funds into FNMA.

H.R. 14026 which would help put money back into home building by:

Empowering the Federal Reserve Board to buy FNMA and FHLBB debentures and other obligations.

And these other provisions of H.R. 14026 which would help end the interest rate war!

Place a ceiling of 4½% on consumer type CD's,

Authorize the Federal Reserve to establish different rates on different types of deposits, and

Authorize standby rate controls for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

We also support those provisions of H.R. 14026 which would provide for a board to coordinate Federal fiscal and monetary policy and would increase reserve requirements on time deposits.

We call upon the Congress and the Administration to adopt these measures now and to establish a national housing policy designed to maintain a healthy and viable home building industry. This is essential to our national economy and to provide a proper living environment for all our citizens.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

## FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1374, S. 3155, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3155) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 25 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1966."

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the additional sum of $3,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968 and 1969, of the sums authorized to be appropriated for such years for expenditures on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5 of House Document Numbered 42, Eighty-ninth Congress.

REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 4. (a) Section 109(b) of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: "Such standards shall in all cases provide for at least four lanes of traffic."

(b) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to modify project agreements entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act pursuant to section 106 of title 23 of the United States Code for the purpose of effectuating the amendment made by this section with respect to as much of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as may be possible.

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title 23 of the United States Code, the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) For the Federal-aid primary system and the Federal-aid secondary system and for their extension within urban areas, out of the highway trust fund, $1,000,000,000 for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The sums authorized in this paragraph for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(A) 45 per centum for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system;

(B) 30 per centum for projects on Federal-aid secondary highway system; and

(C) 25 per centum for projects on extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary highway systems in urban areas.

(2) For forest highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $33,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(3) For public lands highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(4) For forest development roads and trails, $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(5) For public lands development roads and trails, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(6) For park roads and trails, $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(7) For parkways, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

(8) For Indian reservation roads and bridges, $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and $23,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

ALASKAN ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 116, funds made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, may be expended by the State for maintenance of Federal aid highways.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 103, funds made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, may be expended for construction of access and development roads that will serve resource development, recreational, residential, commercial, industrial, or other like purposes.

(c) For construction and maintenance of highways in the State of Alaska, out of the highway trust fund, and in addition to funds otherwise made available to the State of Alaska under title 23, United States Code, $10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1968, June 30, 1969, June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972.

EMERGENCY RELIEF

SEC. 7. (a) The last proviso of subsection (f) of section 120 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(b) Subsection (c) of section of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after "park roads and trails," the following: "parkways, public lands highways, public lands development roads and trails,".

(c) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 125 of title 23 of the United States Code is hereby deleted and the following is substituted therefor: "Subject to the following limitations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to establish the fund authorized by this section and to replenish it on an annual basis: (1) not more than $50,000,000 is authorized to be expended in any one fiscal year to carry out this section except that if in any fiscal year the total of all expenditures under this section is less than than $50,000,000 the unexpended balance of such amounts shall remain available for expenditure during the next two succeeding fiscal years in addition to amounts otherwise available to carry out this section in such years, and (2) 60 per centum of the expenditures under this section for any fiscal year are authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund and the remaining 40 per centum of such expenditures are authorized to be appropriated only from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

(d) Subsections (b) and (c) of section 125 of title 23, United States Code, are amended by striking the words "from the emergency fund" where they appear.

STUDY OF ADVANCE ACQUISITION OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the advance acquisition of rights-of-way for future construction of highways on the Federal-aid highway systems, with particular reference to the provision of adequate time for the removal and disposal of improvements located on rights-of-way and the relocation of affected individuals, businesses, institutions, and organizations, the tax status of such property after acquisition and before its use for highway purposes, and the methods for financing advance right-of-way acquisition by both the State governments and the Federal Government, including the possible creation of revolving funds for such purpose. The Secretary shall submit a report of the results of such study to Congress not later than January 10, 1968, together with his recommendations.

STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

SEC. 9. Subsection (a) of section 302 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In meeting the provisions of this subsection, a State may engage, to the extent it deems necessary or desirable, the services of private engineering firms."

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to make, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the State highway departments, and other affected Federal and State agencies, a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to provide additional assistance for the relocation and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations to be displaced by construction of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with recommendations, to the Congress not later than July 1, 1967. The study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to—

(1) the need for additional payments or other financial assistance to such displaced persons, business concerns and nonprofit organizations, and the extent to which the making of such payments and the providing of other financial assistance should be mandatory;

(2) the feasibility of constructing, within the right-of-way of a highway or upon real property adjacent thereto acquired for such purposes, publicly or privately owned, buildings, improvements, or other facilities to aid in the relocation of such displaced persons, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations;

(3) the extent to which the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements, and other facilities should be paid from the highway trust fund; and

(4) sources of funds to pay the portion of the costs of acquiring such real property and constructing such buildings, improvements, and other facilities, which is not properly chargeable to the highway trust fund.

HIGHWAY STUDY—GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 11.(a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the government of Guam, the government of American Samoa, and the government of the Virgin Islands is hereby authorized to make studies of the need for, and estimates and planning surveys relative to, highway construction programs for Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(b) On or before January 10, 1968, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the adequacy of present highway programs to provide satisfactory highways in both the rural and urban areas in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands;

(2) specific recommendations as to a program for the construction of highways throughout Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; and

(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost responsibilities, and other pertinent matters.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of $200,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

SEC. 12. Section 109 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) The Secretary shall not approve plans and specifications for proposed projects on any Federal-aid system unless he determines, after consultation with the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, that the plans include adequate measures to minimize soil erosion which might be caused by the proposed excavations and construction."

PRESERVATION OF PARKLANDS

SEC. 13. (a) Chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"*§ 137. Preservation of parklands*

"It is hereby declared to be the national policy that in carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall use maximum effort to preserve Federal, State, and local government parklands and historic sites and the beauty and historic value of such lands and sites. The Secretary shall cooperate with the States in developing highway plans and program which carry out such policy. After July 1, 1968, the Secretary shall not approve under section 105 of this title any program for a project which requires the use for such project of any land from a Federal, State, or local government park or historic site unless (1) there is no feasible alternative to the use of such land, (2) such program includes all possible planning to minimize any harm to such park or site resulting from such use."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this proposed legislation provides the biennial authorizations for the Interstate and Defense Highway System and the Federal-aid ABC highway systems, for the 2 fiscal years, 1968 and 1969.

The measure—which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Public Works—authorizes a total of

$9,529,200,000 from the highway trust fund and the general fund of the Treasury.

The bill authorizes $3.3 and $3.6 billion from the trust fund for the Interstate System for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, respectively, and $1 billion for the ABC systems—which are our primary and secondary road systems and their urban extensions—for each of those years.

In addition to these authorizations from the trust fund, this S. 3155 provides funds for roads constructed on public domain lands in the amount of $579,200,000 for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

The major recommendation from the Committee on Public Works in the category of public domain roads authorizations has been to increase the funds for forest development roads and trails from $85 and $110 million for fiscal years 1968 and 1969, respectively, as proposed by the administration, to $170 million for each of those years.

The reasons for the committee action in this regard are summarized by the following statement from the committee report:

> Therefore, it is the committee's view that, in order to maximize efficient maintenance and development of national forest resources, to serve the widest range of benefits for the public, and to strengthen cooperative relations between the Forest Service and the timber products industry, the Congress should strive toward the goal of constructing as much of the national forest road system as possible from appropriated funds, with a minimum of purchaser constructed roads required.
>
> The committee conducted extensive hearings on this section of the bill, receiving testimony from Senators and officials of the administration, as well as from State and county officials and a broad spectrum of conservation interests and forest products industry representatives. The committee is, therefore, of the firm conviction that the recommended authorization levels of $170 million for each of the fiscal years of 1968 and 1969 represent a prudent and necessary investment in our national resources and in the future well-being of the national economy.

The committee bill also substantially increases the funds available for the construction of public lands highways, from $7 million for each of the fiscal years of 1968 and 1969, to $20 million for fiscal 1968 and $25 million in fiscal 1969. And even with this substantial increase, the authorizations amount to only one-third of the total applications from the States for assistance in these categories.

Finally, Mr. President, S. 3155 authorizes modest but significant increases in the funds available for the construction of public lands development roads and trails and Indian reservation roads and bridges. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point those sections of the report which discuss the committee action on these categories of roads:

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS, SECTION 5

> The road system financed under subsection (5) of section 5 serves the "unreserved, unappropriated public domain lands" comprising some 176 million acres, largely in the 11 Western States, and 288 million acres of public-domain lands in Alaska.
>
> Though the public domain lands have been the neglected stepchild of the entire Federal lands resource, it is now generally recognized that the bulk of these lands is not going to pass from Federal ownership, and it is long past the time to develop an affirmative program for their management.
>
> In 1964 the Congress passed the Classification and Multiple Use Act, which gave official recognition to the recreational and resource values of public-domain lands and to the need for an improved management program. Major programs requiring new and improved access are (1) fire and disease protection, (2) soil and watershed projects, (3) range management, (4) forest management, and (5) recreation.
>
> The present transportation system available to manage these resources consists of some 50,000 miles of road, of which at least 90 percent is inadequate and in need of reconstruction.
>
> The committee authorizations of $4 million for fiscal 1968 and $6 million for fiscal 1969 are based on an analysis of need and capability of developing an orderly road construction program. The Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, which has administrative responsibility for most of the land in this category, has already developed a comprehensive transportation plan. This plan consists of an inventory of existing roads and an estimate of planned transportation facilities necessary for the development, protection, administration and utilization of lands and resources in the public domain.

INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS AND BRIDGES, SECTION 5

> The committee has increased the recommended authorization for Indian reservation roads and bridges from $18 million in fiscal 1968 to $20 million for that year, in order to provide construction funds for a Navajo Reservation road from Crystal, N. Mex., to Sheep Springs, which is a distance of approximately 20 miles. The cost of improving the road to State highway standards would be approximately $2 million.
>
> The proposed facility would serve one of the newest and largest lumber mills in the world, would improve transportation for the marketing of forest products in the Shiprock and Farmington areas and also in the cities of Colorado, and would furnish needed access to outstanding recreational sites along the crest of the Chuska Mountains.
>
> The Department of the Interior acknowledges the economic justification of the proposed road, but because of other project commitments, the Department has not been able to program construction of this project earlier than 1971. The committee amendment would allow for programing of immediate construction to serve a long-neglected area and its people.

With reference to the total authorizations for public domain roads, Mr. President, I would summarize the committee's actions by saying that this is the most progressive step that the Public Works Committee has taken in the field of public lands resource development in the 8 years that I have served on this committee. And I commend all the members of the committee for their constructive and nonpartisan approach to this important aspect of natural resources development.

I wish to say that limiting the interstate authorization in this bill—as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will bring out, I am sure—to only the 2 years, 1968 and 1969, does not indicate that there is any lessening of our commitment to the completion of the Interstate System. On the contrary, the Committee on Public Works has withheld authorizations for the years following fiscal 1969, because we know that the authorizations, based on the 1965 cost estimates, are inadequate. Your Public Works Committee knows, from the testimony that was given, that additional costs will be involved. We have, therefore, directed the Secretary to include in the 1968 estimate all known and anticipated increased cost factors, so that in that year, Congress can authorize appropriations for completing this vital Interstate System on the basis of more accurate and definitive knowledge than we now have.

Therefore, Mr. President, the States can continue their planning beyond 1968 with the confidence that Congress will maintain its commitment to our vital Federal-aid highway program.

The committee conducted extensive hearings and considered at great length the problem of the cost of completing the Interstate System and the insufficient revenues under existing legislation. In this regard, the committee report declares that—

> On three successive occasions since 1961 the administration has recommended revenue measures to augment the trust fund. And in each instance the Congress has withheld action. Others may speculate regarding the reasons for this impasse, but as a practical matter affecting the major civil works construction program in the Nation, this committee urges the administration to reappraise its assumptions regarding interstate financing and recommend to the next Congress a realistic revenue measure which will solicit congressional approval.
>
> Finally, with respect to the 1968 cost estimate of completion, the committee directs the Secretary to consider in his estimate all known and anticipated cost increases heretofore discussed by the committee under the heading of "Additional Cost Factors." The 1968 estimate should include, but not be limited to, extrapolation of the average increase in unit prices of construction and materials; appreciation of land values, particularly in urban areas; increases due to new design features; possible increases in relocation costs for displaced persons and businesses; increases generated by the need to serve additional social, cultural, esthetic, historic, and recreational values, particularly in urban areas; and increases required by implementation of the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 and pending highway safety legislation, as well as the programs authorized or anticipated by studies which are authorized in S. 3155.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of Senators the entire committee report, which presents a detailed and factual discussion of our Federal-aid highway program. For the particular attention of individual Senators, I would note that pages 20 and 21 present the approximate apportionments to be made to each of the States for fiscal 1968 and 1969 under the provisions of the pending bill.

Finally, I wish to commend all the members of the Committee on Public Works and the members of the Subcommittee on Roads for their application and their sincere, thorough, and searching discussion of the problems involved

in the continuation of our Federal highway system and the improvement of the administration of this vital program.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to support the pending bill, which has been reported unanimously by the Committees on Public Works. I commend the chairman of our committee, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Senator RANDOLPH, for conducting, as he always does, very thorough and extensive hearings on this important legislation covering 7 days from May 11 to 26.

There are more dramatic pieces of legislation which come before the Senate, but this is an important bill. It assures the continuation of one of the oldest programs of our Federal Government—a program to provide assistance to our States in the construction of highways—the ABC system which includes primary, secondary and urban highways—and during the last 10 years, the Interstate System. In the case of the Interstate System the Federal Government provides 90 percent of the cost, and in the case of the primary, secondary, and urban roads—50 percent of the cost.

The bill carries a large authorization—one of the largest which comes before Congress—of about $9.5 billion for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. As we know, Congress has already provided funds for the years 1966 and 1967.

I wish to comment briefly on the main provisions of the bill and at the same time to set forth my reservations concerning several aspects of this legislation.

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Section 2 of the committee bill authorizes $3.3 billion for the Interstate System for fiscal 1968, representing an increase of $300 million above the present authorization, and $3.6 billion for fiscal 1969, representing an increase of $600 million over existing legislation due to the necessity of meeting the increased cost of construction. Both increases were requested by the administration.

These increases are based on the 1965 Interstate Cost Estimate contained in House Document 42 of the 89th Congress which indicated that the Federal share of the cost of completing the Interstate System would be $42 billion, an increase of $5 billion over the 1961 estimate. However, the 1965 cost estimate was based on 1963 prices and does not include costs for future increases in price levels and increases due to design changes.

The committee has received estimates that the increased cost of these two factors—bid prices and design changes—may require an additional $4 billion to complete the Interstate System on schedule. In view of the present inflation the committee has authorized appropriations only for fiscal 1968 and 1969 and has instructed the Secretary to include in the 1968 cost estimate, which he is required to make under existing legislation, all of the projections for these foreseeable increases through to the scheduled completion date of the Interstate System. I supported the committee amendment to limit the authorization to 2 years.

THE A–B–C SYSTEM

The committee has authorized $1 billion for the Federal share of the A–B–C system for fiscal 1968 and $1 billion for fiscal 1969, representing no change in the amounts authorized for fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967. A breakdown of these amounts is as follows:

[in millions]

| | 1968 | 1969 |
|---|---|---|
| Primary roads | $450 | Same |
| Secondary roads | 300 | Same |
| Urban | 250 | Same |
| Total | 1,000 | Same |

OTHER FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS

In addition to the Interstate and ABC systems the committee made the following authorizations:

For forest highways: $33 million for each of fiscal 1968 and 1969; for public lands highways, $20 million for 1968 and $25 million for 1969, an increase over the administration request of $7 million for 1968 and $7 million for 1969; for forest development roads and trails, $170 million for 1968 and $170 million for 1969, representing a substantial increase over the administration recommendation of $85 million for 1968 and $110 million for 1969; for public lands highways, the committee went beyond the administration's request and authorized $20 million for 1968 and $25 million for 1969; for public lands development roads and trails, $4 million for 1968 and $6 million for 1969, doubling the administration's request; for park roads and trails, $25 million for 1968 and $30 million for 1969, which amounts were requested by the administration and represent a slight increase over the authorizations for 1966 and 1967; for parkways, $9 million for 1968 and $11 million for 1969, as compared with $11 million for each of 1966 and 1967; for Indian reservation roads and bridges, $20 million for 1968 and $23 million for 1969, as compared with $18 million for each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

I raised questions in committee concerning the committee's amendment to increase authorizations for forest development roads and trails beyond the amounts requested by the administration. These increases beyond the administration's request amount to $85 million for 1968 and $60 million for 1969. I did so not because development roads are not needed, but in view of the Vietnam situation and the inflationary condition that we find the country in today, I opposed the amendment. I feel that expenditures of this nature should be kept to a minimum. I urge the Appropriations Committee in considering the appropriation of funds for these programs to take these factors into account.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

In the original version of S. 3155 the administration proposed to amend the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 by removing the prohibition against the use of the highway trust funds during fiscal year 1967 to finance the highway beautification program and provided that beginning with fiscal year 1967 this program be financed through the Trust Fund. It has been my position that the cost of the highway beautification programs relating to the control of outdoor advertising, screening of junk yards, and landscaping should be financed out of the highway trust fund, at least during this time of heavy war expenditures. However, since the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 requires the Secretary to report to the Congress in January 1967, and to submit an estimate of the costs of the present and projected highway beautification programs and since minimum funds will be expended in this fiscal year, it was the view of the committee, and a view which I supported, that authorization for the Highway Beautification Act be taken up as a separate matter next year after the committee has had an opportunity to study the cost estimate of the program by the Secretary.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

It is important to remember that the Federal cost of the Interstate System, and the regular Federal-aid system is not a charge on general appropriations and that it is financed from the highway trust fund on a pay-as-you-go basis—a principle which I strongly support. It is quite apparent that there will not be sufficient revenues in the highway trust fund to complete the Interstate System on schedule in 1971. As pointed out in the committee report at page 17:

> The authorization for the fiscal year 1968 and succeeding years through 1972 as proposed by the Administration in the original version of S. 3155 are known to be insufficient to complete the program on schedule.

This insufficiency is further complicated by the known fact of cost increases above the 1965 estimate resulting from inflation and design changes may amount to $4 billion. The testimony of representatives of the American Association of State Highway Officials estimated that without a tax increase producing additional revenues for the highway trust fund and without charging the costs of the beautification program to the trust fund that it would take until 1975–76 to complete the Interstate System. The administration estimate would require an 18-month to 2-year stretchout. Although I do not favor the principle of charging additional programs to the highway trust fund, I have urged that the administration consider stretching out the completion date of the Interstate System in this special case because of the increase in the national budget resulting from the Vietnam war and the serious inflation that threatens us today. Also I wish to avoid the levying of additional taxes on highway users. Another cost estimate of the Interstate System will be provided in 1968, and the Congress must make its decision at that time.

USE OF CONSULTANTS BY STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

Section 9 of the bill was added by the committee and authorizes States to engage to the extent necessary the services of private engineering firms. Under existing legislation, it is not absolutely clear that State highway departments may retain the services of consulting engineers. The committee amendment would clarify section 302 of title 23 of the United States Code to this extent. I have received communications from the Kentucky State Highway Department

and other officials pointing out the advantage to the State highway departments of being able to retain the services of highly professional people on a consultant basis in specialized work when the State highway department would not have sufficient funds to employ such specialized personnel on a full-time basis. I am very happy to support this amendment.

RELOCATION ASSISTANCE STUDY

I wish to note that section 10 of the bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to make, in cooperation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the State highway department and other affected Federal and State agencies, a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining what action can and should be taken to provide additional assistance for the relocation and reestablishment of persons, business concerns, churches, and other nonprofit organizations, to be displaced by construction of projects on any of the Federal-aid highway systems.

In many situations that have come to my attention, I did not feel that the individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations required to relocate because of highway construction, received adequate compensation or assistance in finding suitable new quarters. I supported this amendment in the committee, and I am looking forward to the report of the study and investigation by the Secretary, which is due to be submitted to the Congress by January 10, 1967.

THE FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS AND KENTUCKY

I am pleased to note that Kentucky will receive a total of $84,217,000 for 1968—a $9,472,000 increase over its 1967 apportionment and a total of $90,393,000 for fiscal 1969. The breakdown is as follows:

For 1968: $67,395,000 for the interstate program; $7,479,000 for primary roads; $6,307,000 for secondary roads; and $2,496,000 for urban streets.

For 1969: $74,111,000 for the interstate program; $7,479,000 for primary roads; $6,307,000 for secondary roads; and $2,469,000 for urban roads and streets.

The Federal-aid highway program is of nationwide interest, affecting and improving, as it does, every State and segment of our economy—industry and agriculture.

I am glad to serve on the Senate Committee on Public Works, which has submitted this bill to the Senate, and to have had a part in its development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and his committee colleagues on the excellence of this bill to authorize highway programs for fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

I am particularly pleased that the committee has shown full recognition of the need to develop the vast federally managed forests, parks, public lands, and Indian lands in our States.

For the first time in memory the authorization for national forest roads and trails, is at an adequate level.

In Montana, vast areas in the national forests have not been opened up by access roads. This has had a serious impact on the growth of our timber industries. There is also a threat to the stability of existing timber industries if access roads are not provided. Many of these industries are small in size and are unable to finance road construction, which is very costly and of high risk in the rugged mountain areas where most of our national forest timber is located.

The timber industry in Montana is an important part of its economy. It is largely dependent on national forest timber. Last year, national forest timber cut exceeded $6 million in value. Timber purchasers built roads valued at $5 million. If these roads had been built in advance by the Government, the returns to the Treasury would have been increased by the cost of purchase road construction. They would also be increased by higher bids due to lesser risk and more competition.

Some years ago, many of us in Congress with an interest in developing fully our national forests, prevailed on the Eisenhower administration to present a program for action. The late Senator James E. Murray of Montana was one of the leaders in this effort. Later, this program was revised and a short-range, 10-year program was presented to the Congress by President Kennedy. This program contained provisions for access road construction as well as for other needed forestry operations—timber sale preparation, recreational development, and range improvement were also included. The rest of this program has proceeded substantially on schedule but access roads have lagged.

The committee's action closes the gap by providing $340 million over the 1968–69 fiscal period.

The funds will act on the West like Henry Ford described his joy with woodcutting. He used to say the wood you cut warms you twice, once when you cut it, once when you burn it.

These funds will have a double—even a triple effect. They will open the forests to wise multiple use. The roads will help business. These roads will strengthen hard-pressed local governments already burdened by the costs of servicing local roads and schools.

Likewise the increase in public land development roads and trails to $10 million for the next 2 years and the increase in public land highways to $45 million for 1968 and 1969 will serve the same good causes.

These authorizations plus those for park roads and Indian roads will advance the opportunity for early completion of roads into the new Bighorn National Recreation Area near Billings where majestic Yellowtail Dam is creating a magnificent lake, and assist in other needed road development throughout the West.

These natural resource roads serve rural and urban America alike. These are national roads. They bring the products of farm, ranch, forest and mine to the consumer, while opening the spectacular beauty of our forest and rangeland to the recreation-seeking city dweller.

I am particularly pleased to note that the committee rejected the proposal to finance forest highways and public land highways out of the trust fund These roads serve the forests and public lands. They are not like the conventional Federal-aid roads. Back in 1958 this proposal was made and rejected. In 1960 and in 1962 and again in 1964 it was made and rejected. Four times now the Congress has rejected this notion.

It seems to me that the idea should finally get across in the Bureau of the Budget that this recommendation is without merit.

The committee is to be congratulated also on its action to minimize soil erosion and to preserve park land beauty in road construction. Roads can be constructed to save soil and beauty. Much has been done by the roadbuilders and State highway departments. These amendments will improve the rate of progress.

Again my sincere congratulations to the chairman [Mr. RANDOLPH] and to all the members of the committee for bringing before us one of the most progressive highway bills we have ever had.

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

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to reflect that, although the Senator from Montana is not now a member of the Committee on Public Works, he has been of genuine value to the committee members in the consideration of this program for highways and road construction.

We appreciate his counsel and are always helped by it.

All members of the committee are grateful for the remarks the Senator made today during the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I thank the chairman for his remarks and I thank him for his courtesy in permitting me to work with the committee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, S. 3155, which we are considering today, makes no changes or additions to the Interstate Highway System. This bill is confined to providing the necessary authorization for funds for the existing system.

Many Senators have been interested in proposals to add mileage to the Interstate System so that it would serve greater portions of our population. The junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has been especially interested in such a proposal for an addition to the interstate to serve Dakota County, Nebr., and adjacent territory.

I wish to state that the committee is aware of the great interest shown by Mr.

CURTIS and others and that while proposals for additions to the interstate are outside the scope of today's bill, that we feel that just as soon as the Interstate System is to be enlarged and extended that these proposals advanced by individual Senators should be given consideration.

S. 3155—PROGRESS IN THE ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Public Works Committee, and especially its illustrious and diligent chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], deserve special commendation for the excellence of the bill they have reported. It is a progressive bill. It is a comprehensive bill.

Highway safety, economic growth, and national well-being have a close relationship to the adequacy and excellence of our highways. The Roman Empire rose to its position of eminence in its time, because, among other things, it had developed a comprehensive transportation system.

So I want to salute the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his leadership in meeting national transportation needs. West Virginia and the Nation are well represented by his enlightened chairmanship of the Public Works Committee.

With over 651,000 people in 1960, the greater Portland area ranked 27th in the Nation as an urban center—5th for the west coast. Eugene, Oreg., with over 95,000 people, ranked 161st in the list of the 200 areas with over 50,000 people.

Oregon has made remarkable progress in completing its allocated interstate highways, and it is actively participating in the program initiated in 1965 to beautify roads, control signs, and eliminate junkyards. Oregon has 630 miles open to traffic out of its 730 miles designated under the interstate program, and this is one of the best records for any State in the Nation.

FOREST RESEARCH—AERIAL LOGGING

Because of the interest I have expressed in aerial logging, with the fine support of leading Oregonians such as Glenn Jackson and Faye Stewart, I am particularly pleased over the following comments which appear at page 28 of Report No. 1410 on S. 3155:

> Balloon logging has been shown to be technically feasible, but to make the system economically feasible requires studies of various balloon configurations, wind tunnel tests, development of cheaper gas supply systems, means of deicing, and ground handling and transport facilities. The committee is informed that accelerated research could result in making the balloon logging concept of aerial logging operational in about 2 years. The committee therefore urges the Secretary of Agriculture to make funds available for conducting the necessary research and development program.

NATIONAL FORESTS

The 15 million acres of national forest in Oregon, while not the largest acreage in any State, do represent the most important unit in terms of both timber productivity and timber production.

They contain over one-half the saw timber in Oregon—some 300 billion board feet—and they produce in excess of 3 billion board feet per year.

This bill, which authorizes $170 million a year for forest development roads and trails, for the first time brings the authorization level to the point where it ought to be.

Since I first came to the Senate, I have worked for this program. For example, in 1955, when the authorizations were about $20 million, I urged a 10-year $50 million per annum program. At that time some in my State objected, but now there is a complete understanding in industry, conservation circles, and county government on the vital need for forest access roads. This year the committee received compelling testimony from these groups.

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction to observe the fruition of the results of our long campaign of education concerning the wisdom of developing access roads into our Federal timber resources. Of course, my colleague from West Virginia, who works so well on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, did not have to be educated to understand the great need for roads in the forests. He comes from a natural resource State and he is a conservation-minded Senator. He has long been aware of the importance of timber access roads.

Mr. Kenneth Tollenaar, consultant to the Association of Oregon Counties, made an impressive statement before the committee on this topic. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tollenaar's statement be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

PUBLIC LAND DEVELOPMENT—ROADS AND TRAILS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to my good friend from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], to Mr. Richard Royce of the Public Works Committee staff and to the other fine members of the committee's staff, I express appreciation for adopting the recommendation of the Senators from Montana and Oregon on public land development roads and trails. The authorization of $4 million in 1968 and $6 million in 1969 is modest, but it is realistic. The public lands are mainly grasslands, but they also include substantial areas of forest. Such areas as the Deschutes River Canyon in Oregon offer some of the Nation's finest recreation and fishing. This authorization will serve to develop the public lands so that grazing, mining, lumbering and recreation can be advanced on a multiple use basis. On this subject, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, a speech by Malheur County Judge Ellis White before the National Association of Counties, entitled "The Public Land Development Road and Trail Program."

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

(See exhibit 2.)

NATIONAL FOREST ACCESS POLICIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is an opportune occasion to include a progress report on access to the national forests, prepared at my request by the Forest Service. I ask unanimous consent that a Forest Service letter dated July 15, containing this information, also be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, prior to February 1962, the Forest Service had two means of solving access problems in the Western National Forests that were created originally from the public domain. It could, if the intermingled landowners agreed, enter what is called a cost-sharing cooperative agreement or it could condemn a roadway across the private land.

Up to that time, the Forest Service had erroneously proceeded on the basis that when a timber firm wanted access across a national forest, it had to grant that access even if the timber firm would not give the Forest Service access or enter into a road-use and share-cost agreement.

This was an unsatisfactory situation. Despite the fact that a segment of the timber industry seemed to like the situation, I concluded it needed correcting. Therefore, I discussed the matter both with the late President Kennedy and his Attorney General, ROBERT KENNEDY, who is now the distinguished Senator from New York.

The result was a complete review by Attorney General Kennedy and his assistants, Mr. Byron White, now a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and Mr. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, now Attorney General of the United States. A decision, based on the review, was issued February 1, 1962, by the Attorney General.

They concluded that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Forest Service had the right to condition roadbuilding across the national forests by timber companies to, among other things, secure the access needed to the public forests.

That decision brought heated attacks upon the Senator from Oregon and Attorney General KENNEDY, but the passage of time proved that we were right. Four years have elapsed and this policy has been tested in practice. A report on its effectiveness is in order.

Some of the rather emphatic allegations of the time were:

First. "The Forest Service could take over a timber grower's costly road system with no assurance that the timber grower will receive fair value." This has not occurred.

Second. "The Forest Service takes over all control of roads while paying a fractional share of costs." This has not occurred.

Third. "The Forest Service can delay access to the timber grower indefinitely unless he agrees to sacrifice his investment." This has not occurred.

Fourth. "Multiple-use traffic rides without an assigned cost share." This has not occurred.

Fifth. It was contended that "access to 40 million acres of potential recreation land" was in jeopardy. This has not occurred.

I was criticized by some in the industry for citing the fact that 55 billion board feet of national forest timber was without

access. I note that in this period access has been secured to about this amount of national forest timber.

It has been an effective policy. It has been applied in a reasonable manner. It has not produced chaos. In fact, almost 78 billion board feet of timber, an amount equal to 6 years production from the national forests was covered in 208 agreements entered into as of June 30, 1965. Last year 40 more agreements were negotiated.

In 1964, when S. 1147 was on its way to becoming Public Law 88–657, some in the industry endeavored to overturn this wise policy. With the understanding and help of my two colleagues, Senators RANDOLPH and METCALF, who served on the Roads Subcommittee, this did not occur.

It is significant that the Forest Service elected not to apply all of the authority the Attorney General said it had. The Forest Service decided not to condition the grant of a right-of-way upon a reciprocal grant, even though it could do so, but rather elected to use what it calls a system of incentives.

My view has always been that this decision on how much of the authority to apply is a question of executive policy. I did not propose then to urge its use, but I did want it made clear that it is a proper and legal policy that could be used if the facts should warrant.

The Forest Service has pursued a course of giving easements and cost sharing to cooperators but only permits and no-cost sharing to noncooperators.

I am aware that in the course of the hearings on S. 3155 witnesses from the Weyerhaeuser and other companies endeavored to make a case for compensation for roads built previously under permits which did not give the Government the right to full use of the road.

While I think this matter does deserve some further study, it was this very problem these firms created, under which they built roads the Government could not use, that led to the need to review the policy in 1962.

On this point, if some in the industry think they have a meritorious case and will present the facts to me, I can assure them they will receive my careful attention.

The progress that has grown out of the policies we were instrumental in having developed in 1962, certainly was not forecast by its opponents. Now, I give them full credit, these critics of the past recognize that their prophecies of chaos were wrong. And I can assure them that if those policies had proven unsound in practice, the senior Senator from Oregon would not have hesitated to have them corrected.

I think that in addition to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], my colleagues from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON], who worked on this question of access, a great deal of credit is also due the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], who as Attorney General acted as the catalyst in the executive branch to assure better public access to the public forests.

So today, in addition to a proper authorization for national forest roads we have other legislative and policy changes in operation which, taken together, have produced conservation progress on the 180 million acres of national forest. This bill, with its authorization for national forest development roads and trails brings the funds to the level required for conservation purposes for the first time in the history of the national forests. The Senator from West Virginia, his colleagues and the chairman and members of the House Public Works Committee deserve the warmest appreciation from conservationists, lumbermen and county government officials.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF KENNETH C. TOLLENAAR, FORMER EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ASSOCIATION OF OREGON COUNTIES

Mr. TOLLENAAR. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ken Tollenaar, and I am serving as a consultant to the Association of Oregon Counties on certain Federal-aid road programs. I was formerly employed as executive secretary of that association.

My permanent position at the present time is research associate, Bureau of Municipal Research and Service, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

National forest development roads and trails are financed from three main sources: authorizations under the biennial Federal-Aid Highway Act; allocation of 10 percent of national forest receipts under the act of March 4, 1913; and deductions from national forest receipts due to agreements between the Forest Service and timber purchasers which call for the purchasers to build the timber access roads. These deductions reduce the price purchasers pay for the timber so as to reimburse them for their costs.

There are some significant relationships between these sources. In particular, when authorizations and appropriations under the Highway Act and the 10-percent fund fall short of the urgent needs, there is a tendency to rely more heavily on purchaser construction to fill the gap.

For example, during the period from 1951 to 1963 appropriations available for the system were hopelessly inadequate to meet the demand, so purchaser construction increased during this time by 294.8 percent while appropriations increased only 185.7 percent.

Although the situation was somewhat improved by the substantial increases voted in 1962, purchaser construction from 1963 to 1966 has been ¢95 million more than planned levels, while authorizations for the appropriated fund portion of the program have been almost $190 million less than the long-range program called for.

Reliance on purchaser construction to meet national forest goals has many adverse effects for the Forest Service, the timber operators, the local counties and school districts, and the general public.

To the extent that the Forest Service must rely on purchasers funds, its road program becomes unbalanced because the roads must be built in areas where timber is to be sold, and consequently other areas are left without access for recreation, watershed, fire control, salvage, and silvicultural purposes.

Vast recreation resources that could be opened up to meet rapidly rising public demands are locked up for lack of access. Potential losses from fire, insects, and disease in these areas without access stagger the imagination.

Another disadvantage for the Forest Service in the purchaser method of financing is the difficulty of getting permanent, maximum-economy roads built under this method. The basic difficulty is that purchaser roads must be built under the "prudent operator" concept, which means that the purchaser can be required to finance only that standard of road that a prudent operator would build to remove the timber from the particular sale area.

Usually, this means rough, single-lane roads and temporary bridges. Furthermore, timber purchasers are interested in cutting timber, not in building roads, and this makes it difficult to enlist their cooperation in adhering to Forest Service standards and requirements.

The Forest Service now has authority to require purchasers to use supplementary appropriated funds for the purpose of building higher standard roads, but this program is complex and generally unpopular with timber purchasers.

Purchaser road construction requirements have proven especially burdensome for small operators. Despite recent changes in the Forest Service timber sale contract, which permit a rapid writeoff of road costs against stumpage payments, purchasers must still put up extra capital before they begin removing timber to finance road construction costs. There are other operating difficulties in meeting the road requirements, and in general the small operators would much prefer that the Forest Service build all necessary main-line access roads from appropriated funds.

The purchaser would still pay the portion of the road cost chargeable to his sale, but he would pay it in the form of increased stumpage payments, and would therefore pay as the timber is removed and sold.

These difficulties for the small purchaser tend to restrict competition for certain national forest timber sales, especially those in the more remote areas which are now being marketed as old growth timber is removed from the more accessible areas.

Larger sales must be put up to justify the greater road costs. A recent study of Government timber sales by Economist Walter Mead has confirmed that roadbuilding requirements do tend to restrict competition and may be a factor in producing de facto collusion in Government timber sales.

Without vigorous competition for its timber sales, the Government (including the counties) receives less money for its timber, and the economy suffers through increasing concentration of firms in the timber and wood products industries.

In addition to disadvantages for the Forest Service and timber purchasers, we believe that extensive reliance on purchaser construction jeopardizes the public interest because there is inadequate control of costs and practices in the construction of what is essentially a public road system. Almost all purchaser roads are built by the purchasers themselves, with their own forces and equipment, there being no requirement for competitive bidding on the road project itself.

The professional and technical competence of professional road contractors is thus lost to the Government through this method. Purchasers are building over $70.5 million of national forest roads in the current fiscal year, and a sizable proportion of this amount will go for permanent, main-line roads of the kind which in other Government programs would be subject to laws requiring formal bids and contracts.

Finally, local counties and school districts suffer from purchaser construction because the total national forest receipts against which their 25 percent payments are calculated are reduced by the amount necessary to finance purchaser construction. In 1966, these local governments are losing some $17.6 million due to this program.

The Forest Service recently completed a study which estimates the amount of property taxes which would be paid if the national forests were privately owned, and compares this amount with (1) the actual 25 percent payments and, (2) the value of Forest Service "contributions in kind," that is, Government services and facilities which would be provided on such lands by State and local governments if the land were privately owned.

One basic finding was that payments plus contributions in kind increased only 80 percent from 1952 to 1962, as compared to a 126-percent increase in the estimated taxes which the same land would pay, if it were privately owned. Stumpage deductions allowed to finance purchaser road costs accounts for a substantial part of the difference between these two figures.

Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Counties urges that even if it is found necessary to postpone badly needed improvements in the national forest road system, due to overall economic considerations at this time, authorizations for national forest development roads and trails should be increased substantially over the levels proposed in S. 3155, and that these increases be used to accomplish a major shift in the method of financing these roads from purchaser construction to construction by the Federal Government through the use of appropriated funds.

This would not increase the total road program, and would therefore not be inflationary. Moreover, we believe it can be done with no net cost to the Government and with an excellent prospect of actually increasing the net return to the Treasury. Federal stumpage receipts would increase in direct proportion to the increase in the appropriated road program.

It is true that part of this increase would be shared with local governments but we believe that the long-range benefits to national forest management and the increased competition for Forest Service timber which such a shift would produce would more than make up this difference.

Turning to another section of the bill, the National Association of Counties supports an increase this year in the public lands development roads and trails authorization under section 5, paragraph (5). The road system financed under this section of the bill is entirely within what is often referred to as the "unreserved, unappropriated public domain." These Federal lands comprise some 168 million acres, most of it in the 11 Western States.

The public domain lands have, we believe, been the neglected step-child of the entire Federal land resource. Uncertainty as to the final disposition of these lands, and the lack of an affirmative program for their management, have been mainly responsible for this situation.

Today, however, it is becoming widely recognized that the bulk of these lands is not going to pass from Federal ownership. At the same time, with the advent of new, mass recreation activities and other economic changes affecting these lands, there is also a greater recognition of their value as natural resources.

In 1964 the Congress passed significant legislation, including the Classification and *Multiple Use Act*, which gives official recognition to these values and to the need for an improved management program for the public domain.

As is the case with the national forests, the key to an effective management program for the public domain is an adequate road system. The Bureau of Land Management estimates that eventually some 80,000 miles of roads will be needed to provide access to these resources.

The Bureau now has in its road inventory some 45,000 miles of roads and trails of all types, including fire trails and roadways that are so primitive that they are usable for only a few months each year. Substantially more than half of this present mileage must be reconstructed to meet existing and projected needs.

Actually, more access is now being provided to these lands than is indicated by these figures—but it is being provided mainly by the county governments of the Western States, and it is being financed primarily by local property taxes and local highway user taxes.

Counties receive virtually no money from shared revenues or payments in lieu of taxes on behalf of the public domain. Federal grazing receipts which are shared with the States are earmarked for range improvements, not roads, and only minor amounts are received from public land sales.

At the present level of authorization—$2 million—the Bureau of Land Management cannot even begin to scratch the surface of its roadbuilding needs, and it must leave most of the maintenance of its existing roads up to the counties.

In Oregon, for example, the BLM claims an inventory of about 2,500 miles of roads of all kinds on its 13.5 million acres of public domain. Of this total, it maintains only about 300 miles. There are roads in my State which are used more extensively by the BLM's own administrative vehicles than by any other class of user, but which are maintained by the local county government.

Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Counties urges that the Congress make a beginning toward an adequate road network for the public domain by authorizing $7 million for each of the fiscal years covered by S. 3155, in lieu of the levels proposed in the bill of $2 million for 1968 and $3 million for 1969.

This action would permit the BLM to make a start on implementing its long-range plans for these lands, and would ultimately, we hope, relieve county governments of part of the burden they are now bearing in constructing and maintaining the road system for these federally owned lands.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to express our views.

I would like to comment on two points, one of which was brought up yesterday during the hearings, when Senator Moss inquired about the effect of eliminating class 3 forest highways from participation in the forest highways system, and at that time, Chief Cliff of the Forest Service, who was testifying, indicated that there are three alternatives for financing those roads, which comprise some 3,000 miles.

One alternative would be for the counties simply to take over and finance those roads as part of their own systems, which means that the financing would have to come from property taxes, locally levied, and from local highway user taxes.

The second alternative would be to include the same roads, with the consent of the States involved, as part of the Federal-aid secondary system.

The effect on financing in that case would be to reduce, in effect, the Federal participation in the financing from 100 percent under the forest highway system down to approximately 60 percent or more in some States, because of the unreserved public-domain provision.

The third alternative would, of course, be to simply dump the same roads over into the national forest development road system, which is provided for by this bill. Again this would mean 100 percent Federal financing, but it would water down an appropriation and a program which is already much too thin.

I just wanted to comment on that, and indicate that the National Association of Counties is objecting to elimination of those county roads from the forest highway system.

I might add that in the State of Oregon, where I happen to live, this would not prove to be any problem, because we only have some 35 miles of class 3 roads in the State, but there are several States where this mileage is substantial. There are four States where the mileage is more than 200 miles.

The States are California, Colorado, Montana, and Utah.

The other point which is covered in my remarks has to do with another section of the Federal-Aid Highway Act which I believe has received very little attention, and that has to do with the public lands development roads and trails, under section 5, paragraph 5 in the bill.

This program was, I believe, initiated some 6 years ago, and has been given annual authorization figures of between $2 and $4 million, but this amount has been completely inadequate in relationship to the need to provide an access road system on the public domain.

There are 168 million acres of public-domain land, primarily in the 11 Western States. There are additional hundreds of millions of acres of public-domain land in Alaska. There are management possibilities for this land, which are largely unrealized, because of the absence of an adequate access roads system.

Congress has recognized and given impetus to management plans for these lands by passing the Classification and Multiple-Use Act in 1964, and this act is now being implemented, but the end result will come to very little, unless an adequate access road system is provided for the public-domain lands.

There are recreation pressures today on those lands, with substantial recreation utilization, over and above the ability of the road system to handle it. We have people running around on the public domain in jeeps and other power vehicles, and probably making it all right, but for the ordinary passenger car to try to traverse the majority of the so-called public land development roads is almost an impossibility, year round, and is definitely an impossibility during many months of the year.

There are rockhounds and campers and plain sightseers, and hunters and fishermen, and various other categories of recreationists attempting to use the public domain.

The Bureau of Land Management has some long-range plans for development of an adequate road system for these lands, but it has had little or no money to implement these plans.

In my State, and I do not have similar figures for other States, but in my State, the BLM claims a road inventory of about 2,500 miles.

However, they are only maintaining about 300 miles, so their total inventory, and some of our county officials question whether they are even maintaining 300 miles.

The problem is not lack of good intention, it is a lack of money. What is happening is that the county governments are actually filling this gap to some extent by providing, from their own funds, money to construct and maintain access roads in these areas which are 100 percent federally owned.

They, I might add, are receiving little or no money in lieu of taxes on behalf of the public-domain lands. There is only one real revenue-sharing formula. That one provides for 5 percent of the proceeds of sales of public land and their products to be directed to counties, but it results in a very minute sum of money which does not begin to cover the counties' actual road costs on those lands.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Counties is suggesting that the figure in S. 3155 of $2 million for 1968 and $3 million for 1969 be increased to $7 million per year, for both years, in order that the Bureau of Land Management can begin to undertake a program of developing access roads for these lands.

That concludes my testimony, Mr. Chairman.

---

EXHIBIT 2

THE PUBLIC LAND DEVELOPMENT ROAD AND TRAIL PROGRAM

(A speech by Judge Ellis White, Malheur County, Oreg., before the national meeting of the National Association of Counties, New Orleans, La., July 17–20, 1966)

The program has for its purpose the planning, building, and maintaining of an adequate system of roads on 168 million acres of public lands in the 11 western states. These lands, commonly referred to as "Public Domain," are that part of the original public lands in the United States still in Federal Government ownership which has not been set aside, reserved, nor appropriated for use as National Forest, Wildlife Refuge, National Park, or any other specific use—lands under exclusive management of the Bureau of Land Management, an agency of the Department of the Interior.

There is agreement by the B.L.M., State, County Government Officials, resource users, and the recreation minded public that: "An adequate system of roads is the essential key to development and beneficial use of public land under the concept of Multiple Use."

It is likewise agreed that there is not an adequate system of roads to properly manage and use our public lands; and further agreement that authorizations of funds by Congress to date have not been sufficient to meet present accumulated needs not to initiate a realistic "Public Land Development Road and Trail Program."

Historically, part of the public lands came into federal ownership through the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the Texas and Gadsden Purchases in 1850 and 1853, the Cession Settlements in 1848, the Alaska Purchase in 1867, all at an average cost of four cents per acre. The lands in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Western Montana were acquired without cost or purchase through the Oregon Compromise of 1846.

At various times in the history of the United States, the Federal Government has held title to about four-fifths of the nation's gross area. Today governmental agencies administer about one-third of our nation's land's. The B.L.M. has exclusive responsibility for 464 million acres—more than one-half being in Alaska and the remaining public lands in 26 states, of which 168 million acres are in the 11 western states and small acreages are in the midwest and south.

Until the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, there was no management of public lands. In fact, these lands were regarded as having little value or potential. Population increase, growth, World War II, and the demand of full development of our resources ushered in a revaluation of public lands and their resources of oil, minerals, timber, grazing, and recreation.

In 1946 the Bureau of Land Management was created as an agency of the Department of Interior to manage and develop this new recognized multi-million dollar natural resource.

Income from public lands in the 10 year period of 1955 to 1965 was $2,261,501,981. Expenditures in the same period, or re-investments, were $363,480,278. Income amounted to six times the expenditures. It is interesting to note that about 90% of the income came from the 11 western states. In the years ahead this income will increase with good management.

Technically, these lands may be homesteaded under the Desert Entry, however, the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964 makes clear that most of this land will be retained in federal ownership and developed for beneficial use of the nation.

Public lands and their resources have received very little federal investment, including roads. Presently there is not a realistic road inventory on the public lands. Mileage claimed includes mostly sub-standard roads and mere fire trails or 4-wheel drive and Jeep roads.

Prior to 1964 the B.L.M. made request to the budget bureau for two million dollars to be used for new construction or reconstruction of existing roads for the fiscal year of 1964 and four million dollars in 1965 to begin the initial phase of the Public Land Development Road and Trail Program. Projected needs were for eight million dollars in 1966 and fourteen million dollars in 1967. B.L.M. indicated that a level of thirty million dollars would be needed per year thereafter to re-construct substantially more than half of the existing roads, new construction, and maintenance of an adequate road system. In reality, Congress has not authorized the requested funds. The 1966 authorization was two million dollars for approved projects of construction of 136 miles of roads in 11 states—a capital road investment of one and two-tenths cents per acre.

You may be interested as to how individual counties have fared from the present level of appropriations. My County of Malheur, Oregon has a land area larger than the combined states of Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island—78% of which are public lands, including 4,610,279 acres of B.L.M. land. The B.L.M. has to date, completed or under construction, less than 50 miles of graded and drained roads. In comparison, Malheur County has built and maintains about 1,100 miles of roads in the same public lands area. These roads have been financed by user and property taxes, not by federal agencies. The only federal funds available to help finance county roads in the public domain in 1965 were forest reserve rentals and sale of public lands, amounting to $6,280.95—or about $5.75 per mile of county built and maintained roads—roads which are actually used more by B.L.M. administrative vehicle travel than any other user. In a recent discussion with the manager of our B.L.M. district, I received information that no money has been approved for public land roads in the counties of Eastern Oregon having more than 13 million acres of public land for the 1967 year.

A study of counties in the 11 western states having substantial percentage of public land areas leads to the conclusion that the situation of Malheur County is not unique, and that there are many counties in which similar situations are present. The Public Land Development Road and Trail Program is the neglected step-child of federal road building.

The neglect of Congress to authorize sufficient funds for the implementation of a program for an adequate system of roads on public land has, in effect, shifted the responsibility for roads from the Federal Government to local county government. Moreover, the local county government does not receive taxes or monies in lieu of taxes on these lands.

It must be pointed out that those of us in county government in the areas of substantial public lands have likewise failed. Too long we have sat in our courthouses with knowledge of the need for roads and, through apathy and acquiescence, tolerated and compounded the situation; whereas, as individuals and collectively, we should have been working through County, State, and National Associations, State B.L.M. Directors, and District Managers in preparing and presenting a factual case to the appropriate congressional and budgetary committees and bureaus so that authorization and budgeting of funds could be carried out to meet the increasing road needs on public lands.

In this endeavor the county officials of the 11 western states will need the approval and support of county officials of the midwest, eastern, and southern states.

The vast storehouse of natural resources on public lands is the heritage of all Americans, for these lands range from the desert country to the multi-colored canyons, towering buttes, and mountains. The gamut of cover runs from cacti to sage, juniper, and pinion pine to the majestic redwoods and douglas fir of the northwest. Together they offer some of the most sweeping vistas in America. These lands offer recreation unlimited for the camper, hunter, fisherman, sight-seer, and scientist. Truly, they are a warehouse of potential natural resource.

An adequate system of roads is the essential key to access, management, and use as proposed through "The Public Land Development Road and Trail Program", a program worthy of the support of every American to the end that these natural resources of our public lands be maintained and developed for multiple use in our time and preserved as a priceless heritage for future generations.

---

EXHIBIT 3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
*Washington, D.C., July 15, 1966.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
*U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You wrote to us on June 13 asking for information on our implementation of the Secretary's policy of reciprocal access on the National Forests. Mr. Greeley acknowledged your letter on June 20 stating that we would prepare a complete reply.

We think that this letter contains the information you asked for. If not please do not hesitate to let us know.

You first asked for a chronological review of the highlights of events leading up to enactment of Public Law 88–657 on October 13, 1964. The enclosed chronological review summarizes important actions taken prior to and since enactment of P.L. 88–657.

You also requested a progress report on the reciprocal access program under the regulations. Progress in the cooperative road construction program has been good. The following tabulation summarizes accomplishments through June 30, 1965:

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of agreements (including supplements) | 208 |
| Miles of road constructed | 2,977 |
| Construction cost | $45,159,181 |
| Timber made accessible (million board feet): | |
| National forest | 55,692 |
| Other | 22,016 |
| Total | 77,708 |

About 40 additional agreements have been negotiated in F.Y. 1966 which ended June 30, 1966. The number of new agreements entered into each year will begin to level off and then decrease as more and more of the areas of intermingled National Forest and large industrial forest ownerships are covered by agreements. However, cooperative road mileage will continue to be added to the system in each cooperative area as the Cooperator and the Forest Service agree to construct more roads in each agreement area. A supplement to the agreement is written to

cover the details of construction, cost sharing and the exchange of easements. In the future most construction of cooperative roads will be under supplements to existing agreements.

It has been our experience that agreement supplements providing for extension of cooperative road systems within a cooperative agreement area are relatively easy to negotiate. Final agreement with the National Forest Products Association's (NFPA) Access Roads Subcommittee on a standard form of agreement (see chronological review) should expedite the formation of future agreements covering new areas.

Once a cooperative agreement is entered into and some roads constructed under it, the roads must be maintained. The regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture (36 C.F.R. 212.11(f)) provide that a cooperator will be required to bear only those maintenance costs occasioned by his use. The Forest Service is responsible for assuring that the maintenance attributable to all other use of the cooperative road is performed or paid for. The easements for a cooperative road include the substance of this commitment. It is therefore necessary that arrangements be made between the Cooperator and the Forest Service for getting the maintenance job done and for sharing in the costs. The Forest Service and the NFPA Committee are presently working on this problem. It is expected that a form of agreement and annual plan will be developed for administering the joint maintenance responsibilities for a cooperative road system.

Finally, you asked for a summary of past and present views on National Forest access policy and a judgment of the current public and private position on this access policy.

At one time the Forest Service and the large industrial forest landowners held quite opposing views on the solution to access problems in areas of intermingled private and National Forest lands. The controversy reached its peak following issuance of the Attorney General's Opinion of February 1, 1962, and continued after the Secretary's access regulations were published June 10, 1963. The position of those opposing the policies adopted by the Secretary was set forth in detail during the hearings before the Senate Public Roads Subcommittee on June 11 and July 30, 1963. Support for these policies was voiced by spokesmen for conservation organizations.

Since 1963 and especially since enactment of Public Law 88-657, October 13, 1964, many controversial issues with respect to the access policy have been resolved. A better appreciation of the problem by both the Forest Service and the private landowners has gone far to limit the areas of disagreement. Almost three years experience under the access regulations has allayed much of the concern felt by private landowners. More specifically, several actions have occured that have especially contributed to the improved situation. These are:

1. Instead of utilizing to the fullest extent the authority to condition the grant of a right-of-way upon a reciprocal grant of rights from the applicant, the access regulations provide incentives for the applicant to cooperate in a joint road that will serve his lands and the National Forest lands.

Section 212.10(a) of the access regulations provides that an applicant who wishes to construct a road across National Forest land but declines to grant access rights across his lands, may nevertheless be granted permission to construct the road. However, he would be granted a permit rather than an easement. The permit would retain in the United States the right to use the road he constructs on the permit. Furthermore, the Government would not help build the road.

You may recall Mr. Hendee's letter dated December 6, 1963, which was in response to your letter of October 10, 1963, to Mr. Cliff. This aspect of the access policy is discussed in considerable detail in that letter. He said: "We believe that the policy expressed in this section, when administered as we intend, will result in getting access across intermingled and adjacent private lands to National Forest lands as needed with equity for the private owner and the Government. We also believe the section provides a powerful incentive to the private owner to cooperate with the Forest Service in developing a single road system to serve the intermingled and adjacent private and Federal lands."

We believe our expectations as to the effectiveness of this policy have been confirmed.

2. Enactment of Public Law 88-657 removed a significant barrier to voluntary agreement on development of cooperative roads to serve intermingled Federal and private ownerships. The easements which can be granted by the Government under authority of this law are far more acceptable to the private owners than the rights granted under authority of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1233, 16 U.S.C. 525), for National Forest lands withdrawn from the public domain, and permits for acquired lands or interests in land. Since the easements are executed by the Regional Forester, who also negotiates the agreements for cooperative road construction, the entire process is simplified and speeded up.

3. Immediately after passage of the easement bill in October 1964, a National Lumber Manufacturers Association (NLMA now NFPA) committee was formed to meet with Forest Service representatives and undertake the task of perfecting the machinery to meet mutual access needs. The committee represented most industrial forest landowners who own lands within or adjacent to National Forests.

The Forest Service prepared a draft of revised regulations which was discussed and further revised at a meeting with the industry committee in January 1965. The resulting draft was discussed with interested individuals and groups including the conservation organizations. You will recall that several of your suggestions for language were adopted at that time. The revised regulations were published April 12, 1965. The industry committee very frankly and clearly explained their position on particular problems and then joined wholeheartedly in the search for acceptable compromise and appropriate language. A great deal of credit is due the industry committee for the prompt issuance of the revised regulations.

4. Development of standard easement forms and a standard form of cooperative road agreement were the next important jobs completed in participation with the industry committee. Agreement on forms of easements to be exchanged in cooperative road undertakings was reached in May 1965. Development of a standard form of cooperative agreement has been completed. We understand that it is acceptable to the committee and that it will be approved shortly.

Standard forms for the easements and agreement which are acceptable to both sides will shorten the time needed to negotiate easement exchanges and cooperative agreements.

5. Forest Service manual instructions for developing cooperative agreements and granting rights-of-way were issued in January 1966 (See Chronology).

6. Assignment of responsibility for bearing the share of construction and maintenance costs attributable to use of the road by persons using the private lands for recreation had been a troublesome issue in negotiating cooperative agreements. The Forest Service has agreed that all non-commercial recreation traffic using a cooperative road is assigned to the Government for cost sharing purposes, regardless of ownership of the land generating the traffic. Traffic resulting from recreational use of the Cooperator's land which is charged for by the owner remains his responsibility. This policy is incorporated in the easement language and stated in Forest Service manual instructions.

A summary of current positions on access policy would not be accurate or complete without mention of aspects of the access problem that are still of concern to some landowners. They were discussed in testimony before the Roads Subcommittees of the Committees of Public Works of the House and Senate in April and May 1966, in connection with the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1966 (H.R. 14359). On April 28, 1966, we wrote to Mr. Kluczynski, Chairman of the House Subcommittee, responding to a series of questions about Forest Service policy on issues raised before his committee at hearings in San Francisco in November 1964. This letter, a copy of which is enclosed, and the Hearings Record for the 1966 Highway Act constitutes the most up-to-date detailed statement of the positions of the Forest Service and the private owners concerned with access to intermingled lands.

It is our judgment that the access policy and procedural questions related to the intermingled landownership pattern in the National Forests have been largely resolved. Reasonable solutions and compromises have been found to eliminate the majority of the issues that divided the Forest Service and private owners. The Attorney General's Opinion, the access regulations, Public Law 88-657, and development of standard easement and cooperative road agreement forms in cooperation with the industry committee have all contributed to the current favorable situation.

We very much appreciate the great contribution you have made toward development of access policy and your continuing interest in a matter which is so important to industry and the public using National Forest resources and to owners of private lands within the National Forests.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE HENDEE,
*Deputy Chief.*

---

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS REGARDING NATIONAL FOREST ACCESS

EARLY BACKGROUND, 1905-50

It has always been Forest Service policy to obtain cooperation in extending a road and trail system into the National Forests. Settlers, prospectors, miners, lumbermen and stockmen as well as counties were encouraged to assist in this task.

Until the 1940's the demand for timber on the National Forests was not widespread. However, private timber owners were actively building roads and harvesting their timber on lands intermingled with and adjacent to National Forest lands. By 1950 there were many miles of logging roads serving the private lands and constructed in part on National Forest lands. Throughout this period the Department of Agriculture interpreted the Act of June 4, 1897, as assuring all owners of land within National Forest boundaries access across National Forest lands to their property. It could not exact from the landowner any conditions as the price of access except for protection and preservation of Government property. In 1950 this interpretation of the 1897 Act was confirmed in an informal opinion by the Office of the General Counsel (then Solicitor).

1950 The first cooperative road construction and use agreement was entered into between the Forest Service and a private landowner. Subsequently, many such agreements were made. The private owner's rights in segments of the cooperative road on National Forest land were recognized by a special-use permit or Stipulations Governing

the Exercise of Ingress and Egress Rights issued by the Forest Service.

1952 The Forest Service adopted a policy which limited timber sales to areas where access was not restricted.

1955 Some members of Congress criticized the variation in methods used to solve access problems by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management administering the O and C lands in Oregon. Joint hearings on access in the West were held by special subcommittees of the Senate and House. The resulting staff report questioned that corporations were entitled to have access across National Forest lands as a matter of right.

1955–1957 Forest Service representatives explored legislative needs with landowners who were sharing in construction of roads.

1957 First easement-granting and related access legislative proposal sent to Congress by Secretary of Agriculture.

1959 The situation in the Lewis River drainage in the State of Washington where access to seven billion feet of National Forest timber required use of a private road, stimulated action by the Congress. Senator JACKSON, with the help of Senator MAGNUSON and other Northwest Senators, obtained a special appropriation to purchase interests in private roads. The appropriation continued through fiscal year 1963 and has been used to solve many critical and complex access problems through purchase of interests in privately-owned roads that also serve National Forest lands.

1959 Secretary of Agriculture proposed that easement-granting legislation include authority to condition the grant of an easement on reciprocal access grants by the applicant.

1959 The Forest Service met twice with National Lumber Manufacturers Association (NLMA) representatives to consider proposals for access legislation. Industry representatives opposed reciprocity and other features of the legislation.

1960 In May, NLMA opposed the administration bill S. 1797 before the Senate subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry. The bill again failed to pass. Increased interest in National Forest access problems, stimulated by a speech by Senator MORSE, led to a detailed study of situations where lack of access prevented development and use of substantial bodies of National Forest lands and resources. The analysis of major access cases was completed in March 1961.

1961 On April 27, Senator MORSE wrote Secretary Freeman suggesting that questions on interpretation of the June 4, 1897 Act as it affected access across National Forest land be submitted to the Attorney General. On August 2, Secretary Freeman wrote to the Attorney General requesting his opinion on the key questions concerning the 1897 Act.

February 2, 1962 Attorney General Kennedy issued his opinion on ingress-egress. The opinion held that the Act of June 4, 1897, did provide "actual settlers" with a statutory right of access across National Forest lands to reach their property, but this right did not apply to others than "actual settlers". The Attorney General also held that except as to "actual settlers" the Secretary had discretionary authority to condition the grant of a right to use existing roads or to construct new roads on National Forest lands on the grant of a reciprocal right to the United States by the applicant.

March 1962 The Forest Service instructed its field organization to comply, insofar as possible, with the intent of the Attorney General's opinion pending development of regulations and instructions.

May 1962 Arrangements were made with the Department of Interior to utilize the authority of that Department contained in the Act of March 8, 1899, for issuance of permanent easements across National Forest lands reserved from the public domain. These easements were to be granted to applicants who agreed to share in the cost of a road to serve their lands and Government lands and who granted easements to the Government for segments of the road on private lands. The Department of Interior easements substituted for permits or *Stipulations Governing Exercise of Ingress and Egress Rights* which had been issued to the private landowner who cooperated in a joint road prior to the Attorney General's opinion.

August 1962 A first draft of proposed access regulations was widely circulated for review.

October 23, 1962 Interim regulations were adopted and issued to permit continued cooperation in building and using joint roads until comprehensive regulations could be issued. These regulations authorized approval of applications for 1899 Act easements in accordance with the arrangements with the Department of Interior.

November 9, 1962 The Forest Service met with NLMA representatives to discuss the proposed comprehensive regulations and the interim cooperative program regulations of October 23, 1962.

January 10, 1963: The Department submitted a new draft of easement-granting legislation to the Congress. The new bill (S. 1147) differed materially from previous proposals. It did not include as part of the easement-granting provision the authority to condition the grant on a reciprocal grant of access by the applicant. The Attorney General had said the Department already had this discretionary authority.

Neither did the draft bill include authority to recover a share of the cost of a Forest Service road from commercial users who had not already shared proportionately in the cost of the road. The Comptroller General had ruled in a series of three Decisions dated December 19, 1960, July 3, 1961, and March 2, 1962, that recovery of a share of road costs is not to be regarded as an exaction of a toll barred under the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 301. Therefore, there was no need for legislation giving this authority to the Department.

March 18, 1963: A redraft of the proposed regulations was circulated together with a notice of a hearing. The redrafted regulations and notice of hearing went to over 100 Members of Congress as well as the industry people, conservation organization and individuals who had received the earlier draft.

April 1963: Assistant Secretary John A. Baker conducted a public hearing on the proposed regulations in Washington, D.C. and another was held in Portland, Oregon. Industry representatives criticized the proposed regulations. Conservation organizations spoke in favor of the regulations.

June 10, 1963: After further discussions with Members of Congress, industry people and conservation organizations following the April hearings, Secretary Freeman approved the National Forest access regulations and they were published in the Federal Register (36 C.F.R. 212.7–11).

June–July 1963 The Senate Subcommittee on Roads of the Public Works Committee held hearings on S. 1147 on June 11 and July 31. Industry representatives testified in favor of the easement-granting provision of the bill but offered several amendments which would substantially modify the effect of the Attorney General's opinion and require changes in the access policies enunciated in the June 10, 1963, regulations. The Department opposed the industry amendments as did the conservation organizations.

1964 On July 8, 1964, the Senate Public Works Committee favorably reported S. 1147 with an amendment clarifying the financing of maximum economy roads. The industry amendments to the easement-granting section of the bill were not adopted. The House Committee on Public Works reported out the Senate-passed S. 1147 on September 30, 1964. The bill was passed without further amendment and become a Public Law 88–657 on October 13, 1964 (78 Stat. 1029, 16 U.S.C. 533–539). Basically, the Act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to issue easements for roads and to provide for construction, operation and maintenance of a system of maximum economy roads serving the National Forests and adjacent and intermingled lands.

November 30, 1964 The House Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works held hearings in San Francisco on November 30 and December 2, 1964, on issues raised by industry in the hearings on the easement bill. The Subcommittee viewed some road systems in Northern California.

April 12, 1965 The Secretary issued revised access regulations (36 C.F. 212.1–212.12). The revised regulations were developed in consultation with a National Forest Products Association (NFPA, formerly National Lumber Manufacturers Association) Committee representing most industrial forest landowners who own lands within or adjacent to the National Forests. The proposed revisions were reviewed and discussed with other interested individuals and groups including the conservation organizations.

Revision of the regulations was primarily to incorporate the new easement-granting authority into the procedures for meeting the access needs of Government and owners of intermingled and adjacent private lands. The revised regulations also provide for replacement of prior right-of-way grants (permits and Department of Interior easements) with Department of Agriculture easements, and for granting easements to public road agencies for roads not part of the Federal-Aid System.

May 1965 Agreement was reached with the industry committee, with whom the Forest Service had worked on revising the regulations, on the form of easement to be granted a cooperating party across National Forest lands, and the form of easement a Cooperator would grant the United States across his lands. Granting of easements in the agreed form results in each party's having a uniform interest in the entire road or road system which is cooperatively built.

January 1966 Forest Service Manual instructions for developing cooperative road construction and use agreements and for granting rights-of-way for roads were issued. The Forest Service Manual references for these instructions are FSM 5467 and 2730.

May 1966 Substantial agreement was reached with the industry committee on a standard form of agreement to serve as a pattern for cooperative road construction undertakings by the Forest Service and private parties. When put into use, the standard form of agreement should make it easier to reach agreement on new proposals for cooperative development.

---

APRIL 28, 1966.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Roads,*
*Committee on Public Works,*
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: This is in response to your request of April 15, 1966, for comments on issues raised before the committee at the San Francisco hearings November 30 and December 2, 1964. You also asked for an explanation of Forest Service policies and their evolution since January 1962 and the considerations supporting present policies on certain matters which are then listed in your letter.

To provide background for our comments and to establish the chronology of important events bearing on the present situation with respect to access to intermingled National Forest and private lands, a brief digest of these events and dates will be helpful.

February 1, 1962. In response to a request from the Secretary of Agriculture, the Attorney General issued an opinion which held

that the Act of June 4, 1897 (National Forest Organic Act) did provide "actual settlers" with a statutory right of access across National Forest lands to reach their property, but this right did not apply to others than "actual settlers." The Attorney General also held that except as to "actual settlers" the Secretary had discretionary authority to condition the grant of a right to use existing roads or to construct new roads on National Forests on the grant of a reciprocal right to the United States by the applicant.

March 1962. The Forest Service instructed its field organizations to, insofar as possible, comply with the intent of the Attorney General's Opinion pending development of regulations and instructions.

October 23, 1962. The Secretary issued a regulation to permit continuance of cooperation in developing and using road systems during the interim before comprehensive regulations could be issued.

June 10, 1963. The Secretary of Agriculture issued comprehensive regulations for administration of the forest development transportation system (36 CFR 212.1–212.11). Issuance followed extensive consultations with members of the Congress, industry representatives, representatives of National Forest user groups, and conservation organizations. Assistant Secretary John A. Baker conducted a public hearing on the proposed regulations in Washington, D.C. and another was held in Portland, Oregon during April 1963.

October 13, 1964. S. 1147, the so-called easement bill was enacted (78 Stat. 1089, 16 USC 533–539). The act authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to issue easements for roads and to provide for a system of maximum economy roads serving National Forest and adjacent lands.

April 12, 1965. The Secretary issued revised road regulations (36 CFR 212.1–212.12). The revised regulations were developed in consultation with a committee representing most industrial forest landowners who own lands within or adjacent to the National Forests. The proposed revisions were reviewed and discussed with other interested individuals and groups including the conservation organizations.

May 1965. Agreement was reached with the industry committee with whom we had worked on revising the regulations, on the form of easement the Department of Agriculture would grant to a cooperating party across National Forest lands, and the form of easement a cooperator would grant the United States across his lands. Granting of easements in the agreed form by the United States and the cooperator results in each party's having a uniform ownership interest in the entire road or road system which is cooperatively built.

January 1966. Forest Service Manual instructions for developing cooperative road construction and use agreements and for granting rights-of-way for roads were issued. The Forest Service Manual references for these instructions are FSM 5467 and FSM 2730.

April 1966. Substantial agreement was reached with the industry committee on a standard form of cooperative agreement to serve as a pattern for cooperative road construction undertakings by the Forest Service and private parties. When accepted and put into use, the standard form of agreement should make it easier to reach agreement on new proposals for cooperative development.

The listed items in your letter accurately identify the principal issues raised before the committee at the San Francisco hearings. Our comments and answers on each item follow:

"1. The availability to a private landowner of opportunity to cross national forest for access to his own lands promptly after request therefor."

Forest Service policy is to act promptly on applications to construct and use roads across National Forest lands. Every effort is made to meet the construction or resource development and utilization schedules of applicants consistent with the need to thoroughly study the impact of the applicant's request on National Forest programs and its relation to the public interest. This policy is elaborated on in the answers to your questions under this item.

"A. What conditions, if any, have been or are imposed on the granting of prompt access across national forest lands?"

The only condition for granting access is that the proposed road be on a location and constructed to such specifications as to protect National Forest values and not cause damage to adjacent National Forest lands or resources.

The type of right-of-way grant—whether an easement or permit—will depend on whether the applicant wishes to build and use the road in cooperation with the Government or prefers to forego cooperation. To be granted an easement, the applicant must meet the twin requirements set forth in the regulations (36 CFR 212.10(d)(1)). He must provide appropriate easements to the United States over his lands and have borne or arranged to bear his proportionate share of the cost of the road or road system involved.

Time is required to negotiate the exchange of easements and cost-sharing arrangements for joint roads. However, exchange of information on road development plans between landowners and local Forest Service officials should provide sufficient lead time to work out the details of cooperation soon enough to avoid delay in constructing the road. When there is not sufficient time to complete negotiations on cost sharing and to exchange easements, but there is general agreement on cooperative development, the Forest Service will issue a permit which provides that if the road construction on the permit is later included in a cooperative agreement for joint construction, the applicant's construction costs will be treated as incurred under the agreement. When final agreement is reached, the permit will be replaced by an easement.

In some cases, an applicant may prefer to forego cooperation, or is unwilling to meet the requirements for obtaining an easement. He will be issued a permit provided the proposed road meets the basic requirement of location and specifications mentioned above, but this permit will retain the right of the United States to use the road so constructed.

"B. What procedure is used to assure that specifications of a road or of standards of construction where the Forest Service thinks these should be prescribed are not long delayed."

Whether the road is to be a cooperative road or not, the location and specifications for the road must be decided on and incorporated in the right-of-way grant. To redeem its responsibilities for administering the National Forests, the Forest Service must approve the location and specifications of the road before it is constructed. Likewise, the applicant needs to know that the location and specifications of the road he proposes to build are approved before he makes his investment.

A road which is to be cooperatively built and used must be located and built to a standard which will serve the needs to both parties. Agreement on these points is negotiated as one of the first steps in developing a cooperative agreement.

An applicant who prefers to build a road independently, or is unwilling to meet the requirements for grant of an easement will be issued a permit. The only requirements are those of location and specifications given in the first paragraph under A above, since the road is constructed to serve only his needs. To assure prompt action, Forest Service field representatives have been instructed on ways to avoid delays in acting on permit applications. Excerpts from the Forest Service Manual will indicate the direction given.

"FSM 2733.2 . . . For major projects, the details of the proposal should normally be provided in more than one stage. It would be unreasonable to require the applicant to survey and design an expensive road before a tentative decision on the permit is made. Verbal discussions which will develop the principal facts and indicate the steps needed to perfect the application will usually be desirable. As early as possible, the applicant needs to be told whether a permit will be granted. He needs to know the form of permit he will receive and the limitations on the specifications and location of the road before he incurs substantial expense in location, survey, and design work . . . ."

"FSM 2733.3. Plans and specifications for the road to be constructed will be included in every permit either as an attachment or by reference to plans and specifications on file with the Forest Service. The plans and specifications must provide for prevention of soil erosion and stream damage during and after construction.

"Higher standard roads require more detailed plans and specifications than low standard roads. For very low standard roads, short logging spurs and skid trails, form specifications prepared for use Region-wide or Forest-wide may be used. In these cases, a simple plat or sketch can be used to show the location.

"The applicant should do the work needed for preparation of plans and specifications. In the simplest cases, this may be only a "tag line" location on the ground and the supplying of a simple map which shows this location. For major projects, he may be required to make a complete survey and design including design of structures such as bridges, which will then be incorporated in the permit. Often, it is desirable for a forest officer to participate in the location work, especially when location is a critical factor and the applicant is not experienced in this work."

"C. Is there any reason why prompt access across national Forest lands should not be available as a matter of general policy?"

As a matter of Forest Service practice and policy, prompt access across National Forest lands is provided to those who need it to reach their own lands.

"D. If prompt access were required to be given as a matter of law, would the United States be in any way substantially inhibited from obtaining access it needs in view of its power of eminent domain?"

The regulations of the Secretary and the policy and practice of the Forest Service under these regulations provide for granting prompt access. The grant of an easement is conditioned on the applicant agreeing to provide reciprocal access to the United States and bearing a proportionate share of the cost of the road. Where the negotiations leading to grant of an easement will take more time than is available, provision is made for the applicant to have immediate access pending development of final agreement.

Access is provided by permit when the requirements for obtaining an easement are not met.

We believe these provisions for granting access are working quite well. They are designed to encourage cooperative development of roads in an intermingled landownership pattern while at the same time providing prompt access.

The effect of providing a statutory right of access across National Forest lands would

depend on wording of the law. We think existing legislation, the present access regulations and the policies and procedures the Forest Service has developed in consultation with representatives of private landowners now provide a fair and workable means for meeting the access needs of all parties. They should be given a fair trial.

"2. The circumstances, if any, in which an owner of private land requiring access across national forest land can recover any share of his investment in the road built by him if use by the government is planned or is subsequently made."

The arrangements under which the Government will share in the cost of a road a private landowner builds across National Forest land have been discussed. The answers to the questions under this item elaborate further on these arrangements.

"A. Are there any reasons why the government should not agree to share in the costs of a road built on national forest lands if the government or its permittees subsequently make use of the road?"

The Government does agree to share costs of a road to be built on National Forest land when the road is on a location and will be built to a standard that will serve the Government's needs and the needs of the private owner, and the private owner makes available to the Government access across his lands or over his roads needed to make the road useful to the Government. The Government shares in the cost of the entire road.

"B. Are any arrangements being made currently to assure that the private landowner who has built a road at private expense on national forest lands at some time in the past can recover any share of the cost of such road when it is utilized by recreational or public traffic or for removal of government timber?"

Unless the permit or other instrument under which the private landowner built the road provides for recovery of a share of the cost from Government users, there is no authority to later provide for recovery of a share of the costs.

Presently, as in the past, the Forest Service seeks cooperation with private landowners in building a road to serve his lands and the National Forest land. Under these arrangements, the Government bears a proportionate share of the cost of the whole road, both on the private land and National Forest land. It is true that in some cases the private owner has chosen not to cooperate in a joint road. He has been issued a permit which retains for the Government a right to use the road constructed on the permit. If the Government later acquires an interest in the intervening road segments on the private land, it pays for such interest. No compensation is paid for segments on National Forest land. The Government cannot pay for something it already owns.

"C. Can a private landowner with a continuing need to cross national forest lands on a road built at private expense and under a special use permit now obtain a permanent easement in place of his permit, without the grant of any more or additional consideration than his construction of the original improvement? If not, what policy considerations justify Forest Service refusal to issue an easement in such circumstances?"

If the road were constructed under cooperative arrangements whereby the Government received the access it needed, and the cost of the whole road were shared proportionately, the permit will be replaced with an easement.

Likewise, if the segment of road under permit is later included in a cooperative arrangement whereby the Government receives the interest it needs in the segments of road on private land, and the cost of the road is shared proportionately, the permit will be replaced by an easement.

In both situations described above, no additional consideration is required for the easement. The Government has paid, or will pay, for the interest it acquires in the private segments.

There are some cases where the Government does not need any access from the private landowner in order to use the road built under the permit. The regulations provide (36 CFR 212.10(d)(2)) that an easement may be granted to replace his permit. Generally, an easement will be granted to an applicant to replace the permit in these cases if the road is a permanent part of his transportation system, represents a substantial investment, and his use is a continuing use and is a substantial proportion of the total use of the road. Many holders of permits will probably consider that the permit meets their needs for the future as it has in the past.

"3. Limitations, if any, upon the extent of value required from a private landowner as a condition to the grant to him of requested rights-of-way across national forest lands?"

One of the two conditions for grant of an easement is that the applicant provide the Government with appropriate easements over his lands or roads for the road or road system concerned. The value of the interests he conveys is balanced against the value of the interests he receives from the Government. Any excess in value conveyed to the Government is paid from appropriated funds as part of the consideration for the easement conveyed to the Government, or by a collection right against haulers of National Forest products, or by offsetting construction by the Government of additional roads needed by both parties.

Seldom will the value of the access needed by the Government be balanced exactly by the value of access it grants. The only limitation on the value of the reciprocal grant required of the applicant is that the reciprocal grant be associated with the road or road system of which the right-of-way applied for is a part. Regardless of the value of the reciprocal grant required of the applicant, he is compensated for any amount in excess of the value of the rights he receives.

There are no reciprocal access grants required as a condition for the grant of a permit to cross National Forest land.

"4. The degree of control retained over the use by others of roads on national forest lands which are made the subject of easement grants to private landowners."

The Government retains full control over use by all parties other than the grantee on roads covered by easement grants to private land owners. However, the easement grant provides that use by others will be controlled so as not to interfere unreasonably with the grantee's use or increase his maintenance costs.

Since the purpose of National Forest roads is to accommodate mixed traffic or all anticipated kinds of traffic at various times, it is essential that the Government be in a position to regulate the traffic it plans to accommodate. This does not mean the private owner of an interest in the road cannot control and be assured of the use of rights he has been granted in the road.

"5. The degree of control over roads on private lands acquired by easement exchanges and the reasons therefor."

The degree of control by the Government of segments of roads on private lands it acquires is similar to that it retains on National Forest lands. It is essential that traffic rules and control of use be applied uniformly over the entire road or road system as a unit. It would not be feasible for 1 mile of road to be operated under one set of rules and the next mile under another set of rules. The forms of easement each party will grant in cooperative undertakings (which forms have been developed in consultation with landowners) achieve the desired result.

"6. The extent to which oversized trucks are permitted to continue to operate on roads originally built as private roads for such trucks after the Forest Service acquires the use of such roads either by negotiation or by eminent domain."

This is the subject of negotiation when the acquisition is made. If the road is, or can be made, adequate to safely handle the additional Government traffic and the kind of off-highway equipment the road owner is using, usually, it is possible to leave with him a reserved right to continue use of this equipment. Many privately owned roads have been acquired leaving this right with the private owner.

If it is necessary to restrict the private owner's use of the road to standard highway equipment when he has been using off-highway equipment, he is compensated for the damage suffered, if any, as part of the purchase price. In a condemnation, the award of just compensation includes such damage.

"A. Does the Forest Service have any policy against permitting construction of roads across national forest lands for use by oversized trucks when the roads will be used to get private timber to a mill at lower cost?"

The Forest Service has no fixed policy. Requests for such construction would be acted on consistent with the facts in the particular case.

"B. Does the Forest Service have any policy against permitting construction of roads across national forest lands for use by oversized trucks when the roads may be used to get national forest timber to a mill at lower cost."

The answer to this is the same as to A above.

"7. The means, if any, being used by the Forest Service to assure that the costs of constructing multiple-use roads are not borne entirely by the single use of timber harvesting, particularly with the respect to roads constructed in connection with timber sales."

The Secretary's Regulations (36 CFR 212.12) provide that the purchaser of National Forest timber shall not be required to bear that part of the cost of a road in excess of the cost of the road needed to harvest the timber he has purchased. Forest Service timber sale appraisals contain an allowance for the purchaser to construct the road that is prudent for that sale. Where roads are to be constructed to a higher standard than that needed in harvesting or removing products covered by that particular sale, the purchaser of the National Forest timber is not required to bear that part of the cost necessary to meet such higher standard. Road construction necessary to attain the road standard needed by multiple use and not essential for the timber sale is either constructed by the Forest Service, or the difference between the prudent operator road and the multiple-use road is financed from appropriated funds.

"8. How will the Forest Service react to a suggestion it build all these forest access roads."

We feel that the Federal Government should build by direct methods the bulk of the permanent roads in the system. This would include the main line multiple-purpose roads (land access roads) and the heavier construction jobs on the branch roads (land-utilization roads) and all of the recreational roads within the National Forests. Many of the timber purchasers have the capabilities and machinery to construct roads, and we think the job ahead is so big that we should take advantage of their capacity to help get this system extended.

Sincerely yours,

M. M. NELSON,
*Deputy Chief.*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, not to exceed 3 minutes, and that at the end of the 3 minutes, the voting on the pending measure begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announced that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Flordia [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announced that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 164 Leg.]

YEAS—85

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Cotton | Hart |
| Anderson | Curtis | Hartke |
| Bartlett | Dirksen | Hickenlooper |
| Bennett | Dodd | Hill |
| Bible | Dominick | Holland |
| Boggs | Eastland | Hruska |
| Brewster | Ellender | Inouye |
| Burdick | Ervin | Jackson |
| Byrd, Va. | Fannin | Javits |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Fong | Jordan, N.C. |
| Cannon | Fulbright | Kennedy, Mass. |
| Carlson | Gore | Kennedy, N.Y. |
| Church | Griffin | Kuchel |
| Clark | Gruening | Lausche |
| Cooper | Harris | Long, Mo. |
| Long, La. | Murphy | Simpson |
| Magnuson | Muskie | Smith |
| Mansfield | Nelson | Sparkman |
| McCarthy | Neuberger | Stennis |
| McGovern | Pastore | Symington |
| McIntyre | Pell | Thurmond |
| Metcalf | Prouty | Tower |
| Mondale | Proxmire | Tydings |
| Monroney | Randolph | Williams, N.J. |
| Montoya | Ribicoff | Williams, Del. |
| Morse | Robertson | Young, N. Dak. |
| Morton | Russell, S.C. | Young, Ohio |
| Moss | Saltonstall | |
| Mundt | Scott | |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allott | Hayden | Pearson |
| Bass | Jordan, Idaho | Russell, Ga. |
| Bayh | McClellan | Smathers |
| Case | McGee | Talmadge |
| Douglas | Miller | Yarborough |

So the bill (S. 3155) was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

---

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15456) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the legislative branch appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967, H.R. 15456, recommends appropriations in the amount of $214,418,213. This is an increase of $42,271,880 over the House-approved bill, but $331,550 under the estimates presented to the Congress.

The bulk of the increase over the House-passed bill represents the appropriations recommended for the operations of the Senate, $39,655,180, and for the maintenance and operation of the Senate Office Buildings and the Senate garage in the total amount of $2,587,900. These items were not considered by the House and were not included in the totals approved in the House version of the bill. Exclusive of these Senate items, the committee bill is only $28,000 above the House bill.

Referring first to the Library of Congress appropriations, the committee recommends a total of $29,974,100. This is $154,000 over the House allowance but $1,171,900 below the budget request. The committee report, commencing on page 12, explains the changes made in the bill respecting the Library of Congress and also details the recommendations item by item in the comparative table at the conclusion of the report.

Specifically, under salaries and expenses, the committee has restored the funds denied by the House for the monthly index of Russian accessions in the sum of $478,000—to be derived by transfer from funds available to the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Library officials and scholars from many States testified most forcefully in behalf of continuation of this index and the committee was persuaded that it is of sufficient value to warrant its continuation. In addition, the committee was in receipt of a communication from the Commissioner of Education, which stated:

> We believe abandonment of this well established bibliographic activity under the Library of Congress would constitute a major setback for researchers and for the development of specialists in Soviet affairs.

The committee has concurred in the House allowance of $585,000 to finance the next steps in the Library's automation program and $880,000 for the rental of additional space to accommodate the growing collections of the Library.

For the Legislative Reference Service, the committee recommends $2,938,000, which is an increase of $86,000 over the House allowance. This additional sum will provide 12 more employees over the 23 new positions allowed by the House. The workload of the Reference Service continues to increase, as evidenced by a 22-percent increase in calendar 1965 over the previous year, and if the Service is to furnish prompt and efficient service, the additional employees are unquestionably necessary.

Under "Distribution of Catalog Cards," the committee has approved $28,000 above the House allowance. These funds represent the printing costs associated with the production of the Monthly Index of Russian Accessions, referred to earlier. In addition, the funds allowed for this item, $4,564,000, will finance 39 additional employees which are needed to handle the mounting workload.

For the foreign currency program of the Library, collection and distribution of Library materials, the committee recommends $2,088,000 for payments in Treasury-owned foreign currencies and $180,000 in U.S. dollars. This is an increase of $40,000 in foreign currencies only, over the House bill. The Library had requested funds to expand this program to five more countries—Poland, Yugoslavia, Tunisia, Guinea, and Ceylon. The House included Poland and Yugoslavia in its version of the bill, a program which the Senate had advanced for the past 2 years. The committee is pleased to concur with the House in these two extensions and has, also, in the report recommended the institution of a partial program in Ceylon. Library officials stated this could be administered from the existing post in India at a cost of only $40,000 in excess foreign currencies.

The committee also inserted a provision in the bill which will authorize the storage and transportation of household goods for Library personnel stationed abroad and per diem for families enroute, in addition to the currently authorized health services program and for the purchase or hire of passenger vehicles for overseas offices inserted by the House.

The overall appropriations recommended for the Government Printing

Office total $42,655,900—$21,500,000 for printing and binding operations, $6,155,-900 for the Office of the Superintendent of Documents, and $15 million for the Government Printing Office revolving fund. These represent an increase of $16,326,900 over the 1966 appropriations and a decrease of $5 million below the budget estimates.

It is understandable that there is difficulty in estimating with complete accuracy the printing and binding requirements of the Congress for the new fiscal year and that under the accounting procedures in effect it is necessary to provide additional funds to meet deficits for prior year charges. In this bill, the recommendation of $21,500,000 includes the workload estimate for fiscal year 1967 in the amount of $18,500,000, and $3 million to cover the deficit for fiscal year 1965 expenditures billed through January 31, 1966.

The primary activity of the Office of the Superintendent of Documents is the sale of Government publications, which for fiscal year 1965 amounted to $14,-389,428, an increase of 15 percent over fiscal 1964. As indicated in the tabulation on page 3 of the report, income realized from these sales in fiscal 1965—returnable to the U.S. Treasury—amounted to $7,404,294, and it is estimated for fiscal year 1967 the return to the Treasury will increase still further to approximately $7,600,000. The committee concurs in the appropriation of the House for this item in the amount of $6,155,900.

The committee also is in agreement with the House allowance of $15 million to provide additional working capital for the Government Printing Office. The last increase in the revolving fund was authorized in December of 1963, and the balances of accounts receivable, finished work in process, and so forth, have increased 26 percent since that time.

The committee has included language in the report expressing dissatisfaction with the response of the Government Printing Office to its directive in last year's report to furnish complete figures as to printing costs by congressional committees and other ordering sources. I call attention to the language on page 15 of the present report, and reiterate most strongly the committee's expectation that the instructions cited therein be complied with.

With respect to the proposed new Government Printing Office plant, the budget had initially requested $46,663,000 for construction purposes. But in view of the controversy over a site during the past several months, officials of the Printing Office withdrew their request for funds in the current bill pending a decision on site location. The House committee, faced with a similar request, acceded and, additionally, inserted language rescinding balances of appropriations already enacted. Consequently, there are no funds in this bill for the construction, or planning therefor, of a new printing plant.

The committee recommends appropriations for the Architect of the Capitol in the amount of $14,772,900. The largest single increase over the House bill is $2,530,000 for the operation of the Senate Office Buildings. The committee has complied with a request from the Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings and has included in the bill $10,000 over and above the regular annual amount for the replacement of rugs, cushions, and floor coverings in suites in the New Senate Office Building. The rugs and floor coverings presently in the building have been in use for 7 years and the point has been reached where a gradual replacement program is necessary.

An additional $9,000 has been included in the bill by the committee to provide two end table lamps for each Senator's suite.

Under the appropriation head Capitol Grounds, the committee has provided an additional $5,400 to finance one additional gardener position over the two additional gardeners allowed by the House bill. The committee expects that efforts will be intensified to beautify the grounds and to maintain them in line with the improvement program which has been underway for several years.

For Library building and grounds, structural, and mechanical care, the committee has reduced the House bill by $125,000. This sum was requested for the purpose of installing a new elevator on the east side of the Annex to the Library of Congress. While it may be desirable to add this elevator to the building, the committee felt that it was an item which is not urgent and which can be deferred at the present time.

With reference to the extension of the west central front of the Capitol, I direct the attention of Senators to pages 10, 11, and 12 of the committee report, where a detailed explanation has been made of the committee action. You will also find, on page 24 of the bill, the proviso which has been recommended by the committee and which reads as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for administrative or any other expenses in connection with the plans referred to as schemes 1, 2, and 3 for the extension of the west central front of the Capitol.

The prohibition included in the bill by the committee would preclude the payment of salaries or other expenses for any of the employees working on schemes 1, 2, and 3 for the extension of the west central front. Schemes 1 and 2 would extend the center portion of the Capitol 44 feet, the old Senate and House wings would be extended 88 feet, and the connecting corridors would be extended 56 feet. Under scheme 3, the center portion would be extended 32 feet, the old Senate and House wings 76 feet, and the connecting corridors would be extended 56 feet. The committee is strongly opposed to any of these schemes. It is of the opinion that the Architect of the Capitol should obtain an independent estimate of the cost of restoring the present structure. In the report, the committee recommends that specific interested professional organizations be given an opportunity to study and make recommendations on this matter. These organizations could include, without limiting it to them alone, the American Institute of Architects, the American Institute of Planners, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the Associated General Contractors. The committee understands that with the cooperation of the Architect of the Capitol in providing already gathered statistics and information, representatives from these groups would need less than a week to complete such a study.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have a little statement that I wish to make, but I wish to commend the Senator for his work on the committee report. At this time, I would simply say this, that the committee felt unanimously, with the information and statistics already available that the distinguished American Institute of Architects, the American Institute of Planners, and so forth, could make a judgment on the subject of the extension of the west front of the Capitol. In other words, we did not believe that there was any money necessary for further statistical reference planning, that statistical reference planning was available to make a judgment on what we now have in our possession.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is our understanding that the money appropriated by the last Congress to investigate the need to reinforce the foundations of the two buildings and secure the west wall, had been done by an engineering firm. The foundations were carefully studied and the data is available in the Architect's office. Interpretations and reports on the findings resulting from the engineering study are, I think, the matter at issue. They should be carefully considered by the representatives of these distinguished groups which have been mentioned in the committee report, who are concerned with the final recommendations that Congress would undoubtedly receive on going forward with the work, either on the present outline of the west front or on a new one, if it is found necessary so to do.

The committee recognizes that a serious problem does exist in connection with the west wall of the Capitol, but the Architect of the Capitol has already assured the committee that the temporary wood shoring which has been put in place will be of benefit for at least 5 years. The committee believes that there is time for additional study and design planning which will allow for the preservation of the historic architectural design of the central section of the Capitol without adding 4½ acres of floor space.

The Commission for the Extension of the Capitol has been told by the Architect of the Capitol that the proposed scheme would cost $34 million. The committee is concerned that this estimate is far too low. Experience has taught the Members of Congress that constructions supervised by the Architect of the Capitol have usually ended up costing considerably more than the early esimates. This is not the year for Congress to launch a building project of this

magnitude, in the opinion of the committee, and a safe, beautiful new west front of the Capitol can be provided, it was assured, without adding a grandiose bulge to the middle of this historic structure.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have listened for the past 2 weeks to the mounting hysteria that is among us concerning the proposed rebuilding and extension of the west front of the Capitol Building. It seems that everyone wants to get in the act now and each new spokesman tries to outdo the ones who went before in bewailing the dire consequences of changing one least detail of the Capitol Building. The local press has rushed into print with editorials and articles and the press out across the land seems largely to have followed this lead. Those who oppose the change have adopted every possible argument that could be seized upon. Some base their opposition on the fact that the man who holds the title of Architect of the Capitol is not indeed a professional architect. Others claim they are opposed because the extension was ordered by a small cabal composed of the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of each of the political parties in both the Senate and the House. And so it has gone.

I want to raise my voice as one who does not see the crumbling of our Republic in the "sinister proposal" that the Capitol Building be enlarged. I remember well the hue and cry that went up when the east front of the Capitol was extended. There were the same wails of anguish then, and even today, some of the wails have not subsided. Some still mourn the fact that the identical painted walls of the old Capitol are not now visible from the outside of the building. Of course, the paint that these persons so revered and found so steeped in history had been placed on the walls perhaps 2 or 3 years ago and covered up the point that antedated this coat by another 2 or 3 years, and so ad infinitum. But, nevertheless, it seems to them a great loss.

For my part, I find the appearance of the Capitol Building on the east front most pleasing. I find that the same lines and architectural appearance exist as did before the last construction. The walls are now a beautiful marble, the columns on the east portico are of marble, and the whole appearance of the building is enhanced and improved. Moreover, I defy anyone who is not an expert on the Capitol Building, or a resident who has exerted unusual inquisitive powers of examination to distinguish that the building has been changed. To the vast body of Americans who have come to know the Capitol Building only through photographs and post cards, I would venture to guess that not one in a million would know that there had been a change after the extension of the east front. But those of us who see it every day know that there has been a change and that for the better. The appearance is superior and the additional space provided internally is useful in the building. Of course, there are many who decry the expenditure of moneys to accomplish the extension of the building, and I believe we ought to check to the maximum degree we can the expenditure of funds on a public building. However, the Capitol Building is not only the most noted symbol of our Republic, but it is also a working building in which a part of this great Government carries on its functions. As such, I think it should be of prime materials, be handsome in appearance, and be suited to the uses of the Congress whose duties are performed within its walls. And on that basis, I do not think the funds expended for the improvement and enlargement of the east front were extravagantly spent or wasted in any sense.

The situation regarding the west front of the building, is that the old sandstone walls are crumbling and must be even now be shored up with girders from the outside. Because of the great age of the building stone and the ravages of time, something must be done to make secure the western wall. Since this event must come shortly, we are then confronted with the alternative of whether to try simply to shore up the old walls, or whether there should be some rebuilding of the west front with an extension in space to make available needed rooms for the utilization of the Congress and for the ever-increasing flood of visitors who come to the Nation's Capital to see its great buildings and to see the Nation's Government in action. Within the extension of the west front, it is proposed that there be additional dining rooms which are certainly needed now, and that there be conference rooms or an auditorium and some additional offices. Of course, it is possible to argue on the exact amount of space that is needed, but here again, we are dealing with a great building that houses the Congress and which must serve the Congress not only in 1966 or 1976, but should be a functioning building for the peoples' representatives in the year 2076 and beyond. Since it is a time when change is dictated by the deterioration of the wall, the better part of wisdom would be to look ahead and build for the years to come rather than to take the least course and be required to come again with an expensive operation in another 5 years or 10 years on the west front wall.

I confess that I have no detailed information on the proposed extension. But if it is carried out in the same manner that the extension was made on the east front, I have no fears because I know that the Capitol Building after the extension has been made will have the general appearance that it has now, and that still our people will see in their post card pictures and, indeed, when they come to view with their own eyes, the Capitol Building that they have come to recognize from pictures and visits in years past. I have confidence that the construction would not alter the appearance of the building except for those who are practiced and have a basis for comparison other than a layman's observation of the building in years past. And I have confidence that the internal improvements will be for the benefit of the Congress which must continue to use the Capitol. It has been well pointed out that the Capitol Building is not a museum or a monument to be preserved as such, but that it is a working building to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed. Our Founding Fathers understood this, and those who have served in the Government of the United States through the years have known this. And on this knowledge, the building has undergone many changes. After all, the great Capitol dome that is so memorable for us all, is not an original part of the building, and neither the Senate or House wings, including the chambers therein, part of the original building. And, of course, the east front is changed and is not original. And so we might go from place to place—the building has had to grow with the Republic, and it should still grow. In fact, there might be something symbolic in that observation because if our Republic has become static and encrusted in rigid forms, then indeed have we departed from the hopes of our founders and those who have nourished this great changing Nation through the years. I believe that we are still changing. Certainly we are growing in size and in economic power in this country. I think change is our heritage and I think change must be accepted and guided for the best interests of all of the people.

I plead therefore, for a sensible and restrained discussion concerning the west front and an abandonment of this great hue and cry against the proposal that has been made concerning the building.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Utah has said. The position of the committee is that before we spend a great deal of money, let us find out whether strengthened foundations and walls can be installed to retain the present lines of the Capitol, rather than be told, as a fait accompli, that the design is ready, and that we must extend the Capitol 84 feet westward, at a considerable expenditure of money.

The Senate has not allowed a sufficient investigation to be made by experienced and qualified architects as to what the situation really is and what is involved. We know that something must be done, but we feel, in view of modern engineering techniques, that the foundations and walls can be replaced with modern structures very close to the proximity of the present outer wall.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I submit to the distinguished Senator that what are described as schemes 1, 2, and 3, have been in existence for some time, have been examined, and are subject to examination. Certainly, there has been long discussion of the fact that it is necessary to shore up the west wall with beams. There has been discussion on it. What is now proposed in the appropriation bill is a step backward by cutting off moneys when

actually we could begin with the reconstruction of the west wall. I think, since it must be reconstructed in some manner, and everyone recognizes it, the desirable thing is to proceed with consideration of the proposal of extension, which does not alter the general outline of the Capitol.

Models of the proposed extension have been prepared. As a matter of fact, one appeared in this morning's press, and one has to look very closely to see that it is not the same as the Capitol now appears.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that there is no money provided in the bill before the Senate, or in the bill as it came from the House. If we gave the "go-ahead" to one of these schemes, and provided for the $34 million, later the request would be made in a deficiency bill, with very little opportunity for consideration of the matter.

It is my understanding that now, under the leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma, we have said we will take this time and get a better understanding of the problem by distinguished architects, and then the proposal could be considered next year, so there could be an adequate opportunity for hearings and a real discussion of it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for one additional comment, the language of the bill as proposed prohibits the use of any appropriation for administrative or any other expenses in connection with the plans designated as schemes 1, 2, or 3, for extension of the west front of the Capitol.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the plans were approved, the west front might be extended for 50 feet or more. We do not want that to happen beyond the limits necessary for a solid structure and until we have enough information with respect to what our illustrious Architect has proposed.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield now to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I am thoroughly and completely in accord with the remarks of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. I think it is a sane prescription for what is needed. There seems to be a contagious hysteria in viewing any change as undesirable. We all recognize that repairs must be made. While we are at it, I think it is well to consider enlargement of the Capitol. But this seems to be a "touch me not" subject, as though it were horrible to consider any change.

As the Senator from Utah has said, change is the essence of life in this country. This is a working building, not a monument. I am sure when all aspects of the problem are considered, the position the Senator from Utah has taken will be found to be a proper one.

---

## THE CIA

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, on Monday, July 18, carried an editorial entitled "Brickbats for FULBRIGHT." The text of the editorial runs as follows:

> Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT has been given his come-uppance by the Senate.
>
> The Senate resoundingly defeated the Fulbright move to put the Central Intelligence Agency partly under his Foreign Relations Committee. The crafty Arkansan had sought to take away some of the jurisdiction of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, whose ranking members have exclusive supervision of CIA.
>
> After a heated debate in an extraordinary closed session, the Senate voted 61 to 28 to send the Fulbright resolution to the Senate Armed Services Committee, chairmaned by Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, who sharply attacked FULBRIGHT's attempt to "muscle into" responsibilities of the Armed Services Committee. This was tantamount to killing the resolution.
>
> FULBRIGHT's proposal should have been doomed from the start. It could mean the end of the CIA if the agency were subjected to claws of the militant doves on FULBRIGHT's committee. The resolution should never have been offered.
>
> The CIA has long been one of our most valuable agencies in foreign affairs. Its accomplishments are legion. The Senate properly rebuked Senator FULBRIGHT and gave the CIA a sound vote of confidence.

I shall not take issue, particularly, with the editorial itself. I suppose it is within the limits of irresponsibility which must be allowed on editorial pages. Whether or not the Senator from Arkansas was "crafty" in this respect or in others, I suppose, could be left to the judgment of the editor. The question of whether or not we had any business bringing up this question and the matter of whether or not we are "muscling in" or seeking to take away anything from the Armed Services Committee was discussed fully, I think, and need not be taken up again at this time.

What moves me to take the floor, Mr. President, is a letter printed in the July 27, 1966, issue of the Globe-Democrat, sent to the editor by Richard Helms, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The letter reads as follows:

> *To the Editors:*
>
> I want to let you know of my pleasure in reading the editorial "Brickbats for FULBRIGHT" in The Globe-Democrat of July 18.
>
> It reflects so well your paper's policy of "printing the news impartially, supporting what it believes to be right and opposing what it believes to be wrong without regard to party politics."
>
> RICHARD HELMS,
> *Director,*
> *Central Intelligence Agency.*
>
> WASHINGTON, D.C.

It may well be that Mr. Helms had someone on his staff check all the papers and write an approving letter to anyone who had written an editorial which he thought was favorable to the Central Intelligence Agency. But I suggest that it was entirely out of place for him to have done that, in any case, and particularly to sign his name to a letter regarding an editorial which charges the Senator from Arkansas with being "crafty," and which attempts to tell us what we should take up or should not take up in the Senate, and to explain the meaning of the debate.

In the course of the recent debate on this Agency, we were told that the CIA does not involve itself in domestic politics. I suggest that this is a new departure. If we permit the Director of that Agency to take this action unchallenged by the Senate, it may well be that in every campaign hereafter, people will turn up with letters from the Central Intelligence Agency saying, "We think Senator So and So is crafty," or "He proposes to try to destroy the CIA, to destroy this great Agency."

The Director would not have to write directly to the candidate. He could do it just by endorsing editorials, so that those who campaign would be faced with their opponents going around with an editorial and saying, "Here is a letter from the Central Intelligence Agency endorsing that editorial."

I suggest that such action by the head of this Agency, which depends upon funds from some appropriation—how the money is appropriated is immaterial—is entirely out of order; and we ought to request assurance from the writer of this letter that this policy will be discontinued.

Furthermore, I believe he owes an apology, not just to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas, but to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was surprised to hear for the first time on the floor this afternoon that the Director of the CIA had seen fit to write a letter to a newspaper commenting on an editorial which had to do with the business of the Senate.

The issue, I think, was pretty clear as far as the Senators were concerned, and certainly no one here has ever accused the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as being "crafty." I think he conducted himself in an exceedingly able manner, as did the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I am more than a little surprised that the "silent service" has seen fit to write to the newspaper in question on an editorial which expressed a very personal, and I might add highly inaccurate, opinion about the Senator from Arkansas.

I think this is a matter which must be brought to the attention of Mr. Helms, so that this will not become a habit with him. I would hope that he would take cognizance of what is occurring on the floor this afternoon.

Incidentally, I was under the impression that Mr. Helms was considered to have the potential to develop into one of the best administrators of the CIA in its history. It is my understanding that he has been with the Agency from its early years; that he was considered an excellent professional; and on the basis of that reputation I for one was delighted when he was appointed. As I recall, he received the unanimous support of the Senate, and not one word of criticism was raised insofar as his appointment was concerned.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is to be commended for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate, and I hope that all Senators, regardless of party or of their stand on

the issue which was debated last week, will bear this in mind.

Incidentally, I wish to point out that today there appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a sanitized version of the proceedings held in the closed-door session of the Senate at the time this matter was discussed. Certainly there were no allegations of the kind contained in the editorial even whispered during the course of that debate, which was conducted on a very high level and with a mutual understanding of what the Senators were trying to achieve.

May I say further, the question of the CIA being involved in foreign policy is a pertinent one. No one has ever made the allegation, that I am aware of, that the CIA makes foreign policy. It has been alleged, and I think correctly, that the CIA is involved in foreign policy; and by the very nature of its operation, it cannot help but be involved in that particular field of the affairs of the Government of the United States.

But the debate was worthwhile. It helped to clear the air. I had hoped that the matter had been settled as a result of the closed session held by the Senate; but unfortunately, letters like this by the Director are bound to keep the matter simmering, and will create even more problems in the years ahead.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. May I just make one comment? I think it is especially significant that during the course of the debate, no administration position was taken opposed to the Senate considering the matter; and no one said, "The President wants this resolution debated." As far as we knew, it was the business of the Senate itself.

But here we find, after the act, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency—who supposedly is an agent of the President; that is what we were told here for close to 3 hours—writing a letter saying, "We approve; we are with you all the way."

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say that the administration, to the best of my knowledge, did not take a position on this matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It left it to the Senate to decide. And it was basically a procedural question, involving a desire on the part of the committee charged with the responsibility for foreign relations and foreign affairs to be represented in an area in which they thought—and I agreed with them—that they should be represented.

This is a most serious matter, and I hope, as I have said before, that all Senators, regardless of their personal feelings or party affiliations, would take cognizance of what has taken place.

Incidentally, the purpose was never to downgrade the CIA, but the purpose was, in effect, to safeguard it, and to maintain its security inasmuch as possible; and that thesis was carried out fully and completely during the course of the debate itself.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

May I just say, as a Senator on the other side of the aisle who took an active interest in this CIA discussion, I have just for the first time read the editorial about which the Senator from Minnesota has spoken.

Let me say that so far as I know, this matter was kept entirely free from personalities. The Senator from Arkansas and I came into this body at the same time. We were friends 22 years ago, and we are friends today. As far as I know, I have never made a personal remark against him, nor he against me.

As far as the Senator from Minnesota is concerned, my first recollection of a friendship with him was in Paris, when we were both members of a commission over there, and he was a Member of the House and I a Member of the Senate. We became friends at the time, and we have remained friends ever since.

The chairman of our committee is not present, I am sorry to say, so perhaps I cannot speak for him, but I am confident that he would agree with me that the whole question is a question of procedure, where we felt, as members of the Armed Services Committee, the chairman and the senior minority member, that this was a matter which should be referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and, by a majority vote of the Senate, it is now so referred.

I do not think there is a single word in the debate, which has now been published, concerning personalities.

It is very proper, certainly when the Senate debates a procedure, for the Senate to debate the matter because the rules of the Senate must be lived up to if the Senate is to proceed in an orderly manner.

I agree with what the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, has said concerning the CIA. I have reiterated many times that the CIA, as a fact-finding body, does provide the facts on which foreign policy is based. That procedure has been maintained, and certainly no personalities are involved in the debate at all.

I certainly hope that any future discussion will be kept entirely free from personalities.

I have not seen the letter of Helms. I have seen it referred to. I do not know how many times he thought carefully about this before he wrote the letter.

I think this is a very questionable thing. If the letter did say something about the personality of the Senator from Arkansas, I disagree entirely with it, because there are no more upright Members of the Senate than the two gentlemen who took the lead in bringing the matter to a head.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the distinguished majority leader.

I am not only disturbed, but I am also somewhat shocked to learn that the Director of the CIA would write a letter endorsing the offensive and inaccurate statement made in a newspaper editorial.

I think it comes with ill grace. It certainly is an offense in itself to have the letter endorse the words of the editorial.

Still more shocking is the fact that the Director of the CIA—which supposedly is a clandestine organization and works quietly with no publicity and no public appearance—would publish a letter which, in effect, tries to capitalize on an editorial, an editorial that is so offensive and derogatory.

It appears that the CIA indeed was concerning itself with what was being done in this Chamber relating to the oversight of the activities of that organization.

I think the Director has committed a very grave offense, and I think the matter certainly must be straightened out. He may have limited, because of his action, his usefulness in the position he holds.

I believe, as does the majority leader, that the situation is most grave and must be handled effectively and at once.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, as a member of the Special Committee on the CIA, I have come to know Mr. Helms rather well. He is a very able man, and I think he will be a good Director of the CIA.

I am disappointed and shocked to learn that he would write this kind of letter. The CIA is not supposed to be in the business of publicity, and particularly publicity of this kind.

I happen to be one who believes in much of the foreign policy of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas, and denounce this criticism leveled at him. I still believe that Mr. Helms will develop into one of the best Directors of the CIA that we have had. I am sure he will admit to a serious error.

As far as foreign policy is concerned, I think the National Security Agency and the intelligence that it develops has far more to do with foreign policy than does the intelligence developed by the CIA.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I think we might accept as a partial explanation the fact that this is one of the problems we encounter when we promote career men. It is like the ancient policy of arming the slaves; it always took a little while for them to adjust to their new life.

I hope the experience will be good for the Director of the Agency. This matter of being moved up from a career rank and being given a new weapon may have been too much for him in these early days of his new position. I hope he will become adjusted, and I think he should be given another chance.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senator from Minnesota has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I am also pleased that two members of the subcommittee which has jurisdiction and supervision of the CIA are present and have expressed their disapproval of this action on the part of the new Director. I think it is very healthy that they have said what they did.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the existence of this very unfortunate letter from Mr. Helms has just been brought to my attention.

I was very much impressed with Mr. Helms' appointment. I believe that he will be an outstanding Director of this highly important Agency. He is well trained. He is a man with a good mind and has been possessed of devoted purposes over a period of many years.

It is unusual for me to write a man a letter as soon as he is nominated for his position. However, I certainly did that on this occasion. I make these remarks to show what I think of his ability and character.

I believe that Mr. Helms received bad advice indeed and that his letter is based upon that advice rather than upon his own independent judgment. If he is responsible for this letter, I think he should, and that he will, offer Senator FULBRIGHT his deepest apology.

I exceedingly regret the writing of the letter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. Three members of the subcommittee have now expressed disapproval.

I assure the Senate that my own feelings are not particularly injured by the editorial. This particular newspaper has been printing similar editorials for a number of years. There is nothing new or different or unique about the editorials. However, concerning the letter from the Director of the CIA, it is the first letter of this kind that I have ever heard of being written by any Director of the CIA. It surprises me that a career man would have so little discretion. A newly appointed man might, for a trial period, engage in this kind of activity.

I wonder if the Director has not construed the so-called vote of confidence as a removal of all restraints and the granting of the power to do as he pleases within the area of domestic activities.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to Mr. Helms a great many times. I agree with what the other Senators have said. I do not know why he wrote the letter, but I am confident, from the point of view of the investigatory abilities of the CIA, and its ability to answer difficult questions in different parts of the world, that Helms is a good man.

I hope that this situation will not arise again, and particularly that personalities will not be engaged in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, I hope that the Senator from Massachusetts and his colleagues will ask Mr. Helms if this is the only letter of this character that he has written, or whether he writes to all those who condemn the Senator from Arkansas. It will be very interesting to know whether he has written any other letters of a similar character. This is the only one that has come to our notice.

I must say, in all frankness, that I have heard rumors. One of the things I would have liked to look into, if my committee had been given the opportunity to ask Mr. Helms questions—which we do not have, except under very grave restrictions—was whether or not his Agency takes part in domestic affairs—for example, in the elections in our labor unions. I have heard these rumors, and I would like to prove or disprove them. Other rumors have come to my attention which I would like to have clarified.

I have never been willing to mention this in public before, until this demonstration of the Director's very active interest in controversial political matters that arise on the floor of the Senate. This was a controversy of a political nature.

I believe that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] was quite correct in his original purpose in seeking to bring the CIA a little more under surveillance by Congress. This is the only agency that I know of that is so immune from general supervision and public restraint. It seems to me that this letter is a most unusual action.

There is one other matter that I had not wished to make an issue of, until this matter arose. I believe that 2 weeks ago last Sunday, the former Director of the CIA, Admiral Raborn, in a "Meet the Press" program, apparently had a failure of memory. He was asked about how he had responded to a question that I had asked him. It is in the record. The record is available. It is available to members of the CIA Committee, if they wish, and I invite them to look at it. Admiral Raborn was asked about whether or not the CIA was using the exchange program—I never have mentioned this before, but this has since been publicized. I did not wish to mention it, nor did I wish to mention it on the floor, because I did not wish to raise even a suspicion that the exchange program was used as a cover, and I refrained from doing so.

But now that it has been mentioned on "Meet the Press," there is no reason for me to shy away from it anymore.

I did ask him about it. This was the beginning of my interest in this whole matter, as a matter of fact. This is why I became interested, together with the Senator from Minnesota, in what the CIA is doing. I asked Admiral Raborn that question.

He said that under the regulations—I am paraphrasing it—he was not permitted to answer such a question, and therefore there was no comment. He did not say, "No."

On "Meet the Press," in response to that question, he said, "I answered 'No.' "

I invite all of the members of the CIA Subcommittee to take a look at the formal written record, taken in executive session, and see who was telling the truth. I was astonished when it was brought to my attention that he had answered in this way.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The record will show not only what the Senator has said, but also will show that following his statement that he could not answer—he did not think he had authority to answer—he was asked whether he could have answered if he were asked this question by the oversight committee, and he said he could.

So he did not answer the question. He said he could not answer it to us, but that he could have answered if it had been asked under other circumstances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the program was "Meet the Press."

Mr. McCARTHY. It is not a great issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not have brought this subject up. I had dismissed the whole CIA from my mind, until this matter of Mr. Helms' letter.

I must say that I was shocked that a Director should go out of his way to write a letter to an editor of, I would say, a rather radical newspaper. It certainly takes a radical position on foreign policy, and is most unrestrained in its criticism of anyone who disagrees with its position, as it was in this editorial.

This is not new, but I think it requires some very severe action by the only subcommittee in the Senate that has any right or any opportunity to say anything to him.

I am delighted that four members of that subcommittee have here today expressed their views about the matter. I am encouraged that perhaps they may teach the new Director some proper conduct.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to see the Senator from Arkansas with a smile. We certainly shall try to find out the information that he seeks in this matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe we should keep our judgment open on Mr. Helms. It may be that a subordinate took it upon himself to write to everyone who had written an editorial favorable to the CIA, and it is possible that someone outside the Agency altogether might have written the letter.

Short of that, I believe the Members of this body who are charged with the responsibility should pursue the matter to see what the practice was in this case and whether there is a policy. If they discover that there is a policy, they might do something to bring it to an end.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not believe it is an appropriate policy for the Director of the CIA to comment favorably or unfavorably on any matter such as this.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree. I am trying to make a kind of excuse for him on the ground that he may not have wished to endorse this rather extreme editorial,

which is worse than if he had endorsed a moderate one.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is most unfortunate, because, to the best of my knowledge, no one came in with higher or better recommendations than did Mr. Helms. I do hope that he will not be harmed by this, and that he will learn something which will be of benefit to him and to the country.

I agree that he is a man who has good training and great ability, and who can make a contribution; but this is something which, of course, is most unfortunate.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I regret very much the letter of the Director of the CIA and the editorial about my friend, the Senator from Arkansas.

I have not always agreed with the Senator from Arkansas, just as I have not always agreed with any other Member of the Senate; because, unfortunately, I find that he, on rare occasions, and other Members of the Senate, on many occasions, have not shared the same sound views that I have entertained on all questions.

However, having served with the Senator from Arkansas in the Senate for 12 years, I have learned to admire him for the qualities of his head and to love him for the qualities of his heart. I have never known him to take a position that he did not take sincerely, and I have always been impressed by the fact that he has an unusual amount of political courage; that if his convictions on a subject happened not to coincide with the popular notions of the moment, he has the courage to stand for his convictions.

I hope that out of this matter will come an appreciation by the Director of the CIA of the great truth that men rarely regret saying too little.

Mr. MONRONEY. I join with my colleagues in expressing the great respect and confidence we all have in the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We are aware of his interest in preserving the proper civilian balance in this vast field of foreign policy. I concur heartily with all that has been said about his fine record and his distinguished service in our foreign relations activities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: I wish to assure the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in answer to his question of a few moments ago regarding Mr. Helms' writing letters to newspapers, that I talked to Mr. Helms on the telephone.

Mr. Helms assures me that is the only letter he has written, that it was a mistake, and he feels sorry about it. He has given me the authority to say that on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He did write it. A Senator mentioned a moment ago that he did not believe he could have written it. But he did write it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He did sign the letter. I think there were a great many letters he had signed at the same time, but he makes no excuse. He is sorry for the mistake. And there are no other letters written by him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for completing the record.

There was one curious thing about this letter. It endorses the newspaper for its position in stating "what it believes to be right and opposing what it believes to be wrong without regard to party politics."

I hope that Mr. Helms is not under the impression that it is a Democratic newspaper, because the word "Democrat" appears in its title. It is anything but a Democratic newspaper, and it never has been.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I take the Boston and Washington newspapers, but I do not take the St. Louis newspapers.

Mr. SYMINGTON subsequently said: Mr. President, it is with very deep regret that I learn of a letter from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency to a newspaper, in which he is critical of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

I have not always agreed with the Senator from Arkansas, but know him as a man of high character, an able and patriotic American, and I am proud to have his friendship, as he has mine.

This is a most unfortunate occurrence and one for which I hope there is some explanation.

---

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15456) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The remaining important matters in this bill relate to the Senate and its housekeeping operations.

Senators will recall that last year the Congress provided funds for 25 additional Metropolitan police officers to be detailed to assist the Capitol Police. In view of the crime situation in the District of Columbia and the recruiting difficulties encountered by the Metropolitan Police Department, it was not possible to secure all of these officers on reimbursable loan from the Metropolitan Police Department. Approximately 10 Metropolitan police officers were secured to assist the Capitol Police, but these men were working on their days off from the regular force. In view of this situation, the committee has included in the bill funds to provide for 25 additional privates, 1 additional sergeant, and 1 additional lieutenant for the Senate detail of the Capitol Police. These positions are to be filled by the Sergeant at Arms with men certified to him by the chief of police as having at least 1 year's police experience or its equivalent. A provision has been included in the bill that appointees to these positions shall have at least 1 year's police experience. These professional police officers should provide the Senate with a hard core of trained career officers for the Senate detail. The privates will be paid a salary of $6,109.89 per annum, the sergeant a salary of $8,083 per annum, and the lieutenant a salary of $9,883 per annum. To finance the salaries of these additional officers, the amount of $170,713 has been included in the bill by the committee.

The committee has inserted language in the bill providing salary adjustments for the sergeants, lieutenants and captain members of the Capitol Police force. This totals 22 positions equally divided between the Senate and House details. The adjustments recommended by the committee will bring salaries paid members of the Capitol Police closer in line with salaries paid officers of the Metropolitan Police Department. The individuals occupying these positions have served with the Capitol Police from 8 to 20 years. The salary range for a sergeant of the Metropolitan Police Department is from $8,185 to $10,105 per annum, depending upon length of service. The present salary for a sergeant of the Capitol Police force is in the range of $7,051 to $8,901 per annum. Under the committee's language, the new range in salary for a sergeant of the Capitol Police will be from $8,083 to $10,033 per annum. For lieutenants of the Metropolitan Police Department the salary range is from $10,000 to $12,000 per annum, whereas the range at the present time for a lieutenant of the Capitol Police force is from $7,788 to $9,733 per annum. Under the language proposed by the committee, the Capitol Police lieutenant's salary would range from $9,883 to $11,790 per annum. The present salary of a captain of the Metropolitan Police Department is in the range of $12,000 to $14,500 per annum, whereas the salary range for a captain of the Capitol Police force is from $9,050 to $11,032 per annum. Under the committee's proposal, the salary range for a captain on the Capitol Police force will be from $11,790 to $13,799 per annum. It is estimated that the total cost of these increases for the Capitol Police will approximate $33,900.

Language has been inserted in the bill by the committee increasing the long-distance telephone allowance for Senators from 2,400 calls per year, or 12,000 minutes, to 3,000 calls per year, or 15,000 minutes. The Senators will recall that last year the long-distance telephone allowance for Senators from the 6 States with a population of 10 million inhabitants or more was increased by 50 percent above the allowances for Senators from the other States. The committee language has accorded the same percentage increase to these larger States as the other States will receive.

For stationery allowances, the committee has continued the figure of $2,400 for each Senator with the exception of the Senators from the six larger States, and the sum for the Senators from these States has been increased to $3,000 per annum. These 6 States with a population of 10 million or more are: Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Pennsylvania, New York, and California. The committee had before it a proposal to prohibit commutation payments from the stationery account. The full committee has re-

jected this proposal. It was brought to the attention of the committee by many Senators that the cash commutation payment is used for official expenses of varied kinds which cannot be financed through the stationery room. The subcommittee, and later the full committee, made a detailed study of the stationery allowance problem. A cash commutation procedure has been in existence since February 12, 1868. However, the subcommittee and the full committee realize that the individual Senators have strong personal opinions regarding the procedure. In fact, a recommendation of the subcommittee to incorporate language that would prohibit in the future these commutation payments was rejected by the full committee. The subcommittee had proposed that language be included in the bill providing that any surplus remaining in the stationery account shall be available for reimbursement of official expenses as determined by the Committee on Rules and Administration incurred by a Senator upon presentation, not later than 30 days after the close of each fiscal year, of itemized vouchers therefor. This would have permitted the Committee on Rules and Administration to determine whether such items as home-state newspaper subscription costs, radio tapes and others, not now identified as official expenses, could be covered from the stationery fund.

It was the belief of the full committee that if it were desirable to rewrite the law with respect to the stationery account it should be done in a regular bill which would be studied by the Senate and the House of Representatives so that a uniform procedure would be applied to all Members of Congress.

The committee has included in the bill $953,480 to finance additional administrative and clerical assistance to Senators. Under the committee language, the clerk hire allowance for the Senators from States having a population of 10 million or more inhabitants will be increased by $6,000 basic per annum to provide a total basic per annum of $91,980 for the States of California and New York, a basic of $79,980 for the State of Pennsylvania, and a basic of $76,980 for the States of Illinois, Texas, and Ohio. There are 17 States in the population range of more than 3 million but less than 10 million, and these 17 States would each receive a basic increase of $4,020 per annum. The remaining 27 States have a population of 3 million or less and would be accorded an increase of $2,040 basic per annum each.

Mr. President, I have a table which gives the new basic allowance for each of the States and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

*Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators*

| Population (in millions) | Basic in effect July 1, 1966 | Increase recommended | Revised basic, fiscal year 1967 | Senators | States |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Less than 3 | $52,980 | $2,040 | $55,020 | 54 | 27 |
| 3 but less than 4 | 55,980 | 4,020 | 60,000 | 14 | [1] 7 |
| 4 but less than 5 | 58,980 | 4,020 | 63,000 | 12 | [2] 6 |
| 5 but less than 7 | 61,980 | 4,020 | 66,000 | 6 | [3] 3 |
| 7 but less than 9 | 64,980 | 4,020 | 69,000 | 2 | [4] 1 |
| 9 but less than 10 | 67,980 | 4,020 | 72,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 but less than 11 | 70,980 | 6,000 | 76,980 | 6 | [5] 3 |
| 11 but less than 12 | 73,980 | 6,000 | 79,980 | 2 | [6] 1 |
| 12 but less than 13 | 76,980 | 6,000 | 82,980 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 but less than 15 | 79,980 | 6,000 | 85,980 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 but less than 17 | 82,980 | 6,000 | 88,980 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 or more | 85,980 | 6,000 | 91,980 | 4 | [7] 2 |
| Total | | | | 100 | 50 |

[1] Alabama, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Tennessee, and Washington.
[2] Georgia, Indiana, Missouri, North Carolina, Virginia, and Wisconsin.
[3] Florida, Massachusetts, and New Jersey.
[4] Michigan.
[5] Illinois, Ohio, and Texas.
[6] Pennsylvania.
[7] California and New York.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, another important change recommended by the committee relates exclusively to the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. Under existing law, each committee of the Senate is limited to two positions at a salary of not to exceed $8,460 basic per annum, or $23,244 gross per annum. This limitation on the number of positions which may be paid at not to exceed this rate of $8,460 basic or $23,244 gross per annum, insofar as it applies to the Committee on Appropriations has been increased to 17 positions, or a net increase of 15 positions. It was the feeling of the committee that the responsibilities of the positions of subcommittee clerks were such that this increase was justified. An additional appropriation of $14,800 has been included in the bill by the committee to finance this authorization.

Mr. President, I have referred to the important changes made by the committee. The report describes many of the other changes. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

At the top of page 2, to insert: "SENATE".

On page 2, after line 1, to insert:

"COMPENSATION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND SENATORS, MILEAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND SENATORS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE VICE PRESIDENT AND LEADERS OF THE SENATE

*"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators*

"For compensation of the Vice President and Senators of the United States, $3,296,735."

On page 2, after line 8, to insert:

*"Mileage of President of the Senate and of Senators*

"For mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, $58,370."

On page 2, after line 12, to insert:

*"Expense Allowances of the Vice President, and Majority and Minority Leaders*

"For expense allowance of the Vice President, $10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate, $3,000; and Minority Leader of the Senate, $3,000; in all, $16,000."

On page 2, after line 17, to insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

"For compensation of officers, employees, clerks to Senators, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions and longevity compensation as authorized, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:

On page 3, after line 3, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in basic multiples of $5 per month, $203,515."

On page 3, after line 7, to insert:

"CHAPLAIN

"Chaplain of the Senate, $15,540."

On page 3, after line 9, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For Office of the Secretary, $1,369,630, including $150,220 required for the purposes specified and authorized by section 74b of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That the reporters of debates in the office of the Secretary are hereby designated the official reporters of debates of the Senate."

On page 3, after line 16, to insert:

"COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

"For professional and clerical assistance to standing committees and the Select Committee on Small Business, $3,367,430."

At the top of page 4, to insert:

"CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $99,435.

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $99,435."

On page 4, after line 7, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

"For administrative and clerical assistants and messenger service for Senators, $17,171,215."

On page 4, after line 11, to insert:

"OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

"For office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $3,364,025; *Provided*, That effective on the first day of the first month following date of enactment, the basic per annum compensation of one offset press operator, service department shall be $2,700 in lieu of $2,340,

that the Sergeant at Arms may employ a telecommunications adviser at $5,520 basic per annum, an additional Sergeant, Capitol Police force at $2,940 basic per annum, an additional lieutenant, Capitol Police force at $3,600 basic per annum, and twenty-five additional privates, Capitol Police force at $2,160 basic per annum each: *Provided further*, That appointees to the Capitol Police force positions authorized herein shall have the equivalent of at least one year's police experience."

On page 5, after line 2, to insert:

"OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND THE MINORITY

"For the offices of the secretary for the majority and the secretary for the minority, $166,675."

On page 5, after line 6, to insert:

"OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

"For four clerical assistants, two for the majority whip and two for the minority whip, at rates of compensation to be fixed in basic multiples of $60 per annum by the respective whips, $18,460 each; in all, $36,920."

On page 5, after line 11, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

"For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, $317,895."

On page 5, after line 15, to insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

*"Senate policy committees*

"For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $204,150 for each such committee; in all, $408,300."

On page 5, after line 20, to insert:

*"Automobiles and maintenance*

"For purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of four automobiles, one for the Vice President, one for the President Pro Tempore, one for the Majority Leader, and one for the Minority Leader, $43,660."

On page 6, after line 2, to insert:

*"Furniture*

"For service and materials in cleaning and repairing furniture, and for the purchase of furniture, $31,190: *Provided*, That the furniture purchased is not available from other agencies of the Government."

On page 6, after line 7, to insert:

*"Inquiries and investigations*

"For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including $396,615 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution Numbered 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, $5,420,000."

On page 6, after line 14, to insert:

*"Folding documents*

"For the employment of personnel for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate of not exceeding $2.32 per hour per person, $40,715."

On page 6, after line 18, to insert:

*"Mail transportation*

"For maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles for carrying the mails and for official use of the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, $16,560."

On page 6, after line 22, to insert:

*"Miscellaneous items*

"For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $3,743,160, including $275,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961."

On page 7, after line 2, to insert:

*"Postage stamps*

"For postage stamps for the offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority, $140; and for air-mail and special delivery stamps for office of the Secretary, $160; office of the Sergeant at Arms, $125; Senators and the President of the Senate, as authorized by law, $90,400; in all, $90,825."

On page 7, after line 8, to insert:

*"Stationery (revolving fund)*

"For stationery for Senators and the President of the Senate, $249,600: *Provided*, That effective with the fiscal year 1967 and thereafter the allowance for stationery for each Senator from States having a population of ten million or more inhabitants shall be at the rate of $3,000 per annum; and for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate, $13,200; in all, $262,800, to remain available until expended."

On page 7, after line 17, to insert:

*"Communications*

"For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U.S.C. 46c, 46d, 46e), as amended, and the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; U.S.C. 46d-1), $15,150."

On page 8, after line 5, to insert:

*"Administrative provisions*

"Effective July 1, 1966, the paragraph relating to official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in Public Law 479, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (2 U.S.C. 46c), is amended to read as follows:

" 'There shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, toll charges on not to exceed three thousand strictly official long-distance telephone calls to and from Washington, District of Columbia, aggregating not more than fifteen thousand minutes each fiscal year for each Senator and the Vice President of the United States: *Provided*, That not more than fifteen hundred calls aggregating not more than seventy-five hundred minutes made in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence. The toll charges on an additional fifteen hundred such calls aggregating not more than seventy-five hundred minutes each fiscal year for each Senator from any State having a population of ten million or more inhabitants shall also be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate: *Provided*, That not more than seven hundred and fifty calls aggregating not more than three thousand seven hundred and fifty minutes made in the first six months of each fiscal year shall be paid for under this sentence.'

"Effective the first day of the first month following date of enactment that table contained in section 4(f) of the Federal Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1955 (Public Law 94, Eighty-fourth Congress, approved June 28, 1955), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'States having a population of—

| | *Amount of increase* |
|---|---|
| Less than 3,000,000 | $12,780 |
| 3,000,000 but less than 4,000,000 | 17,760 |
| 4,000,000 but less than 5,000,000 | 20,760 |
| 5,000,000 but less than 7,000,000 | 23,760 |
| 7,000,000 but less than 9,000,000 | 26,760 |
| 9,000,000 but less than 10,000,000 | 29,760 |
| 9,000,000 but less than 10,000,000 | 25,740 |
| 10,000,000 but less than 11,000,000 | 34,740 |
| 11,000,000 but less than 12,000,000 | 37,740 |
| 12,000,000 but less than 13,000,000 | 40,740 |
| 13,000,000 but less than 15,000,000 | 43,740 |
| 15,000,000 but less than 17,000,000 | 46,740 |
| 17,000,000 or more | 49,740' |

"Effective the first day of the first month following date of enactment the paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1956, as amended (2 U.S.C. 72a-1a), is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence thereof as follows the words 'First Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1947' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the basic compensation of any employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the majority conference of the Senate and minority conference of the Senate but excluding the Committee on Appropriations), or a joint committee of the two Houses the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, whose basic compensation may be fixed under such provisions at a rate of $8,000 per annum, may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of one such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,880 per annum, and the basic compensation of two such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,460 per annum. The basic compensation of any employee of the Committee on Appropriations whose basic compensation may be fixed at a rate of $8,000 per annum under such provisions may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of one such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,880 per annum, and the basic compensation of seventeen such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of $8,460 per annum."

On page 20, line 2, after the word "Board", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$62,500".

On page 22, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "detective" and insert "three detectives"; in line 5, after the word "detective", where it appears the first time, to strike out "sergeant" and insert "sergeants"; and, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "sergeant" and insert "sergeants".

On page 24, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$647,700" and insert "$635,000", and, in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for administrative or any other expenses in connection with the plans referred to as Schemes 1, 2, and 3 for the Extension of the West Central Front of the Capitol."

On page 25, line 17, after the word "amended", to strike out "$690,000" and insert "$695,400".

On page 25, after line 17, to insert:

"SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

"For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel, and for personal and other services; including eight attendants at $1,800 each; for the care and operation of the Senate Office Buildings; including the subway and subway transportation systems connecting

the Senate Office Buildings with the Capitol; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $2,530,000."

On page 26, after line 6, to insert:

"SENATE GARAGE

"For maintenance, repairs, alterations, personal and other services, and all other necessary expenses, $57,900."

On page 27, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$1,517,000" and insert "$1,392,000".

On page 28, line 22, after the word "Library", to strike out "$510,000" and insert "$504,600".

On page 29, line 13, after the word "Congress", to insert a comma and "together with $478,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriations made for the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

On page 30, line 5, after "(2 U.S.C. 166)", to strike out "2,852,000" and insert "$2,938,000".

On page 30, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$4,536,000" and insert "$4,564,000".

On page 32, line 11, after the word "expended", to strike out "$2,228,000" and insert "$2,268,000"; in line 12, after the word "which", to strike out "$2,048,000" and insert "$2,088,000"; and, in line 15, after the words "United States", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to reimburse the Department of State for medical services rendered to employees of the Library of Congress stationed abroad; and for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles".

On page 33, after line 13, to insert:

"Funds available to the Library of Congress may be expended to reimburse the Department of State for medical services rendered to employees of the Library of Congress stationed abroad; and for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles. Further, payments shall be authorized of allowances and other benefits to employees stationed abroad to the same extent as authorized from time to time for members of the Foreign Service of the United States of comparable grade, subject to such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Librarian of Congress."

At the top of page 37, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 105. Effective on the first day of the first month following date of enactment, the basic per annum compensation of the Captain, Capitol Police force shall be $4,320; the basic per annum compensation of Lieutenants and Special Officers, Capital Police force shall be $3,600 each; and the basic per annum compensation of Sergeants, Capitol Police force shall be $2,940 each."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on page 9 of the bill there is a printing error. Between lines 11 and 12 there is a table giving the population categories for clerk hire allowances and the group from 9 million inhabitants but less than 10 million inhabitants has been repeated in the bill through a printing error.

I ask unanimous consent that the excess line be stricken from the bill.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as we proceed with the consideration of H.R. 15456, the legislative branch appropriation measure for fiscal year 1967, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MONRONEY], who so ably handled this legislation. He was most painstaking and carefully considered the views presented to the committee. I am hopeful that the Senate will accept his recommendations. Although there were some differences between the subcommittee's report and the full committee report, the bill should adequately provide for the agencies included in the bill.

Every Member of this body realizes that this is a difficult piece of legislation because there are so many varied interests involved. In my opinion the most serious problems have been resolved and the needs of the Congress, as well as the Government Printing Office and the Library of Congress, will be adequately provided for in this measure. In summary, the amount of the bill as passed by the House totaled $172,146,333. This amount was increased by the Senate $42,271,880 which, as you know, includes items totaling $42,243,080 not considered by the House. Thus, the amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is $214,418,213.

It should be noted that language has been included in the bill forbidding the use of funds provided in this bill for administrative, or any other expenses, in connection with the three proposals advanced by the Architect of the Capitol for the extension of the west central front of the Capitol. The committee felt that before any funds were appropriated for extending the west front of the Capitol, the Architect should obtain an independent estimate of the cost of restoring the present structure. In order to accomplish this, the committee recommended that various interested professional organizations be given an opportunity to study this matter. When the study is completed it will be made available to the Congress. The committee felt that this kind of information would provide the necessary background in order that it could act on a proposal for renovating or altering the west front of the Capitol. I heartily subscribe to this recommendation as I believe that we should not be hasty in changing the architectural features of the Capitol if it is not absolutely necessary.

There was nothing in this bill to provide for proceeding on the west front of the Capitol. If a recommendation does come in it would have to be considered in a supplemental bill, which is not the correct way to consider a capital improvement to our Government, particularly on the Capitol.

Mr. President, I urge the approval of this measure and I support the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to H.R. 15456 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment as follows:

On page 4, line 11, strike "17,171,215" and insert "18,966,215."

On page 9, in the table between lines 11 and 12, increase by $6,000 each figure under the heading "Amount of Increase."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to provide an additional allowance of $6,000 basic compensation for every U.S. Senator's staff, for the purpose of providing him with a legislative assistant.

The Constitution of the United States charges Congress with the obligation of exercising all legislative powers granted by that basic charter of the Republic.

In recent years, however, the rapid growth of the executive branch of the Government has not only overshadowed Congress, but also threatens to overwhelm it. The vast and increasing power of the executive branch is, in large part, directly attributable to the vast numbers and great quality of the personnel at its disposal.

I can well recall the first time I sat in a committee hearing during the consideration of an important multibillion-dollar authorization. I remember that rank upon rank of highly talented and well paid executive personnel from the administrative agencies were there, all ready to testify on this administration proposal.

We had a very small committee staff, whose combined salaries could not have equaled half that of the first row of executive branch talent in the committee room. But that staff had to advise the committee on whether to adopt the administration's proposal.

It was a completely frustrating experience for me, as a freshman U.S. Senator on that committee. But I quickly discovered that on almost every measure and appropriation the Congress considers, platoons of assistant secretaries and assistant under secretaries, many of whom have far more legislative assistants than a U.S. Senator, appear to testify. These representatives of the executive branch usually are charged with responsibility for only one particular aspect of one particular program of one particular executive department. But a U.S. Senator is supposed to legislate for all the people of the United States on every bill in all areas of legislation which come before Congress.

Mr. President, I think it is high time that Congress face the fact that it has simply not kept pace with the executive branch in providing itself with the necessary manpower to analyze and criticize administration recommendations for legislation.

I know that the Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], realizes that his staff, like every Senator's, is greatly overburdened in just trying to meet the daily requirements of keeping track of legislative and constituent matters. Too little time is left for the members of his or any Senator's staff for really critical analysis of administrative programs. Practically no time is left to either a Senator or his staff to research, organize, and propose constructive legislative programs. Yet this body, the Congress, is supposed to be the branch of the Federal Government which proposes legislation.

Congress itself has recognized this grave shortcoming. It is my understanding that the Joint Committee for the Reorganization of Congress, in a report

about to be published urging congressional reforms, specifically recommendations:

Office staff and allowances should be improved by—1. Creating the position of legislative assistant for each Member.

The House of Representatives has already acted on this recommendation and has provided funds in this pending bill for a legislative assistant at a substantially higher salary than the amendment would specify for the Senate.

Mr. President, my amendment would apply to every U.S. Senator, regardless of the size of his State. A Senator's responsibility to the American people is the same in all legislative matters. He is just as responsible for each legislative item which passes the Senate as any other Senator. He should have an equal opportunity to propose, analyze, and constructively criticize legislation. My amendment would provide every Senator with funds to obtain sufficient additional staff to meet his legislative obligations more effectively.

My amendment would not affect the additions in the clerk-hire allowances already contained in the pending bill to provide every State, according to its size, with some additional staff support. The purpose of my amendment is not to provide additional secretarial or stenographic support to meet constituent requests, but to provide legislative support for each U.S. Senator himself.

Quite aside from the problems of sufficient staff support for proposing and analyzing legislation is the basic problem of keeping track of bills in the various Senate committees and subcommittees of which each of us are members.

Mr. President, we cannot possibly sit in meetings of all the subcommittees of which each of us are members when they meet simultaneously. Unless I am mistaken, the Senator from Oklahoma is himself a member of over nine subcommittees in the Senate, and it is not rare for more than one of these subcommittees to meet at the same time. Until it becomes possible for a U.S. Senator to be in more than one place at one time, we need more legislative staff to keep up with these committee responsibilities and developments.

The sole purpose of my amendment is to provide such legislative assistance. The job of a U.S. Senator is to legislate. Certainly it is important that we serve our constituents. But as it is now, particularly in the case of those of us who represent large States or States close to Washington, D.C., the great majority of each Senator's clerk-hire allowance is taken up merely in handling constituent matters.

I have two staff members who spend full time just answering the telephone in my office. I am sure that other Senators from the heavily populated States have a far greater job than I do in that respect.

My amendment would provide funds for each Senator to use for additional legislative help in the manner that he thought best.

Mr. President, I have discussed my amendment with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which is reporting H.R. 15456 to the Senate and is floor-managing this bill.

I would like the RECORD to reflect the nature of our discussions and our understanding.

Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] agrees with me on the basic need for additional legislative assistants for each U.S. Senator and that in fact, he has been one of the moving forces in the reorganizational program of Congress, which has recommended creating the position of legislative assistant for each Senator? Second, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oklahoma feels, if my amendment is adopted at this time, it would upset the appropriations balance and the figure which he and his subcommittee have worked on so arduously, but that by early next year he anticipates the legislative reorganization program will be adopted, thus providing each Senator with the help I have proposed? Do I also correctly understand that, in the event such additional staff as that plan proposes should not be approved by Congress by early next year, he would agree to work with me and support an appropriation for a legislative assistant for each U.S. Senator next year, when the supplemental budget comes through in February, if for some reason the congressional reorganization bill has not been adopted by that time?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Maryland on the need—the imperative need—of having a legislative assistant on the staff of each Senator. The Senator has quite accurately spoken of the numerous problems that a Senator faces in having his committees meet simultaneously, or in hearing testimony or recommendations of administration witnesses on particular testimony. A Senator is unable to attend all committees of which he is a member because of conflicts in timing.

We feel that the legislative job is being absorbed, to a degree, because of demands on a Senator's time.

For that reason, one of the recommendations by the Joint Legislative Reorganization Committee is for an assistant with talent and ability to be used in interpreting legislation, in helping to draft bills, in reading legislative reports, and assisting Senators in presentation of data necessary to carry forward a point of view. In other words, the legislative assistant would do on the legislative side what the administrative assistant does on the constituent's side.

For that reason, we feel it is going to take a high-level employee to do it, who is paid a sufficient amount to be attracted to handling that kind of job.

The reason I would dislike the proposal being adopted at this time is that this should be a statutory position. The fund provided may be $22,500, or some such fund, but the appropriation should limit it to that type of assistant, and not permit it to be divided among others, who might be lower paid employees, who might do stenographic work, to fulfill the needs of legislative activities which the Reorganization Committee feels should be filled.

For those reasons, I hope the Senator from Maryland will withdraw his amendment. Otherwise, I shall feel compelled to oppose it until Congress is able to act in providing this legislative position in a statutory manner. The reorganization recommendations have been filed. Whether time will permit Congress to enact passage of the recommendations this year, I do not know. I doubt the wisdom of pledging myself to a February agreement, because if we miss, during the last days of the session, getting the Reorganization Act through the two Houses, I would still like to have it passed after the first of the year.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I walked into the Chamber just a few minutes ago, but I am familiar with the subject matter, and I heard the statement of the Senator of Oklahoma. I want to express my interest in the subject matter and say to the Senator from Oklahoma and members of the subcommittee that I think they have done an outstanding job in recognizing so clearly this need and making a recommendation in connection with it. I shall strongly support it when it comes before us as a matter of legislation. I am entirely in sympathy with the purpose of it. It is a "must."

We operate at a disadvantage. We come into session every January, when we have a budget of over $100 billion, when we have many laws already in operation, and more laws proposed that go into every facet of the economic, political, and every other phase of the lives of the people of the entire Nation. We must have someone who is interested in legislation as a career, who is willing to stay with it year after year. This proposal is a step forward in trying to reach that problem. I support it.

However, I think the Senator from Maryland would be wise not to press his amendment. I see in the report some reference to the fact that there may be a delay in the recommendation; for instance, committees of the Senate and House might be divided.

I wonder what the situation would be like in January if that legislation does not move. What would be done as to this item? Perhaps the Senator would support it in a supplemental bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be glad to support it in a supplemental bill, but I would dislike to be tied to a February date. We may miss getting the reorganization proposal adopted this year, although it has been reported by both houses.

Therefore, I would like to see the proposal now before us set aside. I am dedicated to the need for such a staff member, and at the earliest practicable date, but it should not interfere with the overall considerations of the entire Reorganization Act. If it were not included in reorganization, I would support it as an individual appropriation in a supplemental bill.

Mr. STENNIS. If we are going to have to wait for another year to get this relief,

that is a mighty strong case for proceeding now.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think it will be a year, but it might not happen in January.

Mr. STENNIS. Suppose it became a stalemate.

Mr. MONRONEY. If it did, then we would try to bring it up in another bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator would not use this position of a legislative assistant as a carrot to try to get the Reorganization Act through, and then refuse to go along with it?

Mr. MONRONEY. No, but I feel it is a part, and a very important part, of the whole reorganization effort, and I would like to see it enacted at the earliest possible time, along with many other reforms that Congress is willing to adopt. This is one that I feel sure will be considered and adopted. If it is not, I will support a supplemental bill which will include it.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am very happy to hear the statement the Senator from Oklahoma made in the colloquy just had. The Senator from Maryland has taken an active interest in the work of the Senate, and has been very helpful.

I hope what the committee has done in approving an assistant so that there will be available a base pay of $4,000 to each Senator, which amounts to about $12,000 or $14,000 a year, will be of some help. Because of the persuasive argument made by the Senator from Oklahoma as to the need for a legislative assistant, I hope the Senator from Maryland will not press his amendment at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. It is my intention to withdraw the amendment. I did not offer the amendment lightly. I talked with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I have his authority to say he would have supported this amendment. I have talked with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL], and with several other Senators, who felt the proposal had merit.

Mr. President, I now withdraw the amendment, in light of the understandings reflected in the colloquy which the Senator from Oklahoma and I have engaged in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. 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 11, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"The third paragraph under the heading 'Administrative Provisions' in the appropriation for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as amended (2 U.S.C. 43b), is amended by inserting after the words 'six round trips' the following: '(or the equivalent thereof in one-way trips)'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, this amendment is simply a change in the language relating to the transportation allowance provided for each Senator. The law now provides for six round trips, and the paymaster, by his interpretation, considers that he has no authority to pay the equivalent thereof, or, in other words, 12 trips just one way.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and with the minority members, and I do not believe that there is objection to the amendment. It would not result in any additional cost to the Government, but would give more flexibility in the allowance of transportation expenses to a Senator's home State and return.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have talked to a number of the members of our subcommittee regarding this amendment. Many Senators find themselves unable to return by the same means of transportation as they went out on, and the round trip requirement is difficult. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it would involve the same amount of Government cost, except that a Senator might have two trips to his home district, and perhaps return by other transportation, and he would be entitled to the equivalent of one round trip.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. It was the year that I happened to have the honor of being chairman of this subcommittee on this bill that the travel provision was first put in. We made the language very tight. I think the Senator has found a very practical flaw in it. His amendment has great worth, and would not entail any additional cost. So I hope the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. We will be happy to accept the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to raise a point here. I notice that the bill, on page 7, under stationery allowance, provides, in addition to the regular allowance, an increase for Senators from those States with a population of 10 million or more, to raise their allowance to $3,000.

Mr. President, I wish to say I support that provision, which increases the allowance for the larger States. I make that statement before I proceed with my other comments because I recognize that Senators from the larger States do have a greater problem than we who come from smaller States. I think the stationery allowance should be adequate to take care of defraying the necessary stationery expenses of Senators' offices here in Washington and in their own States. I wish to make that very clear at the beginning. I shall now proceed to another point.

Mr. President, on the other hand, I believe that if the stationery allowance is not needed by a Senator for this purpose it should revert to the Federal Government, and that is the point to which I now address my remarks.

As I have stated before, this Government very properly should defray the legitimate expenses of operating the offices of Senators. Stationery and other items under that category should be paid for out of the general fund, but to the extent that any money is left from any allowance it should revert to the Treasury, and not to the Senator. This should be true without affirmative action to get rid of it.

In my own instance, this past year I had a $1,500 balance. In attempting to refund it I found that if you do not write a letter and say, "I do not want it," it automatically comes to you.

I think that is wrong. We certainly should not be in the position of cashing in on a stationery allowance. In making that statement I also wish to make it clear that I do not suggest that Senators are doing that. I am not suggesting that at all. I know that there are Senators who are spending more money than they receive in their stationery allowances, and to take care of those situations is why I support the increase here today.

What I am suggesting is that to the extent one dime or $1 is left over, that should automatically revert to the Federal Treasury, and it should not be dependent upon whether or not I get a letter off by the 5th or the 10th day of the month to tell them I do not want it. If I overlook writing a letter by a certain date, then under the present law it automatically accrues to me.

Why should it be possible for any public official to make money on an expense account?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the amendment that the Senator proposes the amendment that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee had in the bill, which was later rejected by the full committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is some change in it. I had the legislative counsel draft the amendment. I have a copy of it here. It has one major difference, and other than that it carries out the same objective, because I had the same member of the legislative counsel prepare it.

One difference is that the amendment as I shall offer it here will apply both to the House and to the Senate. The amendment I offered in the committee applied to the Senate only. There was a question raised as to whether we had jurisdiction to make it applicable on both sides of the Capitol. I understood that was one of the objections raised to the amendment as I had introduced it—that we should treat both the House and the Senate on a par.

I agree with that. I think it is a very valid point, and there is a precedent for action in this connection. Two or three years ago we agreed here in the Senate to

an amendment which was dealing with junk mail, and it was made applicable to both the House and the Senate. That amendment was included in the bill as passed by the Senate and was accepted by the House in a modified form.

Today's amendments would insert new language immediately following line 17 on page 7, and on page 16 line 4, would insert identically the same language under the House authorization for their stationery allowance. Therefore, the adoption of this amendment would automatically place the same restrictions upon both Houses.

I send my amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware is as follows:

On page 7, strike out the period at the end of line 17 and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the paragraph under the heading 'Stationery (revolving fund)' in the appropriations for the Senate in Title IV of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 864; 2 U.S.C. 46a), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The allowance for stationery shall hereafter be available only for (1) purchases made through the Senate stationery room of stationery and other office supplies for use for official business, and (2) reimbursement upon presentation of receipted invoices for purchases elsewhere of stationery and other office supplies (excluding items not ordinarily available in the Senate stationery room) for use for official business in an office maintained by a Senator in his home State. Any part of the allowance for stationery which remains unobligated at the end of the fiscal year 1967 or any subsequent fiscal year shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund established by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1957 (71 Stat. 188; 2 U.S.C. 46a-1) and covered into the general fund of the Treasury.'"

On page 16, strike out the period at the end of line 4 and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

"*Provided*, That the stationery allowance, as authorized by law, for such session or any subsequent session, shall hereafter be available only for (1) purchases made through the House stationery room of stationery and other office supplies for use for official business, and (2) reimbursement upon presentation of receipted invoices for purchases elsewhere of stationery and other office supplies (excluding items not ordinarily available in the House stationery room) for use for official business in an office maintained by a Member in his home State. Any part of the stationery allowance which remains unobligated at the end of the session for which it is available, beginning with the first session of the Ninetieth Congress, shall be withdrawn from the revolving fund established by the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 366; 2 U.S.C. 46b-1) and covered into the general fund of the Treasury."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This amendment does not change the definition at all of the type of stationery allowances to which we are now entitled. At the end of the year if Senator X has $1,000 or $1,500 left over and he has spent up to that amount of money back in his State all he does is submit a voucher to the Disbursing Office showing expenditures for official business and collect. On telephone calls if we have calls back in the State, we itemize them as official calls and are reimbursed under the existing law.

This amendment would use exactly the same formula. Now the only difference is that if a Senator does not use his telephone allowance, it automatically reverts to the Treasury. That is all that I am suggesting here for the stationery allowance.

The difference between this amendment and the existing law is that a Senator would be reimbursed only for actual expenditures. This is on the premise that it does not belong to the Senator if he has not spent it for office supplies. It should automatically go back to the Treasury as in the case of every other allowance that is made available for a senatorial office.

I hope that the manager of the bill is willing to accept this amendment. I hope that the Senate will support the amendment.

I had this question up for consideration last year, and the suggestion was made that we carry it over to see if the committee could work the matter out. Apparently we have not been able to work it out, and I think it is time that we settle this question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware knows, the amendment leaving the current language in the bill was approved by the full committee by a rather heavy vote. The language put in the bill by the subcommittee was stricken out.

As I gather from hearing the reading of the Senator's amendment, the language he added does not include the certification and definition of necessary official expenditures as provided in the subcommittee amendment, to be provided by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This amendment does not change the definition at all from what is contained in the existing law. I did not think that I, as a single Senator, should tamper with that provision. If the existing law does not cover all the items some think it should, we should amend that law. But this would come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I am merely using the identical formula for stationery and office supplies as is now in effect under existing law. I did not change it, and I do not propose to change it. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator propose this as one amendment or as two amendments?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was going to offer the measure as a joint amendment and ask that the two be considered together. I understand that they could be voted on separately or together. However, I think we should vote on them together.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, may we be advised whether, if this language amends the Senate provisions on stationery allowance, and then, on page 16, amends the House language on stationery allowance, it would be considered as joint amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are two separate amendments, but the Senator can ask that they be considered together.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have conferred with a number of Senators who were interested in the amendment. I would like to know if they have anything to add at this time to the discussion.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the Senator is offering what is, in effect, a dual amendment, but he wants the amendments to be voted on together.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. My understanding is that while the subcommittee did originally approve the language which would have dealt with the Senate only, that proposal was rejected by the full committee.

I have talked with some of the members of the committee. It is my understanding that one of the major objections to agreeing to the amendment at that time was that it dealt only with the Senate. It was felt that we should not write different rules for the House and for the Senate. I agree with that interpretation.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is offering the two amendments together and is requesting that they be voted on at one time. The total substance of the two amendments is that the change in the law would apply both to the Senate and the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. My original thought was that it would be easier to get it through the Senate first. I was advised differently, and I think that advice is quite proper. That is what I wanted to do first, and I was glad to accept the suggestion.

Mr. STENNIS. The division in the committee was not so much of what would become of the funds. The major and practical part of the division in the committee concerned the belief that if the change was going to be made, it ought to be made simultaneously in the two Houses. The Senator now proposes to do that exact thing, as I understand it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. The only reason the Senator offers his proposal as two amendments, as the Senator from Mississippi understands it, is to meet a parliamentary situation, and he is asking for

a vote on both amendments at the same time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Under the parliamentary rules they would have to be offered as separate amendments and voted on separately. I asked for and obtained unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc, so they will now be voted on together.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the sentiment of many members of the committee was that both Houses should move together, and that there would be an effort later to have some adjustment made to cover both Houses at the same time.

So in view of the Senator's position with reference to the amendments, the substance of them being one amendment, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

I emphasize again that I do not propose a change—either restricting or liberalizing—in existing rules. Nor does the amendment reduce or change the amount that is available to any individual Senator. Quite to the contrary, the Senate bill increases the allowances for the larger States. I support that position.

The Senator from Oklahoma will remember that when I was testifying before the committee I made the point that if Senators from the larger States felt that they needed a larger allowance—and I think some do need it—I would not oppose it. I am aware that we who represent the small States have the same status as Senators who represent the large States. I represent a small State, of which I am justly proud. Likewise we are all Senators of the United States. We do not represent only our individual States, but we are elected by the constituencies of our States.

The constituents of the Senators from California, New York, Rhode Island, and other States go to their respective Senators. Senators representing States having populations of several million receive a larger volume of mail and need much more money to run their offices.

I have always supported adequate allowances for senatorial offices, whether for stationery or other items essential in the official operation of the office, because I do not believe a Senator should have to dip into his pocket to defray the legitimate costs of operating his office. If there is one thing we do not want it is that the Senate develop into a rich man's club and that the people should have to consult Dun & Bradstreet to ascertain the financial rating of a candidate before they could determine whether they would support him.

I have never opposed paying the legitimate costs of operating a senatorial office, and I shall not in the future. I merely ask that any amount that is unexpended revert to the Federal Treasury.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I know that the Senator was merely exercising some deference toward the Senator from Rhode Island by placing Rhode Island alongside New York and California. But the RECORD should show that Rhode Island would not benefit by any increase in funds. Rhode Island is one of the smaller States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I realize that, but I am sure that the Senator from Rhode Island will agree with my statement that Senators from the large States do need extra money.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, I agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I fully support such a proposal.

Mr. PASTORE. There is no question about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I support such increases for such States on their requirements. At the same time I would defend, and be the first to defend, the rights and prestige of the small States. I am not belittling or downgrading the small States.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I am in sympathy with the Senator's purpose of having unused allowances returned to the Treasury. The Senator might well consider adding to his amendment—or at least the Senate should consider such a proposal—a provision to reimburse those who use more than their allowance, and who must use their own money to make up the difference.

Twenty years ago, when I was serving my first term in the House of Representatives, I began preparing and sending home reports to my constituents in the form of newsletters. At that time, it was not a general practice. I doubt whether there were more than 15 or 20 Members of the House of Representatives who sent them. Over the years, however, it has become a general if not a universal practice; and I believe that a majority of the Members of both branches of Congress send home a newsletter, a report or information in some form to the people in their States as to what is taking place in Congress—and, incidentally, the viewpoint of their Senators or Representatives on issues of vital interest.

Having pioneered in this field and developed it, I admit that perhaps the Senator from New Hampshire does it on a more widespread basis than many other Members of Congress.

But through the years, this Senator has prepared and maintained an up-to-date mailing list. It is not a political mailing list. It contains, as far as possible, the names of every teacher, every clergyman, every farmer, every banker, and other categories in his State, regardless of their party affiliations. He has maintained this list to the point that now, every 2 weeks, while the Senate is in session, he sends approximately 95,000 to 100,000 copies of the reports, addressed to families or individuals in New Hampshire.

It is the contention of this Senator that such a practice is beneficial to the people, particularly the young people in the schools. Incidentally, each of my colleagues from my own State—my distinguished colleague, Senator McINTYRE, and both our Representatives—follow the same practice. I do not know in what numbers their reports are mailed.

But let this be known: The maintaining and keeping up to date of an accurate mailing list—bearing in mind that we cannot broadcast our material as the House does, addressed to "Boxholder"—involves expense for which I am sure I would not, and I am sure no one would, expect to be reimbursed. The fact remains that just the buying of the plates for the Addressograph, alone, places an extremely heavy drain on our stationery allowance.

Prior to World War II, every Senator was allowed as much paper for offset printing and envelopes as he needed. During World War II, when it was necessary not only to conserve paper but also to lessen the burden on the mails, that amount was reduced, so that a Senator had the privilege of using 10,000 sheets of paper and 10,000 envelopes a month.

Five years ago, this Senator began to complain to the committee and to his floor leader and to the Policy Committee, asking that the allowance be liberalized.

I well remember the day that my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, came to me and said that he had secured all my desires. He had arranged for the 10,000 sheets a month to be increased to 15,000 sheets a month. My requirement of 95,000 to 100,000 twice a month means a total of 190,000 to 200,00 each month. I checked in my office before I came here, and I discovered, I might add, that this is done not just in election years, but also in every year of the six-year term, as far as I am concerned that in fiscal 1966, this Senator had to pay into his stationery account just one check of $1,250 from his own pocket as well as other amounts throughout the years, for the excess of necessary paper and envelopes that he needed to purchase.

The amendment of the distinguished Senator from Delaware is not of much concern to this Senator, because since the first year I served in Congress, 20 years ago, I have never failed to exceed my stationery allowance, for the reasons just stated.

I suspect that the Senator whom I see on his feet now will have something to say about this matter.

It seems to me that if it is to be provided—and properly so—that unused stationery allowances revert, I believe that at the same time, in justice to the Senate and in justice to the people who benefit by all the information that comes from the Capitol—from the men and women who represent them in the Congress—Senators and Representatives should be permitted a larger allowance, as long as they take it in stationery items, in paper or envelopes, and use it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I am not in disagreement with what he has said. The adoption of this amendment certainly would not affect him.

As to the allowances, I said earlier, and I repeat again, that I am not opposing the increase in the stationery allowance for some of the larger States. I do not know whether this increased allowance affects the Senator's State or not.

I believe that the Federal Government should underwrite the official costs of our offices. All I am saying is that if there is some left over it should not go into the pocket of a Senator or Congressman.

I agree with what the Senator has said. This would not change the use of this money for stationery and office supplies at all. It would not change that point one iota.

Since I have been in the Senate, if I recall correctly, the first allowance was either $300 or $500; this was about 20 years ago. I am now allowed $2,400. When this allowance was raised from $1,800 to $2,400, I supported it. I said that I did not need it for my office, but those States that did need it could use it. I said that as to those offices that did not need it it would not cost any more money; it would merely increase the amount refunded to the Treasury. I believe that should be the principle on which we should operate.

To the extent that any part of this allowance is not used for the purpose for which it was intended—namely, the purchase of office supplies and stationery for official use—we have no right to claim it.

The adoption of this amendment would require us to produce vouchers showing purchases of such official supplies before we could be reimbursed.

So long as the money is spent to conduct the official business of our offices I have no objection to this money being used, and the adoption of this amendment would not change one dime, either way, the position of the Senator from New Hampshire, as he has outlined it.

Mr. COTTON. I would like to add one point with regard to the folding room.

I wish to say, for the record, that I commend the people who work in and who operate the folding room, who print and stuff and mail the material sent out by the Members of the Senate. I wish to commend them because they work long hours, they are most accommodating when one is eager to get something out, and they are dedicated to doing a good job.

In all the years I have been in the Senate, I have never seen the slightest tendency to discriminate in the folding room. I believe that a minority Republican receives exactly the same consideration and the same attention as a majority Democrat—even the same as the leadership—and I am grateful for that.

However, I have observed that some delays are being experienced at present in handling the huge volume of material passing through the folding room. It is my conviction that they now are understaffed, and I feel strongly that adequate provision should be made for sufficient personnel to maintain the high standard of efficiency of this excellent facility.

It is fine to save a few hundred dollars and turn it back into the Treasury, and I commend any Senator who wishes to see that that is done. However, it is a matter of legitimate interest to the people of this country to know, directly from us, and not from some columnist or some television commentator, what is actually going on in the Senate. The people of our States have a right to know what is going on and what our position is on various matters. The young people of our States have a right—it is beneficial to them—to be in direct communication with and have information from their Senators and Representatives.

I have spoken about this for years. I hope that with all this furor about the stationery allowance, we show our constituents a little more consideration. If we adopt this amendment—to which I could not possibly object, because it would not affect me—I believe that at the same time Senators should not be scrimped with respect to the number of sheets of paper they can have to communicate with their constituents.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. BARTLETT addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Senator, by asking for the yeas and nays, anticipated what I was about to say, because I was about to make that inquiry of him.

In discussing this amendment briefly, I wish to say that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] could have added to his remarks the reference to his newsletter that it is sent out on a nonbipartisan basis.

I have been a happy recipient since the days of long ago when I had not a single gray hair. American journalism or literature, or both, would have been the loser or losers. It is one of the wittiest columns, as well as one of the most observant columns I have ever read.

I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], whose State, together with mine, goes to make up the two largest States in the Union, that my interest in the stationery allowance is academic because each year I succeed in overdrawing my account and, therefore, I am required to pay into the fund instead of otherwise.

I wish to explain to the Senator why I am going to vote against the amendment. I shall vote against the amendment for the simple reason, the main reason, and the only reason that I have a very profound belief that it is our business to take care of our business here in the Senate and we should allow the House of Representatives to take care of its own business. I cannot, by my vote, seek to regulate the affairs and business of the House of Representatives. Were this amendment to apply only to the Senate, I would clearly vote with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have always felt that the allowance for stationery was being properly interpreted by Senate officials in that they be permitted out of that allowance reimbursement to be made for such things as radio clips made in communicating with our people back home, television films for the same purpose, newspaper subscriptions for local newspapers, or newspapers from our States, so that communication could be preserved between our offices and the people of our States.

I have found repeatedly that in newspapers, for instance, in the editorials, news columns, and in the contributors' columns, that there are items that lead to correspondence and contacts between my office and my people back home.

I found through the years also that it is very useful to use television and radio. As a rule, the radio stations are glad to give the time as a contribution in the interest of public service. The making of television films and radio clips is an expensive business, as well as the expense that is involved of sending them back and forth.

I wonder if the Senator, by his amendment, means to preclude any of these activities being paid out of the stationery fund which, as I said in the beginning, has been interpreted as being designed to permit our communications, free and ample, between the offices of Senators in Washington and their constituents in the States they represent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I could not answer the question of the Senator except to say that the amendment is drawn so as not to change in one iota the present definition of approved allowances. It may or may not be permissible, but if it is, it is; and if it is not, it is not. I was advised that if I tried to change the definition of existing law to expand or restrict it would be legislation subject to a point of order.

I tried to follow the definition of stationery and office supplies as it is and always has been interpreted so that it would not change in one iota the present law. If present law does not cover some item that should be covered, then the rules could be changed. I speak with reference to the Senator's remarks with regard to radio clips; I would make a guess that they would not be covered because I doubt if radio clips were heard of at the time that these rules were made. Radio clips have been developed in recent years.

The Committee on Rules and Administration outlines the definitions. I made no effort to change in any way the existing definitions. I had no intention of doing so and am specifically trying to stay away from that argument.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator explaining that the amendment makes no provision for such activities as I mentioned and such activities as mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who has followed a custom which is followed by most Senators. I have a biweekly letter, as does he.

I cannot support the amendment of the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Stationery and office supplies for official use are covered. The point of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] was that he was spending more than his allowance. This does not increase or reduce his allowance. Certainly the paper

on which his letters are printed is stationery. That is clear.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator spoke of the Address-O-Graph and other expenses in connection with his letter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I could not answer that point. I do not know how far that is covered. The rejection of the amendment will not cover them if they are not covered. The stationery allowance as now provided is not changed.

If there is something that should be covered that is not covered, the Committee on Rules and Administration should be approached and the rules changed. I did not intend to change the rule to expand or restrict them under my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] insists upon such strict wording in his amendment and in his interpretation because it seems to me that the expenses in connection with sending newsletters, such as the addressograph and plates, are fully covered and should be covered; they are not stationery and cannot be bought at the stationery store.

As to the other items, even though radio clips and television films were not known of at the time the original wording was set up, they have been allowed under the practice of the Senate. It is apparent that the Senator does not think they should be provided for.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Florida misunderstood me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that the wording is too strict and I think that the intention of the Senator is too strict. He goes a good deal further in restricting the requirement than it has been interpreted, which is to allow for communications generally between the Senator and his constituents.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has misunderstood. I did not place a strict or liberal interpretation on the present law. I am not trying to interpret existing law. I am leaving that matter as it is.

The only purpose of the amendment is to provide that if there is any part of the stationery allowance on June 30 which a Member of the Senate has that was not used for the purposes outlined under the present law it automatically goes back to the Federal Treasury.

Why should it not? Otherwise, it would go into our pockets. This is not the way to supplement our salaries. The adoption of the amendment would not eliminate the payment of a single item permissible today under existing law when such is needed in the official discharge of the duties of our offices.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has brought up an important item of the expense of running a Senate office, that of newspaper subscriptions. I consider getting the newspapers from my home State to be an important part of my business. It is important to me to know what is going on in North Dakota and what people back home are thinking.

Since I have served in the Senate, I have subscribed to all the daily newspapers, and most of the weekly newspapers published in North Dakota. Each year, out of my own pocket, I spend approximately $750 for newspapers. This would amount to more than $15,000 during the years I have been a Member of the Senate. This is a legitimate office expense, but it is one which we have to pay out of our own pockets.

It makes little difference to me whether this motion is passed or defeated.

I usually spend little more than the amount of my stationery account and occasionally I withdraw a small amount at the end of the year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from North Dakota is calling attention to exactly the same experience that I have had. The payments that he has had at the end of the year, which have always been small, have not begun to reimburse him for the contributions he has made by way of expenditures on newspaper subscriptions, radio clips, and television films. They are a necessary part of communicating with the people of our States to find out what the people are thinking and to be able to respond to them in kind. This has as much to do with representing the people of our States as the buying of ordinary white paper, with nothing on it, from the stationery store.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I am ready to vote. If newspapers are not in today they are not in tomorrow. This does not put any item in or out. It does not change existing law one iota. It makes an allowance for the payment of purchases of stationery and office supplies such as are allowed today. The amendment would also provide for reimbursement upon presentation of the receipted invoices of purchases made elsewhere of these same items.

If these purchases are made in the Senator's home State they are covered. I repeat, we are not trying to restrict them, but leave them as outlined under existing law.

All that my amendment would provide is that that part which is not used to pay for the purchase of supplies and stationery for the office as defined in the law, will go back into the Federal Treasury. It would not go into my pocket or any other Senator's pocket as extra compensation.

The answer is simple.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement, which is similar to that received by other Senators at the end of each year showing their balances.

All that this statement needed was my signature, and the $1,521.69 would have been mine. Why?

Congress has asked the American businessman to render a full accounting of his expense accounts. Why should Members of Congress not do likewise?

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

THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

To: Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator.

For commutation of allowance for stationery for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966:

| | |
|---|---|
| By amount of allowance from July 1 to June 30, 1966 | $2,400.00 |
| To stationery furnished in kind | 878.31 |
| Balance | 1,521.69 |

Certified correct:

HARRY F. SONNENBERG,
*Keeper of Stationery.*

Acknowledged correct:

_____ _____,
*United States Senator.*

Approved:

_____ _____,
*Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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 Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 165 Leg.]

YEAS—56

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Clark | Fulbright |
| Bennett | Cooper | Griffin |
| Boggs | Cotton | Harris |
| Brewster | Curtis | Hickenlooper |
| Burdick | Dominick | Hill |
| Byrd, Va. | Eastland | Hruska |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Ellender | Jackson |
| Carlson | Fannin | Javits |
| Church | Fong | Kuchel |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Magnuson | Nelson | Simpson |
| Mansfield | Neuberger | Sparkman |
| McIntyre | Pastore | Stennis |
| Mondale | Pell | Symington |
| Monroney | Prouty | Thurmond |
| Montoya | Proxmire | Tower |
| Morse | Randolph | Tydings |
| Morton | Ribicoff | Williams, N.J. |
| Mundt | Robertson | Williams, Del. |
| Murphy | Saltonstall | |

NAYS—25

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Jordan, N.C. | Moss |
| Bartlett | Kennedy, Mass. | Muskie |
| Bible | Kennedy, N.Y. | Scott |
| Cannon | Long, Mo. | Smith |
| Dodd | Long, La. | Talmadge |
| Ervin | McCarthy | Young, N. Dak. |
| Hart | McGee | Young, Ohio |
| Holland | McGovern | |
| Inouye | Metcalf | |

NOT VOTING—19

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allott | Gruening | Pearson |
| Bass | Hartke | Russell, S.C. |
| Bayh | Hayden | Russell, Ga. |
| Case | Jordan, Idaho | Smathers |
| Dirksen | Lausche | Yarborough |
| Douglas | McClellan | |
| Gore | Miller | |

So the amendments of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 15456) was passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the points of disagreement, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair) appointed Messrs. MONRONEY, BARTLETT, PROXMIRE, YARBOROUGH, HAYDEN, SALTONSTALL, YOUNG of North Dakota, and KUCHEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with typical calm efficiency, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] steered the legislative appropriations measure to swift and overwhelming Senate approval. We are grateful always for the competence and skill he applies to all legislative proposals. The prompt success of this measure was just another in a long line of achievements obtained by Senator MONRONEY's extremely capable talents.

I emphasize, moreover, the highly cooperative efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] who, as the ranking subcommittee member, joined to assure the Senate's overwhelming support. Senator SALTONSTALL consistently serves this body, and indeed the Nation, with deep devotion and unstinting dedication. His selfless and gracious cooperative work on this appropriation measure was certainly characteristic. We are grateful.

And to the distinguished Senators from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and Nevada [Mr. CANNON] as well as to the distinguished Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] goes high commendation for assisting the efficient passage of this measure and for offering their clear and articulate views on some of its important features.

Finally, to the Senate as a whole, I am once again grateful for swift yet orderly and thoughtful action on this proposal today. We all may be proud of another fine achievement.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

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

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, tomorrow we will take up Calendar No. 1342, H.R. 4665, relating to the income tax treatment of exploration expenditures in the case of mining, in which Senators LONG, of Louisiana, GORE, HARTKE, RANDOLPH, MORTON, METCALF, and DOMINICK are interested; and Calendar No. 1367, S. 2097, providing for judicial review of the constitutionality of grants or loans under certain acts, in which Senators ERVIN, JAVITS, and HART, are interested.

This will put Senators on notice that these measures will be brought up.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT AND MEMBERS OF STAFF OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, each year when we have under consideration a foreign aid appropriation, or authorization, we hear it said that serving as floor manager of aid legislation is a thankless job. This year that seems to be more true than usual. Although we have spent 8 full, wearing days on this legislation, there have been none of the customary encomiums and lavish tributes distributed among managers, opponents, and staff members which usually accompany passage of a difficult piece of legislation.

What has been said has appeared in the press columns and it has been abuse directed at the Senator from Arkansas because he could not salvage everything in the most unpopular legislation the Senate considers.

Of course, these editorial writers and columnists who are longtime sycophants of foreign aid write with pens dipped in their great reservoirs of ignorance. They live in oblivion to the rising distrust of the aid program as a means of furthering sound foreign policy. They have conveniently ignored the changes in the world in the last 2 or 3 years and the changes in the American position in the world. They conveniently ignore the fact that around the neck of foreign aid legislation hang the albatrosses of every foreign policy mistake the United States has made from one end of the world to the other.

But the people and the Senate have not ignored them. These gratuitous press comments conveniently ignore the President's press conference which coincided with the opening of the debate on the economic aid bill, where the President of the United States blamed Congress for excessive spending. That press conference was widely interpreted on this floor as an invitation to cut the aid program, and yet the Senator from Arkansas is blamed by the press for not sustaining support for economic aid.

I think it also appropriate to mention that of all Senators who serve as floor managers of legislation, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] alone serves without the benefit of unanimous consent agreements. That is because for several years I have objected to unanimous consent agreements in the consideration of foreign aid. I shall continue to so object. Perhaps it is a burden to its expedition in the Senate; but we need more, not less, debate and consideration of foreign policy matters and this legislation is the only meaningful vehicle we have for such debate. Foreign aid above all other measures should be considered free from the guillotine of unanimous consent agreements.

The floor manager of this bill, Senator FULBRIGHT, has labored here diligently day after day. He has not turned over his onerous task to someone else, though if he did, there would be no more critical press comments about his work. His patience in the face of interruptions, delays, and unexpected debates and snags has been monumental, as it always is.

But his biggest burden is the bill he has to conduct through the Senate. It is a bad program; it is ill-conceived and poorly managed and the Senate knows it. The American people have been supporting it for nearly 20 years and now the results are coming in at a critical time in our history and the public does not like what it sees. It does not like coming to realize that we have spent over $116 billion of its money in a so-called foreign aid program; and the people are now recognizing that a great deal of it was wasted. They recognize that the Comptroller General, in report after report, has made clear to Congress the inefficiencies and waste of foreign aid. Yet Congress continues to waste the taxpayers' money by the passage of bills on foreign aid, without cutting them down to the size they ought to be cut down to. What we are not quite sure of is what to do about it. The Senator from Arkansas did much in committee to try to improve this measure so that when it came to the floor it would not be damaged any more than it was.

My votes against these two foreign aid bills in no way diminishes my respect for the way in which the chairman of our committee has sought to salvage as much as could be salvaged from a bad

program. In light of the lack of interest from the administration, he has saved more of the program than I think deserved to have been saved, and certainly more than the program itself deserved.

Mr. President, I not only want to express my appreciation to the Senator from Arkansas for his leadership in connection with this bill, but I wish to pay high tribute, Mr. President, to Senator FULBRIGHT's outstanding statesmanship in Congress in connection with his work as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I also want to express my thanks to the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee who have helped me greatly in connection with the aid legislation, especially the staff director, Carl Marcy, and committee counsel, Norvill Jones.

But to the entire staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, I say that the RECORD should show they have performed outstanding work in carrying out the responsibilities of their appointments. Particularly, Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] deserves, in my opinion, not only the words of praise that I have spoken about him this afternoon, but he also deserves the gratitude of the U.S. Senate for his leadership as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the previous order, until 12 o'clock meridan tomorrow, Friday, July 29, 1966.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 28, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

W. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Nathan Goodman, Monticello Orthodox Synagogue, Congregation Tifereth Israel, Monticello, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

אביע שבשמים

Our Father who art in heaven: We invoke Thy blessing upon our country, the President of these United States, and all those who exercise just and rightful authority.

Help us today, and every day, to be worthy of our rich heritage—this land of the free, and home of the brave. Let Thy light penetrate our midst, so that these dedicated men of the House of Representatives may recognize their duties through the fog of our times. Grant them courage, so that they may be persevering in fulfilling our responsibilities to all countries threatened with the loss of democracy, despite the cost and sacrifice.

Grant that these blessed United States of America may ever serve as a beacon light for liberty-loving people the world over. May freedom and equality, brotherhood and peace fill our land, as the waters cover the sea. אמן

## 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 had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12389. An act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the development of the Arkansas Post National Memorial; and

H.R. 15225. An act to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennesee Valley Authority.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 13277. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1237. An act to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying;

S. 3238. An act for the relief of Miss Matsue Sato;

S. 3254. An act to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation; and

S. 3583. An act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward internal and external security.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3034) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. ALLOTT to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

## THE WISCONSIN MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL DECISION

Mr. STALBAUM. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin Supreme Court, in a 4-to-3 decision yesterday, dismissed Wisconsin's case against major league baseball and the Atlanta Braves.

Several items in their decision are worthy of brief comment: First, baseball is a monopoly; second, because it operated throughout the Nation, Wisconsin was powerless to enforce its own antitrust law; third, the silence of Congress indicated that Congress was content to let baseball police itself.

As one reviews yesterday's decision, one cannot but note the existing vacuum in law which protects the baseball monopoly. As the court indicated, Wisconsin is powerless to act; the 1922 U.S. Supreme Court decisions, which still apply, deny the Federal Government the right to act; and Congress, by its silence since then, has indicated that baseball should police itself, free from government action at either the Federal or State level.

On January 25, 1965, I introduced H.R. 3412, which would have included organized baseball under the antitrust laws. In view of the Wisconsin decision, I believe the Congress should now proceed to hold hearings and pass this bill. To say that baseball is a monopoly which operates from coast to coast but that it should not be regulated by antitrust laws is totally inconsistent.

Municipalities throughout the country have built large stadiums on the premise that major league baseball teams as tenants would provide a substantial part of the stadium's revenue. Baseball, by its action in Milwaukee, has indicated that it feels no obligation to a community.

To those Congressmen who have baseball teams playing in publicly financed stadiums, watch out. Your turn may be next.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight Saturday, July 30, to file a report on H.R. 13361.

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

There was no objection.

## DO SO-CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS MARCH IN SUPPORT OF THEIR COUNTRY?

Mr. HAYS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have here a sheet from the New York Times of Tuesday of this week, and today's Washington Daily News, both of which tell