

loss, simply did not contain the kind of data on which his charge was based. I am urging Members of Congress, therefore, in formulating their positions on this legislation, to evaluate the facts and figures which we have made available.

I do not mean to imply that the tax administrators in general have provided unreliable data to us. Indeed that is not the case. Most who have alleged losses have simply failed to provide data. Those who have explored the problems and have made careful studies, generally support our conclusions. For example, Mr. Fred Cox, of Georgia, has made a test of the effects of our income taxes problems on Georgia revenues. Mr. Cox has a nationwide reputation for being one of the most zealous defenders of State revenues. He supports our bill. The tax administrator of Vermont studied the problem and came to the conclusion that even if our income tax apportionment formula were applied to all corporations large and small, it would cost the State no more than \$250. Other tax administrators have also made it clear that our bill will have no untoward revenue effects.

I am convinced—from our studies, from the wealth of data available to us, from the extensive hearing which we held in 1961, 1962, and the 3 months of hearings which we held in the spring of this year—that the losses being alleged by some of the tax administrators are without foundation.

The claims being made by a few of the tax collectors are faintly reminiscent of the unreasonable claims which taxpayers have complained about to our subcommittee for a number of years. Under the present system of taxing interstate commerce, local tax collectors are vested with an extraordinary amount of discretion. Most State laws concerning the taxation of out-of-State companies are so vague and indefinite that the taxpayers are simply incapable of determining if they are liable for any tax, and if they are liable, of determining just how much the law requires them to pay. This intolerable situation is clearly documented in our 5-year study. It is not uncommon for a few administrators to assert claims which are far out of proportion to the taxes which they actually expect to collect. The claims made by these administrators against this legislation appear to be likewise exaggerated.

The Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce has, I believe, demonstrated its zeal to protect,

preserve, and augment State revenues. In drafting our earlier bill, H.R. 11798, we recognized the need for national solutions which would be helpful both to the States and to business. We took cognizance of the fact that the major portions of State revenues are derived from the very large corporations. In the income tax area, for example, roughly 80 percent of State revenues come from the so-called Fortune 500 corporations. These corporations operate all over the United States and all over the world. Our earlier bill contained provisions which were carefully designed to enable each State to get its fair share of revenue from such corporations. With the exception of Mr. Cox of Georgia and a few others, the tax administrators of States which would clearly benefit from these provisions gave us no support for these efforts. Our earlier bill also recognized—and this was pointed out again and again to the tax administrators at the hearings—that there is roughly some \$6 billion per year of dividend income which ought to be taxable by one State or another but which currently escapes tax because of large loopholes in State allocation and apportionment schemes. Our earlier bill would have closed these loopholes through equitable measures which have been advocated by administrators such as Mr. Cox for more than 40 years. Yet the Council of State Governments and many of the same administrators who now accuse the special subcommittee of destroying State revenues were vociferous in their opposition to these measures—they argued that we interfered with States rights, and some even argued that the very measures which would help them raise revenue would cause States to suffer losses. In our new bill, we have abandoned the attempt to provide a national solution to the problem of taxing the income of the large corporations. Instead, we have limited our scope so as to only include the problems of taxing small corporations. As a result the revenue effects of our income tax provisions on the States are indeed minuscule.

Our earlier bill also contained effective provisions designed to assist the States in the collection of sales and use taxes on interstate sales. We provided for a sales tax base that was much broader than the base under the present system. Clearly, through the efficient enforcement and compliance mechanisms that were provided, State revenues would have been augmented and taxpayers

given more equitable and evenhanded treatment. Once again many tax administrators claimed that their States would suffer losses. Our new bill, in response to the objections of the State tax gatherers, abandons any program to give Federal assistance in the collection of sales and use taxes. Instead, it provides a jurisdictional rule which simply accords to the level of effective compliance and enforcement which actually exists under the present system. Nevertheless, in this area the opponents of the bill also persist in asserting that it will do damage to State revenues. I can only conclude that there are a number of tax collectors who will never acknowledge that Congress has a responsibility to protect the American market from further erosion.

Finally, it is important to remember that the small businesses of our Nation are conducted by men who have already demonstrated their willingness to comply with reasonable and equitable tax laws. Our present system of taxing interstate commerce defies even their most conscientious efforts. Today, if a small company with less than 50 employees located in my State of Louisiana—or in Michigan, or in Maine, or in any one of the other States—were to invest not more than \$100 a month for advertising in a trade journal which is given national distribution, it will expose itself to potential tax reporting requirements that are staggering.

If it were to anticipate shipping its products into any State, city, county, or hamlet from which it received an order, it would require a compilation of 80 volumes of State and local tax laws which reaches more than 22 feet in height when piled one on the other. Even if it were capable of studying these laws to the same extent that they have been studied by our subcommittee, it would not be able to determine what liabilities would flow from shipments across State lines. Instead, it would determine—as we have determined—that the enforcement of the current vague laws relating to interstate commerce is largely left to the discretion of State and local tax collectors. Is it unreasonable for Congress to concern itself with this problem? Should the responsibility for our national common market be left solely in the hands of the tax collectors, who persist in asserting that no national solutions are needed? I submit that it should not. H.R. 16491 ought to be enacted promptly.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1966

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

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

Let us pray.

O merciful God whose law is truth and whose statutes stand forever, we beseech

Thee to grant unto us, who in the morning seek Thy face, the benediction which a sense of Thy presence lends to each new day. Unite our hearts and minds to bear the burdens that are laid upon us.

In a difficult and desperate era, be Thou our pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, as patiently and obediently we follow the kindly light.

May we close our national ranks in a new unity, as deadly peril threatens the birthright of our liberties.

As servants of Thine and of the Nation, and of the peoples of this shattered earth, save us from false choices and guide our

hands and minds to heal, and bind, and bless. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator

from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 30, 1966,

The Secretary of the Senate, on September 30, 1966, received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed a bill (H.R. 17607) to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 17607) to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 84-689, appoints Senator YOUNG of Ohio as alternate delegate to the 12th annual session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, to be held in Paris, France, on November 14-19, 1966.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 17787. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1672).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.R. 15098. An act to amend Public Law 89-284 relating to participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1673).

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS, WATER QUALITY CONTROL STUDY, TEXAS, OKLAHOMA, AND KANSAS (S. DOC. NO. 110)

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I present a report dated April 18, 1966, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on the Arkansas-Red River Basins, water quality control study, Texas, Oklahoma and Kansas, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

INCREASES IN ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 938

Mr. PELL submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3247) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

AMENDMENT NO. 939

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 4 line 19 after the word "appropriated" insert the following "": *Provided further, That at the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, funds appropriated for the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam, Oklahoma, may be used to provide appropriate navigational clearances for bridges crossing the Sans Bois Creek which are to be relocated under the existing project"*

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 939), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17787, making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal,

certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 940

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 4, line 19, after the word "appropriated", insert the following "": *Provided further, That the Lost Creek Project in Oregon and the Wynochee Project in Washington shall not be operated for irrigation purposes until such time as the Secretary of the Interior makes the necessary arrangements with non-Federal interests to recover the costs, in accordance with Federal Reclamation Law, which are allocated to the irrigation purpose".*

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 940), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17787, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 941

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, etc. for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 4, line 19, after the word "appropriated" insert the following "": *Provided further, That the Chief of Engineers shall, in lieu of altering the existing obsolescent bridge, provide a new four-lane high-level bridge as a replacement for the United States Highway Numbered 64 bridge immediately west of Fort Smith, Arkansas".*

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 941), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17787, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 942

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 5, line 10, after the word "navigation" insert "financing the United States share of the cost of pumping water from Lake Okeechobee to the Everglades National Park"

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 942), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17787, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 943

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 10, after line 10, insert:

"Funds appropriated for operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government may be apportioned notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases for officers or employees as may be authorized by administrative action pursuant to law which are not in excess of statutory increases granted for the same period in corresponding rates of compensation for other employees of the Government in comparable positions."

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 943), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17787, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 944

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil func-

tions administered by the Department of Defense, etc. for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 31, line 4, after "\$1,950" insert: "Provided, That such amounts may be exceeded by the net extra cost of acquiring and installing air conditioning equipment where, under regulations prescribed by the Administrator of General Services defining particular geographical areas, the head of the department or agency finds and determines that such acquisition and installation is in the best interest of the Government."

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 944), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17787, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT NO. 945

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 17787) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, the Delaware River Basin Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Water Resources Council, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 19, after line 23, insert the following:

"Any appropriations made heretofore or hereafter to the Bureau of Reclamation which are expended in connection with national disaster relief under Public Law 81-875 as administered by the Office of Emergency Planning shall be reimbursed in full by that Office to the account for which the funds were originally appropriated."

Mr. ELLENDER also submitted an amendment (No. 945), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 17787, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 946

Mr. BYRD of Virginia submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3164) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 947

Mr. BIBLE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3164, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 948

Mr. PROUTY proposed an amendment to Senate bill 3164, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the hardest working, most diligent, and conscientious Members of this body is the distinguished deputy majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Louisiana, RUSSELL LONG.

In our duties together he has been most cooperative and understanding. He has made many fine contributions with his sound advice and good counsel, and has never shirked the responsibilities which go with his position in the leadership. His recommendations have been of great value, and his soundness in procedure and policy has been outstanding.

In managing the intricate legislation of taxation, trade regulation, social security, and other aspects of the work of the Finance Committee—and it is most complex—he has demonstrated great skill, ability, and understanding. His knowledge of parliamentary procedure ranks with the best in the Senate and his awareness of the scope of the legislation he considers is truly remarkable.

Mr. President, I want to take this means to say that RUSSELL LONG has been a tremendous asset in his leadership role and to express to him my deepest thanks for his assistance and his cooperation in our years together in the Congress and our close relationship and friendship in this body.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Cecil Holland, appearing in the October 2, 1966, edition of the Washington Sunday Star be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR RUSSELL LONG—ACUMEN,
AFFABILITY, AMBITION
(By Cecil Holland)

In the months since he has been chairman of the Senate Finance Committee as well as Senate whip, Senator RUSSELL BILLIE LONG has brought a restless new force into the Senate leadership.

It is a drive that has made the 47-year-old Louisiana Democrat one of the most influential men in Washington.

In his modest Capitol Hill office LONG, who is seldom still, paused for awhile to discuss some of the philosophy of lawmaking.

A lot of people, he observed, are "fearful of new ideas," and "feel the fewer laws Congress pass the better off we are."

With such views LONG entered a mild dissent. "Sometimes they're right," he remarked, "but we pass a lot more good laws than we do bad ones. The need for legislation is there a good many years before a law is enacted."

ARRANGED SWAP

LONG's activities by no means are confined to domestic legislation. In his role as assistant leader he has emerged as one of the Senate's most vocal defenders of the President's Viet Nam policies.

During a recent debate, LONG took the floor repeatedly to urge faster action on a military request. At one point he was reminded that he, too, had made some long speeches.

LONG, with a grin acknowledged that he had and added:

"I have made speeches at length when I have been right and when I have been wrong. I am not sure when I have been wrong, but I have made enough long speeches to know that I could not have been right all the time."

If some of his flag-waving oratory produced more debate than action on the bill, at least one thing was sure: with LONG on the floor the President would not be wanting for defenders.

M'GEE FEELS SAME WAY

In a quieter and more effective way, LONG saw to it that Johnson also would have another defender at all times on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from which much of the talk over Viet Nam policies has originated. He arranged a swap that put Senator GALE McGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, another strong administration defender, on the committee in his place since he could not attend all meetings. He took McGEE's vacated seat on the Senate Banking Committee.

If he is not directly involved in matters before the Senate, LONG moves on and off the floor. Often he will lounge at his desk, missing none of the by-play that may go on among others.

HAS FATHER'S DESK

That desk—and where it is located on the Senate floor—reveal much about LONG and his political acuteness. It is the same desk once used by Huey Long and for sentimental reasons, and a fierce loyalty to the memory of his father, the son cherishes it. It just happens that it is the same desk once occupied by the illustrious John C. Calhoun of South Carolina. For this reason it has been coveted by successive South Carolina Senators.

Several years ago LONG refused to give it up to Senator J. STROM THURMOND before THURMOND turned his back on the Democratic party and became a Republican in 1964. LONG recalls telling THURMOND that

"John C. Calhoun doesn't mean a damn thing more to you than Huey Long does to me."

When he decided to get into the race for whip, LONG remembered that the late Senator Olin D. Johnston also wanted the desk. This was a different matter since Johnston represented a doubtful vote. Moreover, Johnston had close ties with organized labor and labor disdained LONG because of his stand on civil rights and medicare.

So LONG, reaching a hard decision, said to himself, "Please forgive me, Daddy, but this time I'm going for broke. He offered the desk to Johnston and Johnston accepted gladly. In the whip election LONG won on the second ballot with 41 of the 68 votes—and one of these was Johnston's.

STAYED IN THIRD ROW

When he gave up the desk LONG took over another with family ties too. It had been occupied by his mother, Mrs. Rose McConnell Long, when she served out Huey Long's unfinished term. This desk was distinguished, too, because it had been occupied by two Presidents when they served in the Senate—Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Johnson died a few months later and, LONG related, "I went and got the desk back."

Under a practice started by Lyndon Johnson several years ago, LONG as the Democratic whip was entitled to a seat alongside Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana on the front row. "If I had claimed it," LONG said, "several senior senators would have been invited to move." With the sure touch of one who knows that small considerations are not forgotten, LONG declined the seat and Senator CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, the Senate's Nestor, took it over.

Even when Virginia's Senator Harry F. Byrd resigned late last year and opened up another front row seat, LONG decided to remain where he was on the third row back. For his own convenience HAYDEN shifted to Byrd's aisle seat and the one next to MANSFIELD, ironically, fell to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, who has become one of the severest critics of the administration's Viet Nam policies.

IN DUAL ROLE

"When I ran for the position of majority whip," LONG said, "I had very much in mind the fact that men I had known like Lyndon Johnson and MIKE MANSFIELD had served as whip before becoming majority leader. It's the logical stepping stone in that direction."

"At that time I was the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Finance. It was my thought that at some time a man of 46 (LONG's age then), in his fourth term in the Senate, would become chairman of the Finance Committee."

Within a year's time after being elected whip, Byrd, in poor health, resigned and LONG became the chairman of the committee. Despite some suggestions, including one from HAYDEN, that he would have to give up his floor position, LONG made it clear he intended to keep both—and did. Thus in his dual role he has become one of the Senate's most powerful leaders.

"I've enjoyed working in both these two jobs," LONG said.

GREAT EXPECTATIONS

Where they will lead is something that time—and LONG himself by the record he establishes—will have to determine. For LONG there is time enough for that. At 47 now, he is young as Senators go and the years ahead beckon with great expectations.

How far LONG's ambitions run is something quite properly he keeps to himself. "My ambition now is to do a good job and

get elected again two years from now," is all he will say.

That in itself could be something of a hurdle. With the civil rights legislation opening the way for Negro voting in large numbers, with Southern conservatives turning more and more toward the Republican Party, any reelection campaign presents a challenge if not an actual hazard.

But it is one, many feel, that LONG can meet. With Negro voting now a reality, he has assumed a moderate position on the matter. Louisiana voters, conservative or not, would find it hard to turn their backs on one now occupying such a position of power in Washington. And the LONG name and LONG's tremendous capacity for campaigning will be advantages difficult for anyone to overcome.

WAS YOUNGEST SENATOR

Beyond that, assuming LONG's reelection, the future offers engaging speculation. It might include following in Johnson's path far beyond the whip position. In some election in the not too distant future the Democratic Party could find itself turning to the South for a vice presidential candidate for the same reasons that Johnson was selected in 1960.

Huey Long, when he was assassinated, had his sights set high. RUSSELL was 17 years old at the time and he became determined on a political career. At Louisiana State he held various student offices and ran successfully for president of the student body. His campaign, reminiscent of his father's featured ice cream cones, bathing beauties and an imported band.

He served a political apprenticeship with his uncle, Gov. Earl Long, in his administration, and then the first big chance came with the death of Senator John Overton in 1948. LONG, 29 at the time, won, and had just turned 30 when he took his seat as the Senate's youngest Member. He was reelected in 1950, 1956 and 1962.

LONG, who now ranks 19th in seniority, has seen service on as many or more Senate committees than any other member. He has accumulated a vast amount of Senate know-how which he uses to great advantage. On matters of importance he is careful to "touch base" with those who count; before running for whip, for instance, he checked first with the man in the White House and then with Georgia's Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL whose influence in Senate affairs is great indeed.

CONCERN FOR "HAVE-NOTS"

Those seeking to label LONG have called him an economic liberal and a neo-Populist. Certainly his views, in a more restrained fashion, are rooted in the concern for the "have-nots" that Huey Long displayed in his "share the wealth" and "Every man a king" slogans. While avid in looking after Louisiana's oil and other interests, LONG has championed small business and has been quick to lash out at what he considers rapacious interests.

This has been demonstrated in two Senate speeches this year. In one LONG assailed five major drug manufacturers he accused of price-fixing in the "wonder" anti-biotics; in the other he leveled his fire on "giveaway" in rights to patents developed at the Government's expense.

On the floor recently LONG opposed a bill that would give income tax credit for tuition. He said it would benefit only those able to afford college tuition and not the poor who needed help. When Senator PETER DOMINICK, Republican of Colorado, chiding LONG, said he was opposing the measure because the President asked him to do so, LONG took the floor and replied:

"I say to the Senator that the President has not asked me to do anything about this amendment. I am just against it. . . . I would appreciate it if the Senator would give me credit, once in a while, for doing something on my own. I am capable of thinking."

In the months and years ahead the Senate, quite likely, will have ample opportunity to see that Long is capable of thinking—in an independent, imaginative and, perhaps, even in a disturbing sort of way.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the October 2 issue of the Washington Post there appears an article by Andrew Glass entitled "HUBERT Survives on Humor." It is an excellent article about a first-rate man who carries the responsibilities of his most important position with dignity, diligence, and great ability. He is a man who I was proud to second when he was nominated for the Vice-Presidency and my faith in him has never wavered.

He is, in the words of Mr. Glass "an unabashed American patriot"; and while he may not agree with another's point of view, he is willing to listen, to debate, to reason and to give that view every courteous and considerate attention.

As one who worked very closely with the Vice President while he was a Member of the Senate, I can attest to his outstanding ability, his sense of responsibility, and his devotion to his country, his family, and his party. There is nothing petty or small about him, because his heart is too big, his outlook too broad, and his compassionate understanding of all our people just would not permit it.

The President of the United States is indeed fortunate to have at his right hand at all times the distinguished Vice President, and the Senate is honored to have him as the Presiding Officer of this body. Good luck, good health, and our best wishes to the President of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article previously referred to be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

HUBERT SURVIVES ON HUMOR—SELF-DEPRECATING WIT SMOOTHES CAMPAIGN TRAIL FOR VICE PRESIDENT WHO RATES HIGHER WITH POLS THAN WITH POLLS

(By Andrew J. Glass)

SEATTLE.—Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, pink-faced after a long day of outdoor campaigning in the sunny Pacific Northwest, bounced happily through the mockup cabin of a Boeing 747, the \$20 million jumbo jetliner being readied for the end of the decade.

"Say, listen, I'm telling you! Look at the size of those seats!" HUMPHREY exclaimed, patting a plush cushion. "This is just great."

Boeing President William Allen, a balding man whose rimless glasses and thin mouth remind one of a conservative Midwestern banker, beamed appreciatively. "Don't you think Uncle Sam might want to buy some of these for all the VIPs?" he ventured.

HUMPHREY's blue eyes twinkled. "You're asking the wrong man," he said as everybody laughed.

Yet being the "wrong man" in Lyndon Johnson's Government isn't always a laughing matter. As the Vice President scurries across the land, "carrying the message of our Administration and our party," reporters continually besiege him with controversial questions.

If, as occasionally happens, HUMPHREY says the wrong thing, there might be hell to pay. It is no wonder, then, that HUMPHREY usually plays it safe.

But even caution carries its price. "It's all so bland," a California reporter complained after a HUMPHREY press conference last week. "He's just a Johnson sycophant."

NO SILLY ANSWERS

Not long ago, after walking down the gangplank of his chartered airliner in Cleveland, the Vice President was promptly mobbed by a gaggle of local politicians all eager to have their pictures taken beside the distinguished visitor. A television reporter grabbed HUMPHREY by the forearm, thrust a microphone under his nose and asked: "Do you approve of the President's Vietnam policy?"

HUMPHREY likes to describe himself in public as "an unabashed American patriot," and even in the most secluded counsels of Government, he earnestly voices his unqualified approval of the President's moves in Southeast Asia. But this was more than he could take; the usually good-tempered Vice President shook free and walked away.

Normally, however, the Vice President copes with his difficult role with round after round of self-deprecating humor. After nearly two years in office, it has become his way of adjusting to a job made all the more difficult in the light of his 16 previous free-wheeling years in the Senate.

HAS PROS' REGARD

Thus, before a bipartisan Senate audience, he merrily compared the Presidential Seal—"a powerful eagle . . . fleet of wing and carrying many arrows"—with his own.

"Mine," HUMPHREY said, "looks emaciated and the wings droop down as if it's getting set for a crash landing. On one side, there's only a teeny and scrawny-looking olive branch. And on the other side, why, the eagle is holding just one little arrow. But I want you to know I'm saving that arrow for the right time."

For HUMPHREY, of course, the "right time" is 1972 when Lyndon Johnson's projected second term in office expires. To be sure, it is fashionable these days to ask "Whatever became of HUBERT HUMPHREY?" and, after glancing at Sen. ROBERT KENNEDY's popularity polls to thrust HUMPHREY aside as a serious contender for the Presidency.

But if the polls fail to tell the whole story. If rank-and-file voters tend to regard HUMPHREY as a cipher, professional Democratic politicians decidedly do not. And as Richard Nixon, Barry Goldwater and John F. Kennedy all demonstrated, at convention time, it is the vote of the "pros" that counts.

During the campaign season, the Vice President will visit 38 of the 50 states carrying his "message." HUMPHREY talks of uninterrupted prosperity, of congressional achievements under Democratic leadership, of the Administration's quest for peace and of the President's firm resolve to resist Communist aggression in Asia.

GOOD STAFF WORK

That message, as HUMPHREY well knows, doesn't always go over with the folks. Even among the firm Democrats, one can detect a rising tide of complaint over high interest rates and tight money; over bureaucratic

ineptitude in managing Great Society spending; over record-high draft calls and over the seeming stalemate in Vietnam.

Yet the Vice President's manner in meeting dissatisfaction, both on the political platform and in the back room, is invariably superb. Everywhere he travels, a phalanx of trained "advanced men" leapfrogs ahead, smoothing the way and making sure that no prominent Democrat is ever slighted.

Afterward, an avalanche of personally signed letters goes out from HUMPHREY's suite in the Executive Office Building thanking all concerned for the trouble they took to make his visit pleasant. Even the motorcycle policemen go away with Humphrey pins and Humphrey tie clasps.

As a 55-year-old grandfather, HUMPHREY adores young people and pays them special attention wherever he goes. "Why, hello there, what's your name?" he is apt to inquire while handing a pleased youngster an autographed admission card to the Senate gallery.

The Vice President also loves to talk—sometimes at such length that he begins to bore his audience. His style is as old-fashioned as the soda pop parlor in his late father's drugstore in Huron, S. Dak., but it is quite effective.

"This is a remarkable dinner," HUMPHREY told Oregon Democrats in Portland the other day. "It's just politics with the bark off, I can see that. Everybody here is rarin' to go, and when we finish tonight, I hope that you go right out on the street and start campaigning."

"The first person that you see, why, if they look like they have any doubt or hesitation, have a little private meditation with them, a few convincing words, because you really have an opportunity here to do something for your country and your state."

AUTOINTOXICATION

While it would be most indelicate for HUMPHREY to say so, there can be no question that he, like ROBERT KENNEDY, has set his sights on one day staking his claim on the Presidency.

In his years as his brother's Attorney General, KENNEDY worked within the inner power circle of Government where the really meaningful decisions are made. It is a rich wine and the taste, once acquired, lingers on long after the cup is taken from the lips. In HUMPHREY's case, it is a matter of being a sort of junior President with, as he puts it, "a great deal of authority and very little responsibility."

The high school band invariably trumpets a set of familiar ruffles whenever he arrives, yet carefully omits the following flourishes that only a President rates. Instead of "Hail to the Chief," HUMPHREY hears "The Minnesota Rouser March."

A full-time force of 21 Secret Service agents protects him in Washington and even more agents are tapped for duty whenever he leaves the city. Command posts, pressroom and communications networks are set up wherever he goes.

Limousines, helicopters and chartered airplanes are always available. At 7 o'clock every morning, HUMPHREY receives essentially the same top-secret intelligence briefing that crosses the President's desk.

It is safe to say that no man can live in that way, perched day after day at the edge of power, without wanting one day to capture the Nation's highest office.

RETIREMENT OF UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE W. BALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several weeks ago announcement was made

of the retirement from Government of Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

Since Mr. Ball became Under Secretary in 1961, he has served with distinction, ability, and loyalty two Presidents of the United States.

Some of us may not always have agreed with the Under Secretary's point of view on a given foreign policy issue. Yet I think most of us would agree without hesitation that as Under Secretary of State he has done an excellent job in difficult circumstances.

His task has not been an easy one. The duties of his office have been exacting and arduous. In the past 5 years, serious and perplexing international problems have occupied the attention of the Department of State. Opinions may differ, of course, as to what path this Nation should pursue in achieving the best solution to a foreign policy problem. But in the Department of State and in the other councils of the executive branch, Mr. Ball gained the reputation of being a man of intelligence and courage and conviction who thoughtfully and carefully reasoned out his views and propounded them forcefully. Whether or not his views prevailed as policy, Mr. Ball gained equal recognition as a man of integrity who was an able and skilled advocate of the administration's position.

Those with whom George Ball was associated during his service as Under Secretary of State will miss his many fine personal attributes and professional skills. He has been a dedicated public servant who has given generously of his time and talents in serving his country well.

I know my colleagues would join me in expressing the hope that Mr. Ball enjoys his forthcoming deserved vacation and rest and that he reach additional successes in the years ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that an article by Mary McGrory appearing in the Evening Star of September 30 relative to Mr. Ball's retirement be printed in the RECORD.

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

**A DOVE ALIGHTS FROM THE SEVENTH FLOOR—
FLEEING THE FUDGE FACTORY**

(By Mary McGrory)

George W. Ball, retiring undersecretary of state, made a farewell speech this week. He entitled it, "My Six Years in the Fudge Factory."

One gropes in vain for the name of another man on the seventh floor of Foggy Bottom who would have put it just that way.

Ball, a close friend and ally of Adlai Stevenson and an appointee of John F. Kennedy, leaves the State Department the same man as when he came—amiable, interested, irreverent.

He wears suits tailored in London. He enjoys good wines and good conversation. He makes jokes about things that never seem funny to anyone else who wears the fuzz of the seventh-floor carpeting on his shoes. He is a tall, crinkly-haired man, whose long eyes disappear when he smiles. And through six years which have seen nuclear confrontation and bloody involve-

ment in Southeast Asia, he has managed to keep smiling.

Once, in recent months, when the situation in South Viet Nam appeared more murky and desperate than usual, he said to a friend, sighing, "Oh, yes, we keep hoping something will turn up. Mr. Micawber is a very important member of this government, you know."

In April 1961, when the Bay of Pigs had plunged the city and the White House into stygian gloom, the undersecretary managed a small shaft of light.

He quoted T. S. Eliot: "April is the cruellest month," and a few wan smiles appeared.

Now that he is quitting the "fudge factory" he is setting off for three months in Italy. He will begin at Lake Como in the north and work his way down to Sicily, enjoying the leisure that was unthinkable for a man who had approximately two weeks of vacation in six years.

Even on Sunday he and Secretary of State Dean Rusk foregathered in their offices to read the cables. The only difference was that they both wore sports shirts to indicate their consciousness that it was really a day off.

The departure of a hedonist like Mr. Ball is always a sad thing to certain Americans who feel that a man who relishes civilization will fight harder and more cunningly to preserve it than some men who are merely driven by conscience and a sense of duty.

"George is a genuinely courtly figure," mourned one Calvinist, who honored the Ball decision to retire in search of a little rest and a little more income.

But it is Ball the dove whose flight is so lamented on Capitol Hill. Said Chairman J. W. FULBRIGHT, whose dissension on the Viet Nam war was more public, "It leaves only one or two bedraggled senators to carry on."

Ball's lonely course was private and discreet. His views against the war were so well known within the administration that the President, during high councils, would sometimes turn to him and say, "All right, George, I want you to give the contrary view," before Mr. Ball had expressed any.

BRIEFS AGAINST ESCALATION

It was only last spring that the press began to be aware that in Ball's files was a thick loose-leaf folder containing his eloquent briefs against further escalation. Every civilian, beginning with the President, was always in favor of a political solution. The argument was over the cost. In every adversary proceeding, Ball included some face-saving material.

His arguments were listened to, but not heeded except in some softening detail. But the fact that he was heard, that he was able to maintain a warm and friendly relationship with the secretary of state and was never denied a hearing by the President perhaps explains why he is unembittered as he quits.

His views were formed during his long and intimate association with the French government—he was its counsel during the coal and steel and Common Market negotiations. He was with them during their long agony over Indochina. He absorbed much of their feelings of futility about imposing a stable government over feuds and divisions that were centuries old.

He will write a book during his vacation. It will contain no damaging revelations à la Arthur Schlesinger Jr. Nor will it be a manifesto for the anti-Viet Nam elements in the country. Ball is said to feel that an ex-government official urging a diverse view on an administration may simply freeze those he left behind in the positions he has taken.

When he was called upon to defend administration positions with which he dis-

agreed, he did so. He is not a crusader, not a sufferer.

He loved government service because he felt it was relevant and vital. If six years did not change his perspective or his prose, it remains to be seen what effect he had on a large and generally resistant bureaucracy.

Even that bureaucracy, in some branches, will miss him.

"People in the administration who had doubts could go to George," said one of them. "People who were even more worried than he was found George receptive. They knew he would represent their dangerous opinions to the President much better than they could."

For them, the departure of the urbane underground is saddest of all.

SENATE SHOULD INSIST ON BEING TOLD FULL CONSEQUENCES OF SUSPENDING INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, as hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance began today on the administration's proposed suspension of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation, the Washington Post carried a wise and timely challenge to the committee.

The Post points to the many and increasing signs that by the end of next year, the economy may begin turning down. Unemployment may be increasing.

It is at just this time—a year from now—that the suspension of these tax incentives will begin to have their slowing effect on the economy. So the action that the Senate is to be asked to take may aggravate and deepen a recession.

Anyone who questions the delayed effect of the investment credit suspension should review the remarks of the Secretary of the Treasury before the Joint Economic Committee last February, and examine the excellent documentation which the Secretary used to support his position.

Skeptics should also consider the report of the National Industrial Conference Board—to which the Washington Post editorial this morning adverts, showing that a response of more than half of the thousand biggest manufacturing firms in the country indicates that the suspension will have no significant effect for now on their investment plans.

This, of course, means no stemming of inflation now.

But the Post editorial especially challenged the Committee on Finance to elicit from the administration witnesses precisely what expectations they have for the economy in the latter half of 1967, and particularly in the last quarter of next year, when this will have a very serious effect; because then there will be every reason for business to postpone its investment in plant equipment until the suspension is ended and the credit is resumed.

It seems to me that the asking of the following questions makes sense:

Do the administration experts expect business investment in equipment to be

much higher at that time? How much higher? Just what effect will the investment credit suspension have?

What will be the status of business investment in plant expansion late next year? What effect do they anticipate from suspending the accelerated depreciation?

What is the anticipated level of prices and wages in machine tools and in construction generally for next year?

What will be the effect of these suspensions on prices and wages in these industries?

If the suspension is adopted and, as a result, next year some resources in the equipment and construction industries are not needed to produce industrial equipment and plant, where would these resources be employed? What shortages would they relieve? What problems can be anticipated of moving resources, say, from plant construction to home building? Is the transition possible technologically? Is it possible financially? How long will it take to make this transition?

Mr. President, these are the questions the administration did not answer when the proposals to suspend these incentives were before the House Ways and Means Committee. Before the Senate acts, we should insist on these answers, especially since this body last March rejected, by an overwhelming 78-to-10 vote, a very similar proposal to suspend the investment credit. Certainly, before the Senate reverses that decision, it should insist on some good solid reasons for doing so.

Mr. President, I have great respect for President Johnson, and sympathy for the agony of his position, but I do not think that a Senator who would honestly avoid the label "rubber stamp" should reverse his March vote on this issue simply on the basis of a Presidential recommendation. To reverse that vote, Senators should insist on the kind of substantial and detailed answers, spelling out the full consequences of this action, that were sorely missing in testimony before the other body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHY TAKE IT ON FAITH?

The Senate Finance Committee, which opens hearings this morning on the Administration's tax bill, ought to seize the opportunity to probe into issues that were neglected by a hasty House Ways and Means Committee. Chairman MILLS and his fellow Democrats, for reasons which are not entirely clear, were willing to accept on faith the Administration's contention that the economy will continue to be confronted by excessive demands for goods and services through 1967. But why should this crucial assumption about the shape of the future be taken on faith?

Several recent developments contradict the confident but unsupported "qualitative judgments" that Government witnesses made before Ways and Means. The decline

in residential construction is assuming a slump-like dimension. And despite the current pressures of demand in the capital goods industries, new orders, especially for machine tools, have declined. Small wonder then that a majority of economists surveyed by the National Association of Business Economists are predicting a lower rate of economic growth in 1967 and that roughly a third expect a recession late in the year.

Also neglected is the question of whether suspending the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation on industrial and commercial buildings will relieve the current pressures in the capital goods industries. The National Industrial Conference Board, a business organization, asked the 1000 largest corporations how the legislation would affect their investment plans. The answer, based on 552 responses, is that the Administration's measures will have no significant impact on the immediate demand for capital goods. More than 90 per cent of the respondents said that the proposed tax revisions will not induce them to reduce their investment programs during the rest of this year. The proportion falls to 82 per cent in the first half of 1967 and 78 per cent in this second half. These lags in the response to the suspension of the tax incentive—and the possibility that investment in 1968 may be postponed in anticipation of the suspension's termination—suggests that the Administration's bill could work in a mischievously perverse fashion.

Members of the Senate Finance Committee ought to demand hard answers to questions that were not very artfully dodged in the Ways and Means hearings. By how much does the Administration expect the Gross National Product to rise in the next six quarters? Which components of the GNP will rise rapidly, which slowly? What is the outlook for defense production—not defense spending which lags behind production—if it is assumed that the war effort in Vietnam will continue at the present level? How much of an extra burden would an accelerated war effort impose on the economy?

A mistaken fiscal policy, coming at a time when monetary policy is severely restrictive, might well halt the expansion of the economy. In view of the enormous risks, the Senate Finance Committee should accept little on faith.

TWENTY-FIVE LEADING INDICATORS NOW POINT TOWARD END OF BOOM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last week I referred briefly to an analysis of economic indicators by Dr. Howard Sharpe in the *Weekly Bond Buyer*. The Sharpe analysis specified that for the first time in more than 5 years a majority of the leading indicators are pointing down, suggesting the long business boom, the happy period of more jobs, more growth, more prosperity, may be coming to a conclusion.

I called attention to this analysis in connection with pending legislation to suspend tax incentives in order to take steam out of the economy late next year.

Mr. President, I have just secured the complete article by Dr. Sharpe and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SMALL CLOUD ON THE HORIZON: A TREND INDICATOR TURNS DOWN

(Note.—The Beginning of the End? Among economic forecasters, Dr. Howard Sharpe of "The Weekly Bond Buyer" has been a bull consistently and correctly during this expansion. Now he notes what may turn out to be the beginning of the end: The leading indicator diffusion index for the most recent month's real trend has slipped into the minus column. He explains what this means and goes on to say that leading indicator trends are never conclusive in themselves, that forecasters should go outside them for evidence not reflected by the indicators themselves. The biggest piece of such outside evidence today is Government spending.)

(By Howard Sharpe)

For the first time in this five-and-a-half year old general business expansion, the leading indicator diffusion index for the most recent month's real trend—as that trend is measured by "The Weekly Bond Buyer"—has tumbled into the minus column.

Leading indicators tend to foretell the direction of business and production as a whole in the months immediately ahead. It is generally agreed that a mere head-count of single-month changes in direction among these leaders is not very helpful. On many occasions during this current expansion the majority of these leaders have been on the downside. The real trick is to determine when the majority are down in terms of trend rather than merely in terms of a simple erratic fluctuation.

Opinions differ, however, on the criteria for judging trend. On more than one occasion during this economic expansion, other observers have concluded that the trend among the leaders had finally turned down.

A downturn among the trends in the leaders should have been followed by a downturn—or at least a flattening—in the trend of production. However, the trend of industrial production, as measured by the Federal Reserve Board's index, has been upward for more than five years. The only notable downturns during this period have been due to strikes. And during the past couple of years the rate of increase—even on a percentage basis—has matched the rate of increase scored by all but the very earliest months of the expansion.

Recent history thus has justified the index of real leader-trends, as measured by "The Weekly Bond Buyer." This index has pointed upward on more than one occasion in recent years when the leader-trends of virtually every other observer were on the down-side.

But still to be proved is the ability of "The Weekly Bond Buyer" index to call correctly the finale—the ultimate downturn to this expansion which, now in its 68th month, has proven itself the most durable expansion in the history of America.

OUTSIDE THE INDICATORS

Parts of the rationale of the index have been set forth in various stories which have appeared previously in "The Weekly Bond Buyer." Certain of these points are summarized in the caption which appears beneath the table on "Monthly Leading Indicators" on page 7.

A more complete summation of the rationale will be presented next week. But of most immediate importance is the fact that right now—for the first time in this record-long general business expansion—"The Weekly Bond Buyer" leading indicator index for the most recent month's real trend has dropped into the minus column.

The real leader-trends for the most recent single month are definitely down. But on the other hand, the real trends of their respective tri-monthly averages are in this

minus territory by only the skinniest of pluralities.

Furthermore, the leading indicator trends never should be regarded as conclusive in themselves. The forecaster should use every scrap of evidence he can lay his hands on. This includes leading indicator trends. But it includes also evidence which lies outside the immediate ken of the leaders.

Vietnam spending during the quarters ahead will keep growing. In fact it will grow by even bigger increments than last year. We can be pretty sure of this.

Any failure of these Pentagon plans to be fully reflected in the current batch of leading indicators obviously calls for appropriate adjustment in the final forecast.

But by the same token, we need to know more than the simple fact that Defense Department spending will rise. For example: Will the new rise ahead in Defense Department spending put so much upward pressure on the economy that a general tax rise will become a necessity?

The current behavior of the leading indicators suggests the possibility that the private economy may be about to slow down enough to allow a further Vietnam spending build-up to occur without the necessity of a tax hike. If the most recent month's trend continues, a tax hike may not be required.

THE TALLY

Right now, here is the tally on the real trends among the leading indicators as measured by "The Weekly Bond Buyer" and as shown in the final two columns of the accompanying table on "Monthly Leading Indicators":

For the most recent single month, the real trend is up for only nine of the leaders, as opposed to 15 on the downside, and with one unchanged (table's next-to-final column).

But for the most recent tri-monthly average, the margin of defeat for the uptrenders is much more narrow. The real trend is up for 10 of the leaders, as opposed to 11 on the downside, with four unchanged (table's final column).

The method used by "The Weekly Bond Buyer" for measuring the "real trend" is specified in the caption beneath the table. Those leaders which have no natural limitation on their growth capabilities are called "open end leaders." These are the first nine leaders shown at the top of the table. The most recent month is judged to be uptrending if its level is above the level of the middle-valued month in the trio of months centered on the "MCD-ago" month. The MCD is the minimum number of "months for cyclical dominance"—the minimum span for the measurement of a significant cyclical trend, as judged by the calculations of the Census Bureau.

The MCD concept and program were developed by Julius Shiskin—initially for the National Bureau of Economic Research and later for the Census Bureau. Mr. Shiskin currently is the Census Bureau's chief economic statistician.

On the other hand, those leaders which have a natural ceiling limiting their growth capabilities are called "closed end leaders." The 16 closed end leaders are shown in the bottom two-thirds of the table. The method of measuring the trends of "closed end" leaders must of necessity differ from the method used for "open end" leaders.

Most observers would agree that each of these "closed end" leaders does have a ceiling, and so is basically different from an "open end" leader. The average workweek (a closed end leader) for example, is unlikely ever to exceed the peak achieved during World War II.

In contrast, an open end leader has no such natural ceiling. Even at their current depressed levels, stock prices (an open end leader) are considerably above the level achieved during World War II.

HEIGHT OF CEILING

But even though the concept of a ceiling for closed end leaders be granted, the problem is to specify the height of the ceiling as accurately as possible.

Because 1965 was the record high year in a record long general business and leading indicator expansion, this year was used as the yardstick for the rough height of the ceiling for each of these closed end leaders. It was recognized that some excess over that height would be possible for a leader during any particular month, just as in fact had occurred for each of these leaders during certain months of 1965 itself.

But the second half of 1965 was higher for these leaders than the first half of 1965. So also was the first half of 1966 higher for these leaders than the first half of 1965. Therefore, the highest 12-month level for the leaders now has proven to be the 12 months ending in June 1966, rather than the 12 months ending in Dec., 1965. Accordingly, this latter measurement is now being used as the yardstick for judging the height of the "closed end" leaders.

If the calendar 1965 had been used in this month's table, the real trend for the latest single month would have been down. The tally in the next-to-last column would show 11 uptrending as opposed to 13 downtrending, with one unchanged.

So the result still would have been to show this diffusion index of the most recent single-month real trends dropping into the minus column for the first time in this current expansion. The margin of defeat for the uptrenders, however, would be considerably more narrow than the nine-to-15 margin of defeat shown by this tally as it actually appears (wherein the 12 months ending in June, 1966, rather than the 12 months ending Dec., 1965 are used).

As for the most recent trend in the tri-monthly averages (table's final column), use of the calendar 1965 yardstick for the "closed end" leaders would have left 15 uptrending as opposed to only nine downtrending, with one unchanged. This would be in contrast to the 10 uptrenders, as opposed to the 11 downtrenders, with one unchanged—the tally shown by the table's final column as actually presented.

PROBLEMS

In this connection, the points made by Mr. Richard H. Shaw, Investment Assistant Secretary for Monarch Life Insurance Co. are well taken. His letter accompanies this story on page 3.

The questions raised by Mr. Shaw are perceptive. The practical problems pointed to by him are genuine. The practical answers are not easy.

Appropriate here are the comments made by Winston Churchill on democracy. "Democracy," said Mr. Churchill, "is the worst form of government—except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time."

The rule-of-thumb system used for measurement of "closed end" leaders is likewise the worst system imaginable—except for all the other systems (essentially the no-rule-of-thumb systems).

This is not intended to be a glib dismissal of the problem. The point is simply that, until we develop better and more systematic methods of attack, the most practical approach is to do the best we can with the knowledge at hand.

At this point, this consists of the recognition that the nature of "closed end" leaders

is inherently different from the nature of "open end" leaders, and that the criteria for judging their trends should differ accordingly.

In the opinion of "The Weekly Bond Buyer," the best practical type of yardsticks now at hand are those provided by the "MCD-ago" levels for "open end" leaders, and the "recent 12 month leading indicator high" levels for the "closed end" leaders.

The latter of the two yardsticks is obviously rougher and less precise. But, as the old saying goes, better to be roughly right than to be precisely wrong.

BULLISH FOR STOCKS

As for the situation right now: The drop in "The Weekly Bond Buyer's" leading indicator diffusion index into minus territory does not in this current situation portend an actual economic downturn. The continuing buildup of Vietnam spending is too powerful to allow a real recession to occur in the months immediately ahead.

But what the downturn in our leading indicator index does point to in the current context is a significant reduction in the upward pressure of business.

Because of the leadership inherent in the index, the easing in upward pressure which it implies will not take place for a couple of months. It will not occur before November, and the statistical reports on the slow-down will not be at hand before December.

The important policy implications of the forthcoming easing of upward pressure on the economy are two. First, there will be a reduction in motivation for the Federal Reserve Board to tighten credit further. And second, there will be a reduction in the degree of necessity for a tax hike.

While the implications for the bond market are obviously bullish, the implications for the stock market are not necessarily bearish. First, right from the beginning of this current 1966 bear market, stocks have been declining because of tightness of money in all its aspects. These aspects include not only the competition with rising bond short-term yields, but also involve the actual scarcity of money.

The second, and more recent, reason for the decline in the stock market has been the fear of an impending tax hike. Indeed, the Administration's top echelon of economists and cabinet officials are drawing up plans for a tax hike of somewhere between \$7 billion and \$15 billion. The stock market can hardly be blamed for slumping even lower under the fear of tax-hike plans so big and nasty as these.

A reduction in monetary tightness, coupled with the possibility of no tax hike, after all, would be a double-barreled reason for a rise in stock prices.

In this connection it should again be emphasized that "The Weekly Bond Buyer" leading indicator diffusion index is designed to foretell the direction of general business activity. It is not intended to—and it does not—point the direction of the stock market. An upward point in "The Weekly Bond Buyer" leading indicator index does not augur a rise in the stock market. By the same token, the current tumble of the index into minus territory—its first such tumble in the five and a half years of this current expansion—does not necessarily augur any extended continuation in the decline in the stock market.

Indeed, the above analysis suggests that within the context of the current situation, this decline in the leading indicator index—when its implications become more generally evident—will be just what the stock market's doctor ordered.

Capital market report, Oct. 3, 1966—Monthly leading indicators

OPEN END LEADERS

Series No.	Title	History		Latest month				Latest trio of months			Latest real trend	
		MCD	Yearly growth rate	Date	High or low	Monthly change	Trend versus		High or low	Trend versus	Single month	Trio of months
							1965-66 average	MCD				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	
CAPITAL SPENDING												
6	Durable goods, new orders (billions of dollars)...	3	3	August...		—	—	—				
24	Machinery and equipment, new orders (billions of dollars)...	3	4	do...		—	+	—	H	+	—	—
9	Commercial and industrial construction contracts (millions square feet)...	6	5	do...		—	—	—		+	—	—
10	Plant and equipment contracts and orders (billions of dollars)...	4	4	July...	H	+	+	+	H	+	+	+
RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION												
7	Private nonfarm housing starts (millions)...	6	1	August...	L	—	—	—	L	—	—	—
29	New house start permits (1957-59=100)...	3	1	do...	L	—	—	—	L	—	—	—
PROFITABILITY												
13	New business incorporations (thousands)...	3	-1	July...		0	—	—		—	—	—
19	Stock prices S. & P. 500 composite (1941-43=10)...	2	5	September...		—	—	—		—	—	—
23	Industrial materials prices (1957-59=100)...	2	-2	do...		—	—	—		—	—	—

CLOSED END LEADERS

PROFITABILITY												
38	Index of net business formation...	2	-10	July...		—	—	—		0	—	—
14	Liabilities of business failures (millions of dollars) inverted...	6	-31	August...		—	—	—		0	0	0
15	Failures with liabilities over \$100,000 (number weekly) inverted...	6	-26	do...		—	—	—		—	—	—
17	Price per unit of labor cost (1957-59=100)...	3	-0	do...	H	+	+	+	H	+	+	+
EMPLOYMENT												
1	Average workweek, manufacturing production (hours)...	3	0	do...		+	0	—		0	—	0
2	Accession rate, manufacturing (per 100 workers)...	4	-2	July...		—	—	—		+	—	+
30	Nonagriculture placements (thousands)...	2	2	August...		0	0	0	H	+	0	0
3	Layoff rate, manufacturing (per 100 workers) inverted...	3	2	July...		0	+	0		+	0	+
4	Persons on temporary layoff (thousands) inverted...	5	1	August...		+	+	0		—	—	—
5	Initial unemployment claims, State (thousand weekly) inverted...	2	-1	September...	H	+	+	—		+	—	+
INVENTORIES												
21	GNP inventory spending (annual rate, billions of dollars)...	6	5	June...	H	+	+	+	H	+	+	+
20	Change in manufacturers' materials book value (annual rate, billions of dollars)...	6	-15	July...		—	—	—		+	+	+
37	Purchased materials, percent of agents reporting higher...	3	-2	September...		—	+	+		+	+	+
BACKLOGS												
26	Production materials, 60 days and over, percent of agents reporting higher...	3	-5	do...		—	+	0	H	+	+	+
32	Vendor performance, percent reporting slower deliveries (Ch. P.A.A.)...	2	-4	August...		+	+	—		0	—	+
25	Change in backlog, durable goods manufacturers (billions of dollars)...	4	-10	do...		—	—	—		—	—	—
Open end leaders (9):												
	At higher or rising...					1	1	2	1	2	1	2
	At low or falling...					2	7	7	8	2	5	7
Closed end leaders (10):						3	6	8	3	4	8	8
	At high or rising...					0	8	7	9	0	4	8
	At low or falling...										4	7
Grand total (25):						4	7	10	4	6	12	10
	At high or rising...					2	15	14	17	2	9	15
	At low or falling...					3	1	4	4	4	2	1
	Unchanged...											4

Because this table is oriented toward the future rather than toward the past, the data here are shown through the latest month available for each series.

Each series is numbered, titled and seasonally adjusted as in the official Census monthly, "Business Cycle Developments," edited by Julius Shiskin.

The first two columns provide the basis for trend analysis:

Column 1 shows each leader's MCD—the number of months required for the "cyclical" trend to outweigh or "dominate" the erratic

"red herring" fluctuations. By the same token, the MCD represents the minimum number of months required for the measurement of a meaningful trend.

Column 2 shows each leader's compounded average annual percentage rate of growth from 1959 through 1963. Each of these terminal years—1959 and 1963—was in its own day a peak year for "leading indicators" as a whole.

It should be noted that the "open end" leaders display generally positive long-term (1959 to 1963) growth rates. Indeed, if 1964

had been used instead of 1963 for the final terminal year, not any of the "open end" leaders would show a negative long-term growth rate.

In contrast, the long-term growth rates for nearly all of the "closed end" leaders are zero or negative—as demonstrated in the bottom two-thirds of column 2.

The final 10 columns show each leader's most recent behavior:

Column 3 shows the month of the latest data now available.

Column 4 shows whether this latest month scored a high (H)—that is, a "best mark"—or a "low" (L) for this current expansion out of Feb. '61 general business trough.

Column 5 shows the direction of this latest month's change relative to its level of the preceding month.

The next two columns show the trend of this latest month:

Column 6 shows whether this latest month is higher or lower than its average for the 12 months ending in June, 1966.

Column 7 shows whether this latest month is higher or lower than the middle-valued month in the trio of months centered on the MCD-ago month.

The next three columns show the most recent trio of months figured as an average:

Column 8 shows whether this latest trio is at a high (H) or low (L) compared to any post-Feb. '61 trio of months completely prior to this latest trio.

Column 9 shows whether this latest trio of months is above or below its average for the 12 months ending in June, 1966.

Column 10 shows whether this latest trio of months is above or below the MCD-ago trio. For example, if the MCD is four, the trio of months ending in June is compared to the preceding trio of months ending in February.

The latest "real" trends—the most meaningfully measured trend—are shown by the final two columns, column 11 for the latest single month, and column 12 for the latest trio of months.

For each of the "open end" leaders, this "real" trend is taken from the "MCD-ago trend"—from column 7 for the latest single month, and from column 10 for the latest trio of months.

For each of the "closed end" leaders, this "real" trend is taken from the "trend relative to 1965-66"—from column 6 for the latest single month, and from column 9 for the latest trio of months.

The reason that for a "closed end" leader the trend relative to its 1965 average—rather than the trend relative to its MCD-ago level is selected as the "real," or meaningful, comparable" upswing in the case of a "closed end" leaders are specifically those leaders which are restricted in their long-term growth capabilities (Weekly Bond Buyer, Oct. 14, '63, p. 8). Because of this restriction on their growth capabilities, it is unreasonable—after five years of general business expansion—to expect that these "closed end" leaders would continue to be able to surpass their MCD-ago levels.

Accordingly, the surpassing of its average for the 12 months ending in June, 1966 should be scored as a "real" uptrend in the case of a "closed end" leader.

The 12 months ending in June, 1966 surpassed calendar 1965, which in turn surpassed calendar 1964, which in its own turn had surpassed calendar 1963. As already noted, the year 1963 was in its own day an historical high.

The series for unemployment and for business failures are "inverted." In each of their cases, the lowest level is the best and so is scored at a "high." A decrease in its level is scored by a plus—a point emphasized by the asterisk (*).

The only quarterly series used is "#21—GNP inventory spending." This substitutes for the monthly series on inventory spending (#31). The latter was excluded because of its extreme erraticism, its tardiness in being reported, and revisions which make current comparisons difficult.

FACTORY ORDERS AND SHIPMENTS FELL IN AUGUST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, newspapers this morning reveal that new

factory orders in August fell about 2 percent from the month before and shipments slipped slightly, the Commerce Department reported, while the long rise in the backlog of orders slowed significantly. The only aspect of factory activity that added to inflation fears, analysts noted, was a more rapid accumulation of inventories.

Mr. President, in that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Factory Orders and Shipments Fell in August."

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1966]

FACTORY ORDERS AND SHIPMENTS FELL IN AUGUST—FASTER INVENTORY BUILDING WAS ONLY INFLATION SIGN, BUT IMPORTANCE IS DOUBTED—INCREASE IN BACKLOGS SLOWED

WASHINGTON.—New factory orders in August fell about 2% from the month before and shipments slipped slightly, the Commerce Department reported, while the long rise in the backlog of orders slowed significantly.

The only aspect of factory activity in August that added to inflation fears, analysts noted, was a more rapid accumulation of inventories. Some of this could be due to "hoarding" against possible price increases, one said, but he suggested that trying to avoid shortages was a more likely motive.

Usually, a reduced price pace of ordering would be considered a "leading" indicator of less output later. But Government economists didn't view it that way this time, because much of the latest decline was in defense ordering which is expected to turn up again as soon as the Vietnam war needs grow.

August factory orders were estimated at a seasonally adjusted \$44,648,000,000, down \$977,000,000 from July's slightly upward-revised \$45,625,000,000. In July orders had fallen by \$208,000,000.

The second consecutive monthly drop came as bookings in the aircraft, shipbuilding, primary metals and electrical machinery industries "dropped sharply," the department said. These declines were partially offset by a large increase in orders for non-electrical machinery.

DURABLES HAVE WIDEST DECLINE

Nearly all the August orders decline was in durable goods, for which bookings fell to \$23,410,000,000 from July's \$24,371,000,000. The decline wasn't quite as steep, however, as an earlier estimate indicated. Seasonally adjusted orders for autos advanced to \$4,017,000,000 from \$3,884,000,000 a month before but steel mill orders declined to \$1,906,000,000 from \$2,277,000,000 in July and the aerospace industries slipped to \$4,807,000,000 from \$5,092,000,000.

Defense Department orders for aerospace, ordinance and communications gear fell to \$3,082,000,000 from \$3,503,000,000 in July, while those of the machinery and equipment industry slipped to \$4,807,000,000 from \$5,092,000,000.

New orders for nondurable goods slackened off only by \$7 million from the month before to \$21,247,000,000 in August, the report showed.

Factory shipments fell 0.6% to \$44,076,000,000, after a 0.5% increase the month before. Shipments of durable goods dropped more steeply than those of nondurable, where "moderate increases" in food and tobacco shipments almost offset declines in other goods. Except for transportation equipment,

however, the department said shipments in "nearly every" durables category declined.

BACKLOGS RISE

The backlog of orders for durable goods alone rose by 0.8% in August, much less rapidly than the 1.9% advance of the month before, which was also the average advance over the past 12 months.

Nevertheless, the backlog of all types of factory orders continued to loom larger in relation to the shipment pace, possibly boding further production-line strains. As of Aug. 31, the backlog equaled 2.90 months' shipments, up from 2.83 a month before and 2.57 a year before.

Factory inventories, at \$74,100,000,000 at the end of August, were up 1.6% from a month before, compared with a 1.4% July rise and a 1.2% gain in June. The latest month's increase was more sharply in excess of the monthly average gain of only 1.0% over the past 12 months. At the end of August, inventories equaled 1.68 months' shipments, up from 1.65 at the end of July and from 1.62 a year before.

Here is the Census Bureau's monthly tabulation of manufacturers' shipments, inventories, new orders and unfilled orders (in millions of dollars):

	Unadjusted		Seasonally adjusted		
	Aug. 1965	July 1966	Aug. 1966	July 1966	Aug. 1966
All manufacturing	33,443	40,412	42,982	44,327	44,076
Durable goods	19,813	20,599	21,376	23,031	22,817
Nondurable goods	19,630	19,813	21,606	21,296	21,259

INVENTORIES

All manufacturing	65,481	72,684	73,758	72,958	74,100
Durable goods	40,704	45,634	46,641	45,790	46,772
Nondurable goods	24,777	27,050	27,117	27,168	27,328

NEW ORDERS

All manufacturing	39,964	42,314	43,624	45,625	44,648
Durable goods	20,348	22,521	22,141	24,371	23,401
Nondurable goods	19,616	19,793	21,483	21,254	21,247

UNFILLED ORDERS

All manufacturing	61,697	76,602	77,241	76,310	76,881
Durable goods	58,438	72,801	73,564	72,651	73,235
Nondurable goods	3,259	3,801	3,677	3,659	3,646

¹ Revised

² Preliminary.

LOW RATE OF GAIN IN SEPTEMBER PRODUCTION AND ORDERS CAUSES CONCERN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, purchasing agents reported new-order and production rates of their companies gained in September, but the improvement was below last year's seasonal upturn. About 45 percent of the officials surveyed said they were "concerned"—and that was their word—about the outlook for the next 12 months. This was the first time such comment was so widespread since June 1962 during a stock market slump and business slowdown.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Low Rate of Gain in September Production, Orders Causes Concern, Buying Agents Say."

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

LOW RATE OF GAIN IN SEPTEMBER PRODUCTION, ORDERS CAUSES CONCERN, BUYING AGENTS SAY

NEW YORK.—New-order and production rates gained in September, according to a monthly survey of purchasing executives. But the improvement was below last year's seasonal upturn, causing "concern" over the outlook for the next 12 months.

The National Association of Purchasing Agents said the survey showed 33% of members responding had a higher level of orders in September than in the previous month up from the 31% that cited improvement in orders in August. However, this was sharply below the 43% reporting new-order gains in September 1965. Business activity in the fall normally picks up from the summer, the association says.

Association members reporting order drops in September decreased to 16% from 27% in August, but only 7% had reported order declines in September 1965.

The association said 35% of the members noted higher production last month, and 11% cited production slowdowns. This bettered the August picture of 35% with climbing output and 11% with lags. But it reflected far less buoyancy than the 45% reporting increased production in September 1965 against only 8% noting declines.

LARGE PERCENTAGE "CONCERNED"

"Concerned" was the term employed by 45% of members in describing the outlook for the next 12 months. The association said this is the first time such comment was so widespread since June 1962, during a stock market slump and business dropdown. "Satisfied" was used by 20%, "optimistic" by 27% and "worried" or "pessimistic" by 4%.

The rate of inventory building continued to slow in September. The 20% reporting lower stocks is the largest since last January. Also, the 25% telling of higher levels is the smallest percentage since February. There were 57% saying that the higher cost of money is affecting their inventory policy.

As to capital spending plans for the rest of the year, 31% said tight money would have a slight effect and 29% expected a serious impact. Members also cited continuing tightness in labor and material markets.

EMPLOYMENT STABLE SO FAR

The September employment picture is relatively stable so far, according to the association. It said 12% of members had fewer employees last month, against 6% noting a drop in August. But 22% of members reported higher payrolls in September.

Price trends moderated in September. The impact of steel price boosts, reflected sharply in August statistics, lessened a bit. Members reporting higher prices last month amounted to 56%, down from 61% in August.

The copper picture, which eased somewhat in August, was somewhat mixed in September, depending on sources of supply, the association said.

Price-change reports remained at about the same level as in August except that copper has moved to the higher-price list from the lower-price list.

Other higher-priced items were mercury, sugar, corn starch, bearings, paper (particularly corrugated), chemicals (particularly alcohol and phthalic anhydride), forgings, pipe fittings and castings.

Items listed in short supply were aluminum, brass and brass products, copper and copper products, molybdenum, nickel, castings, electronic components, electric motors, bearings, pumps, valves, paper, machine

tools, sulphur, methanol, forgings and porcelain insulators.

No items were listed on the down side for price changes.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS TO SLOW INFLATION WON'T DO THE JOB

MR. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, this morning's Wall Street Journal has a very interesting analysis by corporate economists. In the article the corporate economists say:

The Johnson Administration's plan to cool off the economy by suspending for 16 months both the seven per cent investment tax credit granted to business and accelerated depreciation allowances on buildings won't work.

They expect a continued rise in inflation into mid-1967. This view seems to be widely held. There is a reason for it. They think the inflation will not be reached by the tax action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Corporate Economists Say Johnson Program Won't Halt Price Rises" be printed in the RECORD.

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

MORE INFLATION?: CORPORATE ECONOMISTS SAY JOHNSON PROGRAM WON'T HALT PRICE RISES—THEY SEE COST PUSH FROM BIG PAY HIKES REINFORCING PRESSURE OF HOT DEMAND—FIRMS BUDGET FOR TAX BOOST

(By Albert R. Karr)

"We're going to get a lot more inflation in the months just ahead."

That's the prediction of Albert G. Mata-
moros, economist for Armstrong Cork Co., and of a great majority of corporate economists interviewed by The Wall Street Journal. The economists think that the Government's consumer price index, which rose at a 4.8% annual rate between July and August, will continue to climb at about that rate for the rest of 1966. The rate is more than three-and-a-half times the average annual 1.3% rise the index recorded between 1960 and 1965.

The Johnson Administration's plan to cool off the economy by suspending for 16 months both the 7% investment tax credit granted to business and accelerated depreciation allowances on buildings won't work, most of the corporate economists believe. They think the Administration in 1967 will be driven to an income-tax increase to fight inflation.

But even then "we're looking for a continued rise in inflation into mid-1967," says an economist for Clark Equipment Co., Buchanan, Mich., maker of construction machinery.

CHANGE IN THE PROBLEM?

A major reason for these forecasts: "We are in the midst of a very subtle change in the nature of inflation, from the type of inflation associated with excessive demand to a type associated with rising costs," says Daniel W. Hodes, economist for General Telephone & Electronics Corp. He and others believe that prices, which so far have been pushed up primarily by the pressure of strong demand on a U.S. industrial capacity that is severely strained, shortly will be pushed up by rising costs of labor and materials as well.

Labor cost increases so far have been largely offset by gains in productivity. A Government index of output per man-hour in the nonfarm economy rose during 1965 from 120% of the 1957-59 average to 124.6%,

an average gain of over a percentage point a quarter.

But the rise has slowed in 1966. The Government index rose 0.9 point in the first quarter, then fell 0.5 in the second quarter.

Meanwhile, workers have seen their purchasing power eroded by rising living costs. Their unions have noted that manufacturers' after-tax profits in the second quarter were 5.9% of sales, the highest profit margin since 1950, according to Government figures.

Already, economists note, wage demands and settlements are rising. The Machinists Union settled its strike against major airlines for an increase far exceeding the Government's 3.2% "guidepost" for noninflationary boosts. A settlement between the Communications Workers and Western Electric Co. grants increases topping 5%. And many construction industry agreements have far exceeded the guideposts.

Next year such major unions as the United Auto Workers, the United Rubber Workers and the Teamsters negotiate major contracts. "The wage-price guideposts are obviously off, and with corporate profits as high as they are, unions are quite certainly going to press for big wage increases," says D. B. Kindler of Wheeling Steel Corp. An Air Transport Association economist adds that "with unemployment rates at such low levels, worker bargaining power is awfully strong."

So, economists fear, a combination of big wage boosts and small productivity gains will end a long period of stability in labor costs per unit of output. For manufacturers these costs in August were 99.7% of the 1957-59 average, Government figures show.

The business economists doubt that President Johnson's current program, which is designed largely to slow corporate capital spending, will do much to curb even "demand-pull" inflation. They cite a National Industrial Conference Board survey indicating that suspension of the investment tax credit is unlikely to have much effect before late 1967 or 1968, as most companies are committed on expansion projects through next year. One company polled said the suspension would only "require us to borrow more money" to finance expansion, and thus "put more pressure on the tight money situation."

Economists see no sign of a cutback in Government spending to reduce demand pressures, either. Most look for defense outlays to rise throughout 1967, to a fourth-quarter rate roughly 10% higher than in the final 1966 quarter, and to more than cancel out any reduction in nondefense outlays the White House might effect.

"A MESSY SITUATION"

In this situation, without a tax boost to "reduce demand pressures, we might get into big trouble," says Avram V. Kisselgoff, economist for Allied Chemical Corp. "We're in a messy situation," Edwin W. Magee, Jr., partner in Mackay-Shields Economics, Jr., a consulting firm, says that "almost every company we talk to assumes that chances are better than 50-50 that there will be a tax increase."

Many business economists are so sure taxes will be raised that they are advising their companies to plan 1967 budgets on the assumption that the corporate income-tax rate will be 50% or higher, against the present 48%. This could mean, among other things, that profits available to finance capital spending would be reduced by higher taxes.

Companies getting such advice from their economists include Allied Chemical, Clark Equipment, Du Pont Co., Continental Can Co. and Boeing Co. Boeing already has a "contingency plan" to take a higher tax rate into account, says Manuel S. Rustia, a company economist. An economist for Clark Equipment says his company is planning on a 50% to 51% corporate income-tax rate in

1967, and is "reviewing all of our costs to try to offset the rise in material and labor costs that we're sure to have in the months immediately ahead."

**CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED
ON CHILD NUTRITION CONFERENCE REPORT**

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one section of this year's child nutrition bill extends and expands the special milk program for schoolchildren. To my great joy agreement was reached on this legislation by House-Senate conferees almost 2 weeks ago—on September 21, to be exact.

However, there has been an unaccountable delay in approval of this conference report by the full House and Senate. Apparently the conference report has been set aside in the House as more urgent legislation, such as the Office of Economic Opportunity amendments and the Investment Credit Suspension bill, was made the subject of business. But this situation is going to worsen, not improve. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Congress to act as quickly as possible to approve this proposal and send it to the President.

It would be a pity, Mr. President, if the days, weeks, and months of work on this legislation were thrown away by the failure of Congress to approve this conference report before the session ends—2 or 3 weeks from now. This might well jeopardize the continuance of the school milk program, which expires next June 30. It would be a cruel blow indeed for the children and the dairy farmers of our Nation to sustain.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

VIETNAM PEACE SETTLEMENT ON AN HONORABLE BASIS

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent days I have been disturbed—more than usual—by the trend of events about a Vietnam peace settlement on an honorable basis.

There have been questions raised, both here and abroad, about the honesty of President Johnson's flexible proposals for peace enunciated through Ambassador Goldberg in the United Nations. There have been statements out of Saigon and Peking saying that the Geneva agreements as a basis of settlement in Vietnam are obsolete and should be forgotten completely. Indeed the same suggestion has ever been made by well-known personages in this country.

Statements have also been made about "as much force as we need to win" and "I'd take any action to win" but the specifics to back up these comments have been notable by their absence.

Why should we foreclose the possibility—thin though it is—of the use of the Geneva accords and Ambassador Goldberg's proposal as starting points toward an honorable settlement? It is

bad enough for Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow to doubt the President's word. But I do not doubt his honesty and sincerity. Regardless of feelings he is our President; he does have an awesome responsibility.

When one advocates the application of "as much force as we need to win" the Nation should be told just what is meant. Does it mean the use of 750,000 men or 1 million or 2 million or what? What does the statement "I'd take any action to win" mean? In addition to an increase in numbers sent to Vietnam, does it mean landings in North Vietnam in addition to those evidently being considered for the Mekong Delta—as press reports seem to indicate? Does it mean the use of nuclear weapons and bombs? And, if so, against whom? The Congress is entitled to know and if the matter is to be considered during an election campaign, the voters of the Nation are entitled to know.

The upcoming Manila Conference is also being questioned for a variety of reasons. The charge is being made that Washington proposed the Conference. As a matter of fact, the initiative was proposed by a distinguished Asian leader, President Ferdinand Marcos of the Republic of the Philippines. Does anyone doubt the fact? According to press reports this morning President Marcos said the first step in this Conference would be "a peace offensive."

The charge has been made that this Conference is being held for domestic political purposes. What was President Johnson supposed to do? Decline the invitation? Of course not. It is well to keep this political fact of life in mind; no matter what the President does at this particular time, he will—automatically—be subject to that allegation.

The President of the United States needs our trust and confidence more than ever at this period in our history. He needs it and deserves it, both at home and abroad, in his efforts to seek an honorable peace. To the best of my personal knowledge, the President has been endeavoring to give a credible, honest, and sincere account of events as they pertain to Vietnam. That there have been blunders, misstatements, poorly timed statements, and a certain amount of secrecy, the latter perhaps necessarily, I do not deny.

The President has had to hear many sides about what should or should not be done about Vietnam. There are some who have expressed to him—usually though not always at his request—their views and the reasons for them. He has always listened carefully and courteously to advocates of alternatives, and, in many instances, to my personal knowledge, gone into them in specific detail. Yet he is accused of turning against such people on a personal basis. This, on the basis of personal knowledge, is not true although I daresay at times he does become exasperated. Who would not when you consider the burdens and responsibilities both domestic and foreign? After all, he is only a man and his shoes fit into the same clay as the rest of us.

The President wants an honorable settlement in Vietnam. Are we as

Americans to reject that which the President desires above all else? Is not that what the great majority of us want? Are we, as Americans, to join the doubters in the U.N., the doubters in the Communist bloc, the doubters among our friends and allies?

Or, are we going to give the President as much support as we can and the benefit of any doubts we possess? He needs that support, political campaign or no, and he will need it after the November 8 election, because the situation in Vietnam will not, in my opinion, be settled by then. Neither will the results of the election, whatever they may be, change the course we are now set upon.

Friends and foes, doubters and believers, dissenters and conformists should ponder carefully and not emotionally the size of the stakes involved in Vietnam and their possible effects on the future of the Republic.

I believe my views—my doubts—about the situation in southeast Asia are fairly well known on the basis of what I have said here in Washington and in my home State of Montana. My thinking on Vietnam and southeast Asia has not changed.

The question is not how we got into this barbaric struggle—that is always too easy to do—but how we can resolve the problem with honor—and that is always hard to do.

Dissent is not a disservice to the Nation. It is, indeed, a service provided it is constructive. But backbiting, downgrading, and ridiculing our President will not make his task easier. Rather it will make it much more difficult. Picketing, sloganizing, diatribes, will uncover no solutions but only make them more difficult.

MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I congratulate the majority leader on the magnificent statement which he just made. I agree completely with every argument he advanced.

LET US STOP SQUANDERING TAX-PAYERS' MONEY ON CIVIL DEFENSE

MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, when the appropriations bill for the Department of Defense was before the Senate for debate and vote last month, I offered an amendment to cut the appropriations for civil defense purposes by 15 percent, to accomplish saving \$15 million of taxpayers' money.

At that time, I pointed out the fact that officials and employees of the civil defense section of the Department of Defense are among the highest paid in the entire Federal bureaucracy.

Subsequently, some of my colleagues, in private conversation, expressed their amazement at that fact. I have, therefore, made thorough research regarding the average salaries of officials and employees of all independent Government agencies and ask unanimous consent that the table which I have prepared listing the agencies, the number of officials and employees, and the average salary in each agency be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

Average salary of employees and officials of the independent agencies, fiscal year 1966

[Based on average payrolls and employment for fiscal year 1966]

Agency	Average number of employees	Average salary
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	\$11,905
American Battle Monuments Commission	411	2,892
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	164	11,429
Atomic Energy Commission	7,253	10,753
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	667	9,148
Canal Zone Government	3,036	7,005
Civil Aeronautics Board	797	11,346
Civil Service Commission	3,908	8,794
Commission on Civil Rights	123	8,406
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	133	9,570
Export-Import Bank	291	10,491
Farm Credit Administration	234	10,067
Federal Aviation Agency	43,840	10,182
Federal Communications Commission	1,493	9,779
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,486	8,781
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,251	9,633
Federal Maritime Commission	249	10,645
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	423	12,580
Federal Power Commission	1,103	10,182
Federal Trade Commission	1,130	10,429
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	171	8,343
General Services Administration	36,815	6,669
Indian Claims Commission	20	15,729
Information Agency	11,617	6,510
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,348	9,914
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,930	10,591
National Capital Housing Authority	431	6,626
National Capital Planning Commission	57	10,741
National Capital Transportation Agency	35	12,001
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	33	5,927
National Labor Relations Board	2,234	9,922
National Mediation Board	137	10,856
National Science Foundation	1,035	9,731
Panama Canal Company	12,063	4,927
Railroad Retirement Board	1,697	8,258
Renegotiation Board	175	12,447
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	8,740
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,350	9,857
Selective Service System	8,438	4,283
Small Business Administration	3,903	8,929
Smithsonian Institution	2,260	6,867
Soldiers' Home	1,110	4,565
Subversive Activities Control Board	24	14,165
Tariff Commission	273	10,387
Tax Court of the United States	150	12,078
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,106	8,273
Veterans' Administration	165,116	6,437
Virgin Islands Corporation	11	8,012

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the average annual salary of officials and employees of the civil defense section of the Department of Defense is \$12,450 a year. There are only three other independent agencies in the entire Federal Government in which the average salary exceeds that amount. The Indians Claims Commission with only 20 officials and employees has an average salary of \$15,729 a year; the Subversive Activities Control Board with 24 officials and employees has an average of \$14,165 a year; the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service with 423 officials and employees has an average of \$12,580 a year. Mr. President, the Indian Claims Commission and the Federal Mediation Board, by their very nature, require many highly trained professional personnel deserving of higher civil service ratings. I cannot say the same for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

It is noteworthy that important Federal agencies such as the Federal Power

Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the U.S. Information Agency, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Science Foundation, the Small Business Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission and many others in this table have average salaries far below that maintained in the civil defense agency. Furthermore, these agencies perform vital services requiring the employment of many highly skilled personnel. For example, NASA employs 612 men and women having attained degree of doctor of philosophy.

Even more astounding is the fact that of the 720 employees of the civil defense agency, half receive \$14,511 a year or more. These high-salaried bureaucrats operating the so-called civil defense program have proven themselves to be every bit as tenacious as the Bourbons of France, the Romanovs of Russia, or the Hapsburgs of Austria. In fact, had these royal families studied the methods of entrenched civil defense bureaucrats, they might still be on their thrones.

I am sure that our Nation will be able to continue to maintain its tremendous strength if some of these high-salaried civil defense planners were dismissed or transferred to Federal agencies where they can perform a needed public service.

Mr. President, Secretary of Defense McNamara frequently talks about the economies that he has effected in his Department. To give credit where credit is due, it is a fact that he has brought about the saving of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money through improved management techniques and through elimination of duplication and waste. However, if there is one place in the entire Federal Government where taxpayers' money can be saved without in any way curtailing a vital public service or impairing the national security, it is in the civil defense boondoggle.

In his recent message to Congress, the President stated that he intended "to conserve and save public outlays at every possible point." The place to begin is by drastically reducing expenditures of the outmoded, discredited civil defense boondoggle which already has completely wasted more than a billion and a half dollars of taxpayers' money; or better yet, by abolishing this agency.

I cannot conceive of the justification for any reduction of expenditures for housing programs, school milk programs, education programs, and other important public welfare programs unless the tragic waste of millions of dollars on civil defense is first eliminated.

I do not know of a single means whereby the administration could more clearly demonstrate its desire for economy and to save taxpayers' money which otherwise would be squandered.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to commend the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for the comments which he has made about the situation we face in Vietnam.

I wonder whether the majority leader had an opportunity to read in yesterday's New York Times the article written by James Reston, entitled "Washington: The Tragedy of Skepticism"?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did, and I must say that I was most impressed by this article—and I might add that I am always impressed by Mr. Reston's articles.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the article to which I have just referred.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1966]

WASHINGTON: THE TRAGEDY OF SKEPTICISM
(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—The official proposals for a peace in Vietnam have had a cool reception in the world, not because they are unfair or unrealistic, but simply because they are not believed.

Likewise, next month's Asian conference in Manila has been dismissed rather casually, not because an Asian conference is unimportant, but because this one seems to have been arranged in Washington for domestic political purposes as much as anything else.

If these things are true, as I believe they are, we are in trouble. Even the most powerful Government cannot be effective if it is not trusted, if thoughtful and disinterested men, including our friends and allies, are always scanning our official statements and actions for some unstated motive other than the one given.

JOHNSON'S BATTLE

Yet this is what is happening in the world today and it is a tragedy. For despite all the blunders, ambiguities, and misleading statements out of here on Vietnam in the past, the simple truth now is that President Johnson is searching sincerely for an honorable settlement of that war.

He is prepared for a cease-fire and a phased withdrawal of all combatants in Vietnam: he is willing to dismantle the American bases in that peninsula; he is in favor of the neutralization of all of Southeast Asia, and he is prepared to let the peoples of South and North Vietnam decide their own political future, even if this means a coalition with the Communists or even a Communist Government.

It is true that there are influential men within the Johnson Administration who are not willing to go this far. There has been a sharp dispute about it within the Cabinet, and some officials here, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, still feel that the sacrifices of the past and the strategic demands of the future in Southeast Asia will be lost in so risky an accommodation. But President Johnson has made his decision. He has accepted the risks and decided for a compromise settlement, and this is the tragic irony: he has not been able to convince the enemy; he has not convinced that spare, moralistic Huguenot, Couve de Murville, the French Foreign Minister; and he has not even convinced our old friends in Britain.

The consequences of this are very serious. Consider the reaction of former President Eisenhower, whose views could have a more profound effect on the future of the Vietnam war than all of the opinions expressed in the United Nations over the last two weeks. Ike was originally opposed to American involvement in a land war in Southeast Asia. When his own Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and his own chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, suggested American intervention to rescue the French in the critical battle of Dienbienphu and hold Southeast Asia for the West, the

two major opponents of American intervention were Lyndon Johnson, then Democratic Leader in the Senate, and RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. And President Eisenhower agreed then, not with his own Secretary of State or chairman of the Joint Chiefs, but with Johnson and RUSSELL.

Yet Mr. Eisenhower came out this week in Chicago for using whatever force is necessary to win a military victory in Vietnam. He would not even rule out the use of atomic weapons to achieve this objective. It was a mad proposal, made by an old man on behalf of his Goldwaterish brother Edgar, who wants to be re-elected to the Illinois Legislature, but it should not be lightly dismissed.

THE PRESENT DANGERS

For if President Johnson's offers of a compromise settlement in Vietnam are rejected by the foreign ministers at the United Nations, and he is then being urged by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and even goaded by Eisenhower to go all the way for a military victory, the prospect is for an even more savage war in Vietnam, even at the risk of intervention by Communist China. In American political terms, all the press, all the academicians, and all the Senators who want a compromise settlement will probably not be able to stand out against a political and rejected Johnson, supported by Eisenhower.

The danger of the present situation is perfectly clear. Believe him or not, President Johnson is the ally and not the opponent of those who want an honorable settlement in Vietnam. But if he is rejected even by so sensitive a man as the French Foreign Minister, and forced to choose between de Gaulle's proposals of a humiliating American surrender and Eisenhower's proposal for an all-out military victory, the chances are that he will choose the safe political alternative, which is Eisenhower's.

It is easy to understand the doubts of the colonial nations and of the officials in Hanoi and elsewhere who have suffered under colonialism in the past. They simply cannot believe that the United States would fight such a savage war for a principle, rather than for commercial or military advantage; but this just happens to be the American position. President Johnson is suffering from the disadvantages of his political techniques. He is trying to get out of Vietnam, but his enemies and even his allies, having observed all of his political manipulations in domestic and foreign policy, do not really believe him. And in their disbelief, they are now on the point of creating precisely the holocaust they think they are trying to avoid.

A REACHING OUT

It is, admittedly, partly the President's fault. He has put political tactics above principle, and the reaction against his political manipulations has set in, but on Vietnam he is reaching out to his enemies and his allies for an honorable settlement, and if he is rejected now, particularly after Eisenhower's support for a military "victory," Vietnam will probably become even more of a tragedy than it has to be.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the majority leader believe that—particularly since Ambassador Goldberg's address at the United Nations—it is becoming abundantly clear that the President of the United States is sincerely interested in reaching a peaceful solution of the present unfortunate war in Vietnam through diplomatic and political means rather than through military means?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I would say not only since the magnificent speech and the flexible set of proposals advanced by Ambassador Goldberg, at the direction of the President of the United States,

but also going back for many, many months, the President's desire for peace has been very apparent and, in my opinion, is really the No. 1 objective which he seeks honestly and sincerely.

When the President's credibility is questioned, I sometimes wonder just what we expect in a democracy such as ours because, to the best of my personal knowledge, the President has been honest and forthright in the statements which he has made. There is no question in my mind that when he seeks to achieve an honorable and peaceful settlement via the negotiation table, he is doing so because he sincerely believes that that is the highest objective attainable in the world, at the moment, so far as this country is concerned.

The President is understandably concerned about the possibilities which are inherent in the Vietnamese situation and he would like to avoid those possibilities; but, unfortunately, of late, there have been many voices raised lamenting throughout the land, raising ghosts and hobgoblins which seem to me to be undermining the efforts which the President is attempting, and making it more difficult in this awesome and onerous job which is his as President of the United States of America—and that means President of all our people.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Montana and I deplore the speeches which have been made by former Vice President Nixon and the interview granted by former President Eisenhower.

My concern is that we should all rally to the support of the President in the efforts to achieve a negotiated peace which he is seeking.

What bothers me is that we read in the newspapers that there are many more American troops than there are South Vietnamese regular troops in South Vietnam. They are going into the Mekong Delta, taking over the obligations of the South Vietnamese troops, with the possibility of a pitched battle occurring below the 17th parallel.

I would wish that the President, as Commander in Chief of U.S. forces, would not permit the military to escalate this war at a time when the diplomatic corps is trying to make some sort of detente, some sort of arrangement for negotiations.

Therefore, I hope very much that the speech of Ambassador Goldberg, and the general attitude which that exemplifies, can be U.S. policy and that our military escalation will cease.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial published in the New York Times on yesterday, entitled "Climate for Negotiation."

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1966]

CLIMATE FOR NEGOTIATION

The orders issued last week for a limited pause in United States bombing of the demilitarized buffer zone between North and South Vietnam represent a useful reinforcement of the peace offensive that began with Ambassador Goldberg's speech at the open-

ing of the United Nations General Assembly.

It is plain that the next few weeks will represent a period of delicate, intense and necessarily secret diplomatic feelers to establish whether the Communist nations will come to the conference table on terms that offer some reasonable hope for an honorable end of the Vietnamese conflict.

From all the Communist capitals have come the standard charges that the United States peace proposals are a sham designed to cloak further escalation of the fighting on the ground and in the air. But interspersed with these allegations of bad faith have been the faintest of hints that Hanoi and the Vietcong may be moving toward less intransigence in their own terms for negotiation.

The attempt to probe the extent and genuineness of these appearances of flexibility is complicated by the manifest divisions within the Communist world—not merely in the basic ideological struggle between Moscow and Peking but in the internal hierarchy in each Communist country. Insecurity born of disunity feeds suspicions of the United States and thus plays into the hands of hardliners opposed to any real exploration of Washington's peace bid. The chances that these bellicose forces can be kept from dominating the final Communist response will be improved if the Johnson Administration speak with a single voice in support of the position outlined at the U.N.—and if American actions are consistent with its peaceful theme.

Unfortunately, the only assistance President Johnson has been getting from the Republicans in this period of explosive uncertainty is of a kind calculated to exacerbate Communist distrust. Richard M. Nixon calls on the President to repudiate the key elements in the proposal Mr. Goldberg put before the U.N. The Republican leader in the House, Representative Foa, urges bombing of Haiphong. And former President Eisenhower, whose own election was attributable in part to his pledge to end the Korean war, counsels Mr. Johnson to step up the Vietnamese conflict by applying "as much force as we need to win."

To President Johnson's credit, he has not only specifically reaffirmed his endorsement of the United States position as expressed by its spokesman at the U.N., but has apparently cautioned his aides against statements that might impugn its credibility, such as the ones Secretary of Defense McNamara made on warplane production and the growth in NATO's nuclear arsenal just after the U.N. speech.

There are now more American troops in South Vietnam than there are in Saigon's own regular army. American casualties reached a record level of nearly 1,000 last week. These heavy investments in American blood and military strength require a comparably exhaustive effort to establish a diplomatic climate for peace. President Johnson's meeting at the White House tomorrow with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko will afford the President an opportunity to persuade him that there is no hypocrisy, no evasiveness and no double talk in the United States offer of peace with honor in Vietnam.

SENATOR MUSKIE DELIVERED IMPORTANT ADDRESS ON URBAN PROBLEMS AT OHIO'S KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, perhaps the most important domestic problems facing our Nation in the coming decade are those faced by our urban areas. For too long the difficulties afflicting our cities have been neglected by the Federal Government and State gov-

ernments, while local governments have not been able to cope with them.

On September 20, 1966, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] spoke before the second annual conference on urban regionalism held at Kent State University at Kent, Ohio. Officials of Kent State University have taken leadership in seeking effective means for regional planning and development and are to be commended on their outstanding contribution toward that end.

In his speech before the conference, Senator MUSKIE clearly outlined the problems facing our metropolitan areas. More important, he clearly and concisely defined the new roles which must be played by Federal, State, and local authorities in helping to solve them. It is one of the finest statements that I have read on an issue which is rapidly becoming of paramount importance and with which the Congress will be deeply concerned for many years to come. It will be of great help to all Senators and Representatives to read the penetrating remarks of our distinguished colleague, and I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE TO THE SECOND ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN REGIONALISM, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, KENT, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 20, 1966

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to be with you again.

Last year I applauded the establishment of Kent State's new center for urban regionalism. It seemed to me to be a dynamic approach toward understanding and solving Government problems on a regional basis.

Since then you have been busy in promoting this cause: the new urban library and information service which can be helpful to State and local administrators; the plans for a training institute for transportation management; the school for newly elected councilmen begun last fall; the development of your regional planning commissions and the proposed work on water pollution and transportation problems.

These will lead, I hope, to even more comprehensive ventures in coordinating local resources.

In 1861, John Stuart Mill had this to say about the capacity of local governmental authorities to do their work:

"In the first place, the local representative bodies and their officers are almost certain to be of a much lower grade of intelligence and knowledge than parliament and the national executive. Secondly, besides being themselves of inferior qualifications, they are watched by and accountable to, an inferior public opinion. The public under whose eyes they act, and by whom they are criticized, is both more limited in extent, and generally far less enlightened, than that which surrounds and admonishes the highest authorities in the capital; while the comparative smallness of the interests involved causes even that inferior public to direct its thoughts to the subject less intently, and with less solicitude."

It has been said that Mill "combined enthusiasm for democratic government with pessimism as to what democracy was likely to do."

And so, despite the foregoing pessimism, Mill emphasized two advantages of government by local authorities over the central government: (1) "They have the compen-

sating advantage of a far more direct interest in the result;" and (2) "however inferior the local public may be to the central, it is the local public alone which has any opportunity of watching them (local authorities), and it is the local opinion alone which either acts directly upon their own conduct, or calls the attention of the government to the points in which they may require correction."

Although he was not speaking of the Federal system specifically, these and other observations by Mill a hundred years ago reflect both the problem and the importance of making the Federal system work.

He believed that "if only on the principle of division of labor, it is indispensable to share them (the duties of government) between central and local authorities."

However, he saw a higher purpose to such a division in "the importance of that portion of the operation of free institutions which may be called the public education of the citizens." And, he said, "of this operation the local administrative institutions are the chief instrument."

As we concern ourselves with the workability and improvement of the Federal system, we ought not to forget that it was conceived as a resolution of what Mill has described as the age old "struggle between liberty and authority." As such, it is something more than the efficient distribution of the chores of Government.

Wilhelm Von Humboldt, in discussing the sphere and duties of Government, has said, "The Grand, Leading Principle—is the absolute and essential importance of human development in its richest diversity."

Intergovernmental relations involves people: their health, their homes, their jobs, their rights as citizens, and their security as free men. When our governments do not apply their laws or allocate their resources effectively—when they do not bring the full force of their programs to bear on social and economic problems, it is the people who suffer, and it is the Nation which loses.

During the past five sessions of Congress, we have developed the most impressive package of Federal legislation since the depression to attack poverty, ignorance, economic distress, urban blight, discrimination and other human problems. But the success of this legislation is only as good as the machinery which carries it to the people—in the fastest, most effective way possible.

One of the most far-reaching developments in the growth of America during the twentieth century is the emergence of the metropolitan community. It has put extraordinary demands on our Federal system—for economic development, environmental improvement, and the development of our human resources.

When our Constitution was drawn up, only 5 percent of our population was urban. We were a sparsely populated country of less than 4 million. One hundred years ago twenty percent of the population lived in cities. By 1900, the urban share had jumped to 40 percent of a total of 76 million people. Today, over 70 percent of our Nation is urbanized and we have a total population of 195 million. Projected to the year 2000—and this is the date we should really be thinking about in order to plan for the future—we will reach 300 million people and 85 to 90 percent of them will be crowded into our urban and metropolitan areas comprising a total land area of less than 15 percent of the Nation.

Whether we like it or not, this is the trend, and we must start now to cope with it.

There are other population trends which should be noted. The largest increase in recent years has been among the groups which require the costliest Government services: the old and the young. Since 1940, for instance, the number of persons over 65 has increased 100 percent; the number of young people below 20 has risen 70 percent.

Their demands are special; their requirements for education, health services, job training, leisure activities, improved housing, and police protection, to name a few, will place a heavy burden on Federal, State and local governments of the future.

Where population growth in general has centered in urban communities, it has particularly concentrated in metropolitan areas of 100,000 or more. In fact, 90 percent of our urban population lives in such areas. Furthermore, over half the population of all standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) live in the suburbs of our central cities and this percentage is on the increase.

Here in northeastern Ohio, you have five standard metropolitan statistical areas, all but one of which have a population over 100,000. Together they contain over three and three-quarters million people and in time will develop into one of the Nation's super metropolises. Your region is expected to experience a 26 percent expansion by 1980, most of which will occur in the suburbs and the fringe areas.

Obviously, the more people there are, the larger the demand for public development and services, but the particular nature of our population growth—our increased crowding into the cities and the suburbs, our larger numbers of elderly and young, many of whom are poor—will put a special pressure on our Federal system.

What can our Governments, Federal, State and local, do to meet this challenge?

More than anything else, they must put aside their traditional and oftentimes petty differences and competitive conflicts, and cooperate. Resources and programs must be coordinated. State and local planning concepts must be respected. Reasonable lines of administrative and political authority must be drawn. And modern management techniques and competent manpower must be employed.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

The most important role which the Federal Government can play is to preserve the autonomy and support the flexibility of State and local government. This is the real meaning of federalism. This role is carried out through the grant-in-aid system by which most of our Federal aid money is distributed. In over 70 percent of our Federal programs, the States administer the funds to their local governments. In the others, local units determine the degree to which they wish to participate, and the application of the aid.

The Federal grant-in-aid system, by providing necessary resources, has strengthened and augmented the authority of State and local governments, for public development, while at the same time assuring that minimum national standards will be met.

More than anything else, this task needs cooperation, not conflict, between all levels of government.

State and local officials face a numbers game with Federal aid: 170 programs, administered by 21 Federal department and agencies through hundreds of bureaus and regional, State and local offices. Many of these programs are overlapping and conflicting. Many should be coordinated.

Nowhere in the Federal Government can State and local officials take their problems in a package and get an across-the-board analysis of what they need, what they are entitled to, and what planning must be done to get the full benefit of available Federal aid. There is no overall Federal policy of putting programs together and funding them on a coordinated development basis. This reduces the effectiveness of Federal grants-in-aid.

But we are beginning to do something about this—slowly, but with assurance.

Last year we passed the Economic Development Act, which provides for regional commissions of Governors and Federal members

to study major needs and to recommend plans for program coordination and priorities.

The Office of Economic Opportunity and the Agriculture Department's community development program are similar efforts to develop coordination of Federal programs affecting the poor.

The new Department of Housing and Urban Development now has a Special Director of Urban Program Coordination to pull together Federal resources to help our cities.

And the demonstration cities program, with its comprehensive planning requirements, is a significant step toward intergovernmental cooperation.

Still there is no overall Federal policy or mechanism for combining Federal aid to help States and localities attack their problems on a broad basis. Nor do we have any formal machinery for developing a close liaison between the Chief Executive and State and local leaders.

This is why I recently introduced legislation to establish a National Intergovernmental Affairs Council in the Executive Office of the President, headed by an Executive Secretary directly responsible to him and assisted by a "working secretariat" independent of the agencies, to ride herd on those Federal agency conflicts and to help State and local leaders with their broad development programs.

In short, our goal must be to develop Federal aid as a service to States and localities, rather than as a game of chance, where too often the affluent and the astute win the game, at the expense of the needy and uninformed.

THE STATE ROLE

What role can and should the States assume?

In effect, the State is a regional form of government. It has a broad potential for resolving the disputes and conflicts between local jurisdictions and for bringing order out of the chaos of fragmented local government with its overlapping, uncoordinated districts and authorities. Unfortunately, the States have tended to view the urban crisis as if it either did not exist or was not their responsibility. The effects of reapportionment may make a difference.

Some States have already begun to move toward helping local communities with urban development problems. Some have established a State office of urban affairs to give technical assistance on problems of local government finance, structure, organization, and planning. This office advises the Governor and legislature in the coordination of State and Federal programs affecting urban development. It serves as a clearinghouse of information on common problems of local government. It provides special assistance in the techniques of managing urban services.

The State of Ohio has responded to the challenge. The Ohio Legislature has created legislative committees on urban affairs to deal with the problems of municipal incorporation, annexation, and metropolitanwide councils of government. It has enacted laws providing for interlocal agreements for maintaining public services, voluntary transfer of functions, and the coordination of State water resources, among other measures to encourage local coordination. It has provided for the establishment of regional commissions and has encouraged regional planning. This is very encouraging, but it is only the start of what must be a national effort.

Local governments are finding it increasingly difficult to finance mounting public needs. Federal grants-in-aid, spread out over 170 programs and allocated to thousands upon thousands of governmental units, although helpful, are not enough—particularly with respect to the larger urban areas. The local property tax, which still provides 87 percent of local revenues, tends to grow at a slower rate than the gross na-

tional product and is not providing enough to meet the increasing public demands generated by our tremendous growth.

The States should move to tap our expanding economy through a large application of broad-based taxes that are more commensurate with the growth of the States.

They should take the initiative in financing their own grant-in-aid programs for the benefit of metropolitan communities.

More than half the States now have grants to local governments for public education, health, hospitals, welfare, and highways. A lesser—but growing—number make payments for fire, police, water, and housing. But none of these have reached the dimension that they should for effective impact.

This trend in State assistance must be accompanied by greater equalization of local fiscal capacities. This is being done in the Federal sector. The States, too, can administer grants and provide tax-sharing in a way to minimize differences in the ability to provide services. To minimize the differences in service levels, more than half the States now weigh local tax efforts and community educational needs when distributing educational grants.

Effective State-local collaboration will never be a reality unless the States come to grips with the unequal fiscal capabilities of their municipalities.

THE ROLE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

So much for the state partner. What contribution can the cities make the partnership of cooperative federalism?

First, they must join with states in seeking to reduce the haphazard array of functional authorities that overlap and conflict with the operations of general purpose governments.

A similar effort should be made to blend city operations into a metropolitan fabric of planning and coordinating through various devices: councils of government; joint city-county administration of certain services; and inter-local contracting of others.

The proliferation of districts, authorities, and other special purpose units which work independently of local government authority, often without popular control, ought to be halted and reversed.

Consider for a moment what the jurisdictional crazy-quilt of counties, townships, municipalities, and special districts mean to the individual voter. In a recent report on local governments, the committee for economic development cites the case of the citizen of the city of Fridley, Minnesota, a city of 16,000. In order to exercise his informed vote, the voter must keep abreast of developments in the 11 jurisdictions for whose support he is taxed. He must consider layer after layer of jurisdictions—from his own city, his own school district, his sanitary and sewer districts, his soil conservation districts, his county governments, his airport commission, his mosquito control district, the state of Minnesota, and the United States of America—and this is typical! The CED report shows that there are more than 91,000 jurisdictions operating today in this country, and, not surprisingly, calls for consolidation of most of them.

The problem is compounded in the larger metropolitan areas. New York has over 1,400 local governments; Chicago is surrounded by 900; Pennsylvania has 6,201 local units. Here in northeastern Ohio, your metropolitan areas are involved in this problem. Pittsburgh has 800 local jurisdictions, perhaps the largest number of any city when compared to population and area. The Akron area has 54 local governments, the Canton area has 57, Cleveland has 135, and the Youngstown area has 105.

How can any consensus of good planning and consideration be achieved with such a mixture of authority and independent funding?

Second, the cities must join the States and launch an all-out improvement in property tax application and administration. Studies show that local governments may be losing billions of dollars a year because of inadequate recoupment of this source of income. There are too many loopholes, exemptions, and special treatments, often benefiting the few at the expense of the many.

Many property tax laws are incapable of effective enforcement. Local tax personnel are often not professionally trained or adequately protected against overt outside pressures.

Any consideration of flexible Federal and State assistance to the cities should carry with it the obligation that these local units of government are getting the maximum return from their revenue sources.

Third, city governments can set up their own community development departments, to provide an effective liaison with State urban affairs agencies and with the Federal Department of Housing and Development in planning workable programs of Federal aid, such as that contemplated under the "demonstration cities" bill.

Fourth.—And this is perhaps the most difficult task—the cities must make a far greater effort toward metropolitan regional planning.

The "701" metropolitan planning program authorized by Congress 11 years ago has resulted in the establishment of regional planning agencies in about three-quarters of the metropolitan areas of the country.

Unfortunately, the scope and implementation of the Plans had resulted, too often, in controversy and frustration and inaction.

In a national study, half the planning agencies felt that their powers were inadequate, their funds and staff too limited, and they received too little public support. While the other half were satisfied with their technical programs, only 20 percent felt that their metropolitan program was being accepted.

It should be a primary task of this conference to calm the fears of public officials—and the voters—over comprehensive Government planning. Go back to your communities and sell this program. Tell the people that their tax dollars will go farther, their public problems will be earlier solved, if modern techniques and professional manpower are put to work in building the communities of the future.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to share with you some observations drawn from a very thoughtful article by Professor Peter F. Drucker in the Washington Post on September 4th ("Our Destination—Or A Whistle Stop").

"The core city," says Dr. Drucker, "is likely to present yesterday's politics, yesterday's issues and yesterday's alignments. The suburbs, representing the young people who are more highly educated and more prosperous, are likely to look increasingly toward tomorrow's problems."

He goes on: "Moreover, the core city will have to bear the burden of the metropolitan services but without the tax resources. These will be in the suburbs. Indeed, it is conceivable that deterioration of the core city will bring a mass exodus of business headquarters to the suburbs, which will create growing demands on the part of the core city that the suburbs become part of its tax domain—and growing suburban resistance to the core city."

Finally, he says: "It is conceivable, therefore, that the geographic alignments in this country—between north and south, between country and town, between agrarian and industrial society—may increasingly be replaced by a split between the core city and the suburbs through all regions and all areas of the country."

These observations are particularly relevant to your work in seeking effective regional planning and development, and they raise issues which are paramount in planning and developing a viable metropolitan area.

At the turn of this century, President Faunce of Brown University, speaking at the centennial celebration of my home city of Waterville, Maine said: "Americans have succeeded nobly in building States, but they have not yet learned to govern cities."

His observation is still relevant, but with a greater urgency today. What makes cities seem ungovernable is the nature of their problems—so close to the day to day lives and frustrations of their citizens. These problems—so many of which have emerged as matters of national concern and responsibility—now threaten to frustrate our ability to govern the Nation itself under the Federal system.

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY STUDY OF COMMERCIAL CATTLE FEEDING POSSIBILITIES IN THE WILLAMETTE VALLEY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite attention to a study recently published by Oregon State University which assesses the potential of the Willamette Valley of Oregon as an area for increased commercial cattle feeding.

The authors of the study are two university agricultural economists, Grant Blanch and W. E. Middlemiss. Their research has led them to the conclusion that if the price-cost relationships of the study period hold, there are favorable prospects from a system in which feeder cattle would be purchased in the spring, pastured, and finished for the late autumn market.

The livestock industry in the Northwest is already a significant industry. This is shown by the following table:

Rank of States in the Northwest in production of meat animals

State	Number of cattle	Meat production ¹	Rank of States
(Million)			
Montana.....	2.3	915	13
Idaho.....	1.5	524	20
Oregon.....	1.46	470	23
Washington.....	1.4	408	26

¹ Million pounds in live weight of farm production.

Sources: "Meat Animals," USDA Statistical Reporting Service, April 1965; "Livestock and Meat Situation," USDA Economic Research Service, May 1965.

As these figures indicate, there are about 1½ million head of cattle in my State of Oregon. At present, those in the livestock business, who are almost exclusively small and family businessmen, are feeding about 80,000 to 90,000 head at any one time. In 1965, the total number of cattle fed was about 167,000, down slightly from the previous year. Since Oregon's calf crop is approximately 650,000 a year, of which about five-sixths are beef calves, it has been knowledgeably estimated that something over one-third the annual crop, or approximately one-fourth million beef calves, are being sent out of the State for feeding purposes each year.

It thus appears that if feeding operations could be developed, as suggested by the Oregon State University study,

it would be a significant economic advance for Oregon's livestock industry.

The implications of such a development can be viewed against the background of widening geographic distribution and rapid technological improvement in the feeding industry. Highly mechanized feedlots are springing up across the country, as exemplified by the Monfort Feedlots in Greeley, Colo., which presently handles about 75,000 cattle. It should also be observed that other industries such as grain contracting, marketing, and packing of meats tend to come into areas where large-scale feeding is taking place.

It is my hope that close attention will be given to this feeding study by businessmen in Oregon and throughout the Northwest.

As a member of the Senate Small Business Committee I have, for the past 2 years, been participating in our effort to assist the American livestock industry in building markets for its quality products, abroad and at home. Development of the type of operation described by this study could be the key to increasing Oregon's share of these markets.

I ask unanimous consent that an article based upon this study be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

[From the American Cattle Producer, vol. 48, No. 4, p. 26, Sept. 1966]

FEEDING SUGGESTED FOR OREGON IRRIGATED AREAS

Will the Willamette Valley in Oregon become a center for commercial cattle feeding?

A study conducted by two Oregon State University agricultural economists Grant Blanch and W. E. Middlemiss, shows that growing cattle on forage and feeding them for slaughter might be a feasible way to utilize many acres of potentially irrigable land in the Willamette Valley.

Results only hold good as long as price-cost relationships remain the same as they were during the period of the study, points out Blanch.

The OSU study was made of several alternative cattle management systems. The economists found that the best prospects for profit would come from a system in which feeder cattle are purchased in the spring, pastured, and finished for the late fall market.

No system which utilized a breeding herd, or which depended on selling cattle off pasture without finish feeding, stacked up as being profitable.

The study started with the assumption, based on previous studies, that it would take the equivalent of a 200 cow herd to provide minimum efficiencies of operation. A herd this size would require a minimum of 242 acres of irrigated pasture and hay land for year-round forage requirements.

CONTINUING LOSS OF GOLD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve System reports that the U.S. gold stock continued to decline during the month of August with a net loss of \$94 million—the second highest monthly loss so far this year. Preliminary figures indicate that other gold transactions only partly offset the \$146 million of gold which France purchased from the United States in August.

TAXATION, INFLATION, AND THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of October 2 an excellent discussion of present inflation in America by the noted columnist Sylvia Porter.

As Miss Porter points out, the cost of living has risen just so far this year by some 3½ percent, and we are now in the midst of the worst inflation in 15 years. This is, of course, a severe blow to citizens of our country who are least able to bear the burden of this shrinkage of the dollar, such as those who work at fixed weekly and monthly salaries, and especially persons who depend upon retirement benefits, insurance, social security, and old age assistance for their livelihood.

There is recurrent talk of a proposal for a tax increase to combat inflation, but it is my feeling that if the Federal Government tightened its belt and cut back on all nonessential spending, a tax increase would not be necessary. At a time when we are engaged in a costly war in Vietnam, it is imperative that the Federal Government reduce spending in every possible area and earnestly strive for a balanced budget. So long as the Government pursues a policy of deficit spending, not only expanding many existing domestic programs but also dreaming up new ones, inflation will inevitably worsen.

Mr. President, Miss Porter's column traces the decline of the purchasing power of the dollar back to 1948. I invite the attention of the Senate to the column and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Oct. 2, 1966]

SHRINKING DOLLARS AND POLITICS (By Sylvia Porter)

Between now and election day, the rising cost of living will be in the news and in politics. It has become a political as well as an economic issue of 1966.

We're "feeling" the accelerated climb in living costs in our pocketbooks. We're "living" the accelerated depreciation in the buying power of the dollar in the dwindling real value of the dollars.

There's no denying that the 1958-65 record for price stability has ended this year. The rise in living costs in 1966 already is 3½ percent and speeding up. The dollar which bought 100c of goods and services at the start of this year now will buy less than 97c worth.

This unquestionably is serious inflation—although it is modest, compared with the runaway inflation of the World War II period. The 100c dollar of 1939 was worth only 66c by 1946. It is also modest compared with the inflation of the Korean War period. The cost of living jumped 11.7 percent in the two years of 1950-51.

WORST IN 15 YEARS

Nevertheless, it is the worst inflation we have suffered in 15 years. For young voters whose real-life experiences do not go back even to the Korean war, it is a new, extremely disturbing squeeze. Lulled by the record of 1958-65 into a sense of security about the dollar's stable buying power, these voters resent it even more than those of us

who recall previous war-inspired inflations and can put this new phase into perspective. Here's the dollar's postwar record divided by administrations. I've chosen 1948 as the base year of 100 because it was the first "normal" year after the World War II inflation and it is a recent enough year to make sense to most voters. Assuming 1948's dollar bought 100c of goods and services, the subsequent tale is:

[In cents]

President and dates	Loss	Value end of period
Truman: January 1949-January 1953	9.8	90.0
Eisenhower: January 1953-January 1957	3.2	87.0
Eisenhower: January 1957-January 1961	6.3	80.7
Kennedy-Johnson: January 1961-January 1965	3.7	77.0
Johnson: January 1965-July 1966	2.9	74.0

BOOM RECALLED

Obviously, the heaviest loss of all was during Truman's last term. This covered the Korean war outbreak and also the continually sharp rise in the prices of many goods and services which were still blowing off the lid of World War II's controls.

Obviously, the next heaviest decline was during Eisenhower's last term. This covered the inflation which accompanied the boom in business spending in 1957 and reflected the lack of any curbs over the leapfrogging of prices and wages.

But just as obviously, Johnson is now making a bid for the same unhappy category. Actually, the decline in the dollar's buying power was only 4.5c from January 1961 to August 1965—the equivalent of price stability in the four and one-half years that both Kennedy and Johnson were in the White House. But in August 1965, the escalation of the Viet Nam war came on top of a peacetime economy moving toward full production capacity and full utilization of manpower and materials. In August, the Consumer Price Index was 110 (1957-59 equals 100). By December 1965, it was 111. It is now approaching 114, well may be over 115 by yearend.

But the most important point the record emphasizes is this: The dollar's purchasing power has continued relentlessly down through both Republican and Democratic Administrations, through both booms and recessions. Neither political party can honestly claim "I did it better." The oratory of October-November will befuddle this point—but this factual record offers you the accurate score.

HELEN DIETZ, VISTA VOLUNTEER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have always supported the VISTA program and the ideals which it represents. I am particularly proud to invite the attention of Senators to the work of Helen Dietz, of Baltimore, who is at present a VISTA volunteer in Old Harbor, Alaska.

Miss Dietz, a registered nurse, runs the local health clinic and has established a beautification program and a public library. By translating youthful idealism into action, Helen Dietz has done much to improve the lives of the people whom she serves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article about the work of Helen Dietz, published in the June 26 issue of the Baltimore Sunday Sun magazine.

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

A BALTIMORE NURSE WITH VISTA AIDS ALASKANS—HELEN DIETZ HELPS A VILLAGE OF 250 PEOPLE RECOVERING FROM A TIDAL WAVE'S RUIN

"I wanted a rural area and I got it," says Helen Dietz, VISTA volunteer in Old Harbor on the island of Kodiak, Alaska. "I love Alaska. It's great. The scenery is fantastic. The life is a challenge. People are wonderful."

Miss Dietz, 24, a registered nurse, is the daughter of Mrs. Edmond Dietz of 3025 O'Donnell street. She was graduated from St. Joseph's Hospital, where she served for two years before joining VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

"Through VISTA I hope to be able to do my part in helping people to help themselves. I like this approach to the problem of poverty. I feel certain that it will work and I want to be a part of it," she says.

She chose to serve in Alaska and was trained for six weeks at the University of Alaska before being assigned to Old Harbor, which has a population of 250. The nearest doctor is some 300 miles away. When an emergency arises, symptoms are radioed to him and he radios back the prescription. Critically ill patients are flown, weather permitting, to the hospital in Anchorage.

Miss Dietz serves with two other VISTA volunteers, a boy and a girl. The girls share a neat two-room house painted a cheerful green. They repainted the interior and scrounged beds and bureaus from the local schoolteachers. Miss Dietz maintains the town health clinic in their bathroom.

Old Harbor's village council requested the VISTA volunteers to help them with their problems. Two years ago they watched in horror as a tidal wave swept their village out to sea. Today, with the village completely rebuilt, the residents are slowly trying to rebuild their lives. It isn't easy. Some have moved elsewhere.

The villagers are a mixture of Aleuts, Russians and Scandinavians. They make their livelihood fishing for king salmon and king crab. Their work is seasonal at best and the economy walks a narrow balance.

Miss Dietz works with the village health aide, a woman. "We go together when someone is ill, note the symptoms and prescribe simple remedies," she says. "If a doctor's help is needed we radio the patient's symptoms and he gives advice. I help her to sum up the symptoms for the doctor and report them accurately."

One of her first triumphs was to lick an impetigo epidemic. "I used a certain soap and told the villagers it contained medicine. It's great for skin infections, keeps down bacteria, and is cheaper than penicillin."

She has also taught the villagers to boil their water to stop diarrhea. Two babies died of it this year and the village is constantly plagued with it.

In the absence of a dentist (one visited the village last year and is due to return in 1967) she has held classes in tooth care. "They didn't know what a tooth brush was," she says. "When they found out my teeth weren't false they remarked in awe. 'You mean you still have your same old teeth?'"

Helen also conducts health classes for both children and adults. She shows film strips and discusses health practices.

Not content with just working with health, she has started a public library. Old Harbor's first, with a nucleus of books donated by the Anchorage P. T. A. She also supervises students who take correspondence courses and has started a sewing club.

The village sits on a hill which is stark and barren. The VISTA volunteers have started their own beautification program. They

wrote to the University of Alaska and learned that Kentucky blue grass will thrive in Old Harbor. They plan to bring in top soil, grass seed, fertilizer, trees and flowers. With the help of the villagers they have painted empty oil drums bright red and painted on the slogan "A Cleaner Old Harbor Is Up to You" and educated the village to use them as trash cans. They have also started the village's first newspaper, the Harbor Light.

Villagers call on Helen at any hour of the day or night for her help. She is rewarded by a grateful smile and, "Thank you, good momma." Looking to the future, her plans are indefinite. "There's a great new hospital at Barrow," she says. "Twelve beds! Wouldn't that be great!"

"When I speak of leaving, the villagers get upset. Once they drafted a letter to President Johnson asking to let me stay."

AMENDMENT OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Friday, September 30, S. 3008, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3008) to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the so-called poverty bill the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The pending business is S. 3008, which does not deal with poverty in the true sense of the word.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It deals with health?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 11, beginning with the word "and" on line 13, strike out all through the word "residence" on line 19.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the measure now before us, S. 3008—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inform the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that there are committee amendments to be disposed of before considering the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what I actually would do is take out one committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the committee amendments have not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am in accord with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to take that language out. I think that he and I are in agreement with the substitute language which was suggested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. We would reject the committee amendment and accept an amendment to the effect that that public health services under the plan would be established and maintained for individuals confined to institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There can be an agreement as to all committee amendments, subject to the Senator offering his amendment to any amendment agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so long as I am not foreclosed in my right to offer amendments to the amount involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] agree to that procedure?

Mr. HILL. Just as we proceeded on the appropriation bill; yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill, as amended, be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I make that unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment I just offered, if the chairman will offer his language in lieu of the language that appears on page 11, on which we have agreed; with that understanding.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in accordance with the agreement between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, I move to strike out on page 11, line 13, after the word "funds", the following "and (iv) public health services under the plan will be established and maintained, and will be expanded and extended, in an orderly manner, with a view toward making such services reasonably available as soon as possible to all individuals in the State, irre-

spective of their income or economic resources, age, or place of residence;" and insert "and (iv) public health services under the plan will be established and maintained for individuals confined to institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time on the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment.

Mr. President, I have withdrawn my amendment. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has submitted language in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is pending.

How much time does the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] yield to himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall take 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the measure now before us, S. 3008, is an amendment to the Public Health Service Act designed to extend and improve comprehensive health planning and provides that comprehensive health services of high quality shall be provided for every person "but without interference with existing patterns of private professional practice of medicine, dentistry, and related healing arts."

Measures designed to alleviate human suffering are always praiseworthy. However, I am wondering if this measure is not really broader perhaps than its proponents intended and will not eventually suffocate the initiative for private research and application of the healing arts because we find other language on page 11 of the bill which provides at line 13 that—

Public health services under the plan will be established and maintained, and will be expanded and extended, in an orderly manner, with a view toward making such services reasonably available as soon as possible to all individuals in the State, irrespective of their income or economic resources, age, or place of residence.

That is the language that I had offered to strike, but on agreement with the chairman, he offered substitute language for which I settled.

Nowhere in the report or hearings on this measure is this paragraph explained. I am wondering, however, if the making of public health services available to all individuals in a State irrespective of economic resources or places of residence does not tend to neutralize the foregoing language.

It should be pointed out that notwithstanding the authorizations for appropriations under S. 3008 reflected on page 13 of the bill and expected to reach \$545 million in 1972, an interesting colloquy occurred at the hearings at page 49 with the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, in which the chairman said to Mr. Cohen:

What you are saying is, sir, when you come before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles these funds, you will not necessarily be bound by the figures you give today, is that right?

Mr. COHEN. That is correct, Senator. Just like the bill has a certain amount of flexibility in it, I would like to retain a certain amount of flexibility when I appear before you on the appropriations.

What you have there, Mr. President, is in contemplation of a program that is going to go into billions of dollars before we know it and take in everybody regardless of circumstances or condition of health.

While this extremely broad authorization for expenditure of public funds is predicated on the unhappy fact of life that there exist in the United States at the present time such problems as diabetes, arthritis, kidney disease, suicide, and alcoholism, as well as other ills to which mankind has been historically susceptible, it does not appear that at this time any clear-cut plans are in existence to attack these serious ills. The Surgeon General is authorized under this bill at pages 2 and 3 to conduct studies, research, and investigations to establish a coherent set of national health goals. My understanding of coherent is that it means something which is logically consistent. I wonder, therefore, if it is not too much to ask that a coherent plan be submitted to the Congress prior to the time that a blank check is, in effect, issued for this measure.

The State plans which must be set up under this bill would require the representation of, among others, consumers of health service to advise such State agency. Certainly everyone who ever took an aspirin can be considered a consumer of health services, and in view of the rather large sums appropriated, I am wondering if more precision and clarity is not warranted in connection with this language.

Who are the consumers of health service who are to do the advising? It certainly is not clear from this measure. Incidentally though I am informed this measure was reported on July 22, 1966, the report was not printed until September 29, 1966, which means it was available only last Friday, and here we are on Monday with only an hour to consider this extremely far-reaching measure.

On page 13, the allotments to each State shall be determined in accordance with regulation on the basis of population and financial need of the respective States and the Federal share of funds for any State is determined in part by considering, as indicated on page 14 of the bill, expenditures by nonprofit private agencies as expenditures by the State or political subdivision thereof.

In the report of the hearings, Dr. Leo Gehrig, the Deputy Surgeon General, the Public Health Service, indicated that "a number of federally sponsored health programs may be in operation in a State or community" and pointed out that they are not related one to the other. It would appear that the existing programs

October 3, 1966

are designed to continue notwithstanding the new ones suggested under this bill and it might not be inappropriate to suggest a comprehensive merging of such existing programs into the new authorization with a consequent more efficient application of funds and manpower than to initiate and authorize brandnew studies under this bill.

Certainly we must take into consideration the fact that many State legislatures will not be meeting and will be unable to take immediate advantage of the provisions of this bill if it should pass. Nowhere am I able to determine the manner in which the Government has ready at this point a practical and sensible application for the effective use of such vast funds as will be made available under this measure.

I must say I am as much in favor of overcoming disease and human suffering as any Members of this body. It is necessary to point out, however, that it should not be unreasonable to request that studies be made at the State level to determine the need for and the uses that will be made of the many millions to be spent for these programs.

I respectfully suggest such a case has not been made for this program and I am somewhat concerned by the haste to pass this measure almost on a no-questions-asked basis.

That is the reason for wanting to strike out the language on page 11, but since that has now been cured by the amendment offered by the chairman, I am content to go along with the dimension of authority contained in the bill because that constitutes a very substantial limitation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. HILL. I likewise yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides have yielded back their remaining time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer still another amendment which is multiple in nature, and I ask that it be regarded as one amendment for purposes of consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, is as follows:

On page 3, lines 23 and 24, strike out "1969, and \$20,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years" and insert "1970".

On page 9, lines 4 and 5, strike out "1969, and \$15,000,000 each for the next three fiscal years" and insert "1970".

On page 9, lines 18 and 19, strike out "1969, and \$10,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years" and insert "1970".

On page 10, lines 1 through 4, strike out "1969, \$292,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$297,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972" and insert "1970".

On page 15, lines 18 through 20, strike out "1969, \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$200,000,000 each for the next two fiscal years" and insert "1970".

On page 32, lines 19 through 22, strike out "1969, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for the next four fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary" and insert "1970".

On page 34, lines 7 and 8, strike out "\$2,000,000 and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000".

On page 34, line 17, strike out "each of the two succeeding fiscal years" and insert "the succeeding fiscal year".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the chairman. It occurs to me that the program is entirely too long. The acceleration of funds from present levels up to 1972, as carried in the report which accompanies this measure, really goes right up to the sky. Dr. Cohen has indicated that he wants ample flexibility not only with respect to authority but also with respect to funds.

I therefore reassert that we are on the threshold of a billion-dollar program. If that language which has now been stricken had not been cured, this would probably be socialized medicine of a kind with an absolute vengeance.

The amendment I offer would cut this back and make it a 4-year program. It would cut back the funds. I point out to the Senate that on page 13 of the report, when we start with 1967 for all items which include planning grants, health service formula grants, health service project grants, grants to schools of public health and mental retardation services, and recreation personnel, we start with \$10 million, but by 1968 we jump up to \$304.5 million. By 1969, we go up to \$401.2 million. By 1970, it escalates to \$507.1 million. In 1971 it goes to \$557 million. In 1972, because three of the items have been removed from consideration, it diminishes to \$545 million.

However, we have got all of the major programs on the books that will have been authorized, particularly the planning grants to States and the local areas, and for demonstrations, and so forth, and that carries the seed of escalation in it. It is only a question of a little while before this will be in orbit itself.

My amendment proposes to make this a 4-year program, to cut back at least that much. I cannot quite indicate the exact amount that would be cut back. It should be something in excess of \$100 million. I have never had such difficulty in ascertaining what new money is carried in the bill. We have tried since last Friday in nearly every corner to find out about it, and have not been able to do so. The best I can tell at the moment, this

would probably reduce it by \$100 million and reduce the length of the program. That, I believe, is quite in line with the philosophy I expressed on the so-called HEW bill last week.

It seems to me, with the war going on, and talk of escalation, and the fact that since Congress convened in January until this moment, we have augmented our troop level in Vietnam by 117,000 men, it is about time that we put first things first.

Young Americans are dying over there. Our business is to take a look at the domestic budget and keep it in line, knowing that the inflationary fires are lapping at people everywhere in the country, no matter what the activity is that they touch, whether it be food, or any other thing.

That puts upon Congress a real responsibility. Congress should not be authorizing these things for such long periods. It should not be authorizing this kind of expenditure because we can take a fresh look when, at long last, we achieve either a negotiation or we achieve an honorable end to the unpleasantness now going on in Vietnam. That is the reason for taking the attitude I do.

Standing in this Chamber before the Senate on a pair of crutches, with eleven 6-inch spikes in my hip, I would be the last man ever to deny anyone health services, or ever to speak against further exploration in the field of maladies and diseases which take their toll of the American people.

But, as I indicated, they are not ready for it. It will be a while before the surveys, studies, and investigations can adduce anything as a proper foundation on which to build an appropriation estimate.

For that reason, this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Last Friday I sought to explain the bill. I shall not go into details today. One of the committee amendments expressly stresses that Federal financial assistance must be directed to support the marshaling of all health resources, "but without interference with existing patterns of private professional practice of medicine, dentistry, and related healing arts."

In other words, the language put in the bill by the committee is specifically to make sure that these health programs are public health programs and do not interfere with the private practice of medicine, dentistry, or related healing arts.

The bill, as I said on Friday, would extend to public health programs the concept of comprehensive planning that has been effectively used in the Hill-Burton program, strengthen and improve the existing programs of grant-in-aid for public health services, and provide Federal assistance for the mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

In the last session we passed legislation to grant initial staffing assistance to community mental health centers. This bill would provide for the same type of Federal aid for mental retardation facilities.

Since 1936 the States have received Federal grants-in-aid to support public health services. There are now some 15 different formula and project grants being awarded to combat cancer, chronic illness, heart disease, mental illness, tuberculosis, venereal diseases, dental disease, neurological diseases, and mental retardation. In addition, the grants contribute to the general support of public health programs, community health services, radiological health programs, and the training of personnel for home health services.

Under the bill, the funds appropriated for each of these specific categories may not be transferred to any other of the specified categories and may not be used to combat any other public health problem, even one that represents a more serious threat to health and is more deserving of attention.

The lack of flexibility in the use of Federal funds for public health activities is a matter of increasing concern to States, counties, and cities because of expanding responsibilities in the field of public health. The role of health departments has been expanded by medical research that has yielded the knowledge to prevent and control additional diseases, by environmental pollution that has created new hazards to health, and by population growth.

As an alternative to authorizing new categorical programs of assistance directed against additional specific diseases or health problems, this bill provides for a flexible and responsive program of financial assistance for public health activities.

The bill has been endorsed by Governors, by most State health officers, and also by other representatives of State and local governments. For instance, the Council of State Governments wrote the committee as follows:

For many years both the national Governors' Conference and the National Association of State Budget Officers have been interested in bringing about a greater measure of flexibility in the purposes for which grants-in-aid of various health purposes might be expended. It appears to us that the bill you have introduced serves this purpose admirably . . . All in all, it appears to us that enactment of the proposed legislation would aid materially in achieving better organization and administration of public health programs.

For example, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations also wrote in support of the bill and stated:

The Commission believes that S. 3008 represents a major improvement in intergovernmental relations in the field of public health and in grant-in-aid administration generally. These reforms to permit greater flexibility in the use of grant funds for the provision of community health services are long overdue and should result in more effective use of scarce financial resources of the Nation.

In addition, the National Association of Counties wrote:

I should like to express our support of S. 3008 . . . The concepts embodied in this legislation are in keeping with the American County platform, the official policy statement of our Association, especially our position on regional cooperation and county planning.

The legislation is also supported by the American Dental Association, American Heart Association, American Hospital Association, American Nurses' Association, American Optometric Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Public Health Association, American Social Health Association, Association of Schools of Public Health, Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, National Association of Retarded Children, National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, National Tuberculosis Association, and the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs.

I have also received a telegram from the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, stating that the bill is strongly endorsed by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers.

I have a good many telegrams I could offer for the record. I have one here from Delaware, one from Florida, others from many other States throughout the Nation, supporting the program. It is a bill which is directed to support the marshaling of all health resources, without clashing with private professional practice of medicine, dentistry, or other health professions.

The effect of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would simply limit the program to 4 years. So that for the first year, except for mental retardation services, there would be planning. So there would be 1 year for planning and 3 years for the projects, with 4 years for the mental retardation services. There should be at least that much time for the mental retardation services because the bill passed in the last Congress provides initial staffing assistance for mental health centers for 51 months. There should be at least 4 years of support for mental retardation services. Therefore, under the language proposed by the Senator from Illinois, I do not oppose the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have only one comment. There is hardly any health director throughout the States of the Union who has not endorsed the bill. Likewise that is true of the associations. There is only one thought. The amendatory language I pointed out on page 11 may or may not have been in the bill at the time we received the endorsements, because the endorsements of the Governors and the State officers came in March, 25 days after the bill was introduced, but it was not sent to the Senate Calendar until September, and I wonder if they were aware of the language that has now been modified.

My own Governor endorsed it in March. This is likewise true of the director of the health department. So I suspect these modifications to the text of the bill came after the endorsements, before they were submitted to Congress or the committee. I do not quarrel; I only say this went too far, and I felt compelled to suggest the amendments that are before the Senate, the one already adopted and the one before us now.

I trust the chairman can see fit to take this amendment. By so doing, we will

probably reduce the amount involved rather substantially.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I said we would accept the amendment.

I wish to state that many of these telegrams have come in quite recently. For instance, the telegram I referred to from the president of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers came in September 30, just two days ago. I have telegrams that have come in only this morning, a number of them, dated October 2 and October 3.

The language to which the Senator referred, as Senators know, has been stricken out, and language in the form of the amendment has been agreed to in lieu of the stricken language.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, indicative of the scope of this measure is the fact that by adopting this amendment we have saved the taxpayers of the United States over \$1 billion.

Mr. President, if it is agreeable, at this time I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HILL. I have no objection to the Senator's request. I am sure the Senator means how much we might save in authorizations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we will have an opportunity later to extend the programs if we see fit to do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, indeed, we will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. HILL. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished friend from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I wish to comment, Mr. President, on the report from the Committee on Appropriations, which report was submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

That report, Mr. President, made it clear that HEW was going beyond what Congress had intended and what the Senate had intended when HEW submitted its so-called revised guidelines for integration of schools and hospitals.

I think the statement of the committee incorporated in the report is a very significant one. I think there is additional significance in the fact that, despite the efforts of the senior Senator from New York, the Senate did not in any way exonerate HEW from the charges which were made in the report by the Committee on Appropriations.

The action of the committee and of the Senate itself sustains my protests to HEW Secretary Gardner. I commend the Senate committee for speaking so forthrightly.

A reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1964, when the current Civil Rights Act was being debated, makes clear that HEW has gone far beyond what the Congress intended it to do.

A review of the floor discussion between Senators favoring the bill and Senators opposing the bill clearly reveals a legislative intent entirely contrary to the interpretation cited by the Office of Education.

I concur in the committee report that complaints have indicated an attitude of harassment rather than helpfulness on the part of HEW officials.

I hope the Senate action will stop further harassment by officials in Washington. We have too much interference already in local affairs.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. May I say, as to the record of the distinguished Senator from Virginia, his every act has been in support of the very thoughts he has expressed here today. He has been 100 percent in his support of the thoughts he has expressed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the question that has been raised by the statement of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I feel that I should make a few remarks going back to my statement on September 28.

The HEW desegregation guidelines in the fields of education and hospitals are still in effect. The law has not been rescinded. The law is still on the books, and will be enforced.

The Senate addressed itself last Tuesday to the special medical cases that may arise as a result of the desegregation of hospitals. Our action emphasized the individuality and peculiarity of each patient and the integrity and good faith of the medical profession. It did not negate or even dilute the standards or goals of the 1964 act. It did, however, address itself to a procedural point in effectuating the implementation of the 1964 act to hospitals over the next 8½ months after which that appropriation bill's life will expire and with it any provisos therein.

The allowances provided in that amendment become effective upon the specific finding of the attending physician and the hospital administrator—a finding that the case is special and unusual and necessary for the health of the patient. We anticipate no abuse because of this procedure, but if abuse does occur and patterns develop, corrective action still could be taken by HEW and if necessary by the Congress.

I think that we ought to emphasize that the action was not and is not to be considered a reversal of the policy of title VI of the 1964 act.

Thus the Senate's action was an attempt to specify in the Labor-HEW appropriations bill its recognition of the individuality and the peculiarity of each patient under care, and to give discretion on a case-by-case basis, to attending physicians in determining proper treatment. The question was primarily, even solely, on the procedure to be used in determining compliance with the law. There was no intention to get around the intent of the 1964 act, which is the law.

We declared anew that the policy of segregation in these facilities is unlawful, but the Senate did presume a policy of good faith on the part of the physicians and hospital administrators during the 8 or 9 months' period, and affirms its confidence in the great integrity of the medical profession. If experience should

prove our confidence has been misplaced, I repeat, corrective action could be taken by HEW, or, if necessary, by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Alabama. Under the language of S. 3008, is it the legislative intent of the act to permit grants to State and local health departments in the field of family planning? For example, could the Baltimore City Health Department request project aid for a family planning information and medical assistance center, for individuals who desire these services but who cannot afford to obtain them otherwise?

Mr. HILL. The bill does make such grants possible. If fact, on page 11 of the report, we find the following language:

The proposed authority would permit project grants for program support, program development and demonstration purposes for these kinds of targets, and for other areas such as dental health, urban health, narcotics and drug addiction, rural health services, family planning, and alcoholism.

I think it is made very definite and clear in the report.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the distinguished chairman, and I appreciate the answer. I commend the committee for their work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield back his time? The Senator from Illinois has already yielded back his time.

Mr. HILL. I now yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, 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.

SERVICES AT MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to refer to section 8—grants for costs of initiating services in community mental retardation facilities—of S. 3008, which would extend to facilities for the mentally retarded the same kind of Federal assistance that is now authorized to meet initial staffing costs at community mental health centers—Public Law 89-105—and at sheltered workshops and rehabilitation facilities—Public Law 89-333.

This provision had its genesis in S. 2836, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act Amendments of 1966, a bill I introduced on January 26, 1966, for myself and the distinguished junior

Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. We later on March 15 introduced this proposal as an amendment to S. 3008, the measure now before the Senate.

Mentally retarded children can be educated to be useful citizens, in many cases self-supporting, and in most instances to be free of the need for expensive institutional care. If adequately rehabilitated, between 75 to 85 percent of the mentally retarded can become self-supporting and between 10 and 20 percent can become partially self-supporting; the remainder will remain completely dependent.

More important—and incapable of measurement—is the effect this rehabilitation will have on parents and family to whom the necessity for institutionalization is a shattering experience. And the meaning to the retarded themselves also cannot be measured in money—it is the difference between being a whole human person and being an impersonal statistic in an institution.

Three out of every 100 children born are destined to be mentally retarded. Mental retardation is the major cause of disability among the young adults, aged 21 to 35, who receive assistance under the Federal program for aid to the permanent and totally disabled.

While communities are spending more than \$650 million annually for treatment, education, and training of the mentally retarded, these services fall short of the need for the special training and care that is required. They require the staffing assistance provided by this Javits-Prouty amendment, as modified, now part D of the bill.

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Centers Construction Act of 1953 is further amended by the Javits-Prouty provision to include the cost of acquiring sites as part of construction costs for mental health centers and mental retardation facilities. Experience has shown that the original act was not broad enough to cover critical situations, especially in urban areas where land is expensive and often difficult to obtain. In urban areas, this shortcoming represents a serious deterrent to the public and private agencies desiring to provide buildings for services. The provision to correct this situation follows the pattern of the amendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act provided last year.

Section 8 of S. 3008 is a welcome and constructive addition to the law and will serve to bring to the unfortunate mentally retarded the care and training they require which, all too often, overburdened State, local, and private agencies are unable to provide.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is absent from the Senate today on official business, being a U.S. representative at the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Teheran, Iran. Senator YARBOROUGH is a member of the Health Subcommittee and takes a great interest in this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which he would have made had he been able to be present today, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR YARBOROUGH

For some time now the Federal Government has provided assistance to State departments of health for programs in certain categories of disease prevention and cure. The bill before us today, S. 3008, a bill which has been thoroughly studied by the Senate Labor Committee, would replace that categorical aid with financial assistance which is not restricted to certain types of illness, but which can be used by the state in a manner which will best meet its individual needs.

This is an administration proposal, and one which I feel makes a great deal of sense. In this instance it seems wise to change over to a program which will give the state health departments greater flexibility in planning how they will use these Federal funds. Health needs are not identical in all states, and this new approach will enable each state to design a program to meet its own unique needs.

I wish to congratulate our chairman, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for bringing this measure to the floor and for giving us the benefit of his advice and counsel. He knows more about health legislation than any other man, and the fact that the bills which he brings out of his committee are almost never opposed, is a tribute to his legislative craftsmanship.

S. 3008 has two major purposes. First, it authorizes Federal funds to assist the States in planning for current and future health needs. In order to qualify for a planning grant a State must establish or designate a single health planning agency and provide for the establishment of a representative State health planning council. These bodies would examine the existing health services, plan for future improvements, and encourage cooperation among State and local, public and private health agencies. In each State health services would be coordinated to utilize health resources most efficiently.

The second part of S. 3008 provides for grants for comprehensive health services. The Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to State health and mental health authorities to establish and maintain public

health services. Grants would be authorized for training projects. Under the current Public Health Service Act financial assistance available to the States for health services is in the form of separate categorical grants to meet specific disease problems. S. 3008 revises the health grant structure by providing noncategorical grant support for comprehensive public health services, thus giving States greater flexibility in their use of Federal funds to apply them to individuals and families in local communities. Funds will be available to meet health problems that are regional in incidence.

Allotments to the States for planning grants will be based upon population and per capita income with a minimum allotment of 1 percent of the appropriation to any State. For the comprehensive health services grants a formula is proposed by which funds are first allocated among the States on the basis of population, and then additional funds would be given to states which are below the national average in per capita income. A table of projected state allocations under this formula reads as follows:

"Computation of allocations for formula grants for comprehensive public health services under S. 3008"

	U.S. census provisional estimate, July 1, 1965	Per capita income, 1964	Allotment percentage, ¹ United States/State	Cents per capita (75 cents \times col. 3)	State allocation (col. 1 \times col. 3 \times 75 cents)		U.S. census provisional estimate, July 1, 1965	Per capita income, 1964	Allotment percentage, ¹ United States/State	Cents per capita (75 cents \times col. 3)	State allocation (col. 1 \times col. 3 \times 75 cents)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Total	\$196,587,000	\$2,566			\$162,957,243						
1. Alabama	3,462,000	1,749	146.7124	1.100	3,800,387	28. Nebraska	\$1,477,000	\$2,349	109.2380	\$819	\$1,210,084
2. Alaska	253,000	3,116	100.0000	.750	189,750	29. Nevada	440,000	3,248	100.0000	.750	330,000
3. Arizona	1,608,000	2,233	114.9127	.862	1,385,847	30. New Hampshire	669,000	2,377	107.9512	.810	541,646
4. Arkansas	1,960,000	1,655	150.0000	1.125	2,205,000	31. New Jersey	6,774,000	3,005	100.0000	.750	5,080,500
5. California	18,602,000	3,103	100.0000	.750	13,951,500	32. New Mexico	1,029,000	2,041	125.7227	.943	970,265
6. Colorado	1,969,000	2,566	100.0000	.750	1,476,750	33. New York	18,073,000	3,162	100.0000	.750	13,554,750
7. Connecticut	2,832,000	3,281	100.0000	.750	2,124,000	34. North Carolina	4,914,000	1,913	134.1349	1,006	4,943,542
8. Delaware	505,000	3,460	100.0000	.750	378,750	35. North Dakota	652,000	2,133	120.3000	.902	588,267
9. District of Columbia	803,000	3,544	100.0000	.750	602,250	36. Ohio	10,245,000	2,646	100.0000	.750	7,683,750
10. Florida	5,805,000	2,251	113.9938	.855	4,963,005	37. Oklahoma	2,482,000	2,083	123.1877	.924	2,293,139
11. Georgia	4,357,000	1,943	132.0638	.990	4,315,515	38. Oregon	1,899,000	2,606	100.0000	.750	1,424,250
12. Hawaii	711,000	2,622	100.0000	.750	533,250	39. Pennsylvania	11,520,000	2,601	100.0000	.750	8,640,000
13. Idaho	692,000	2,020	127.0297	.953	659,284	40. Rhode Island	920,000	2,514	102.0684	.766	704,272
14. Illinois	10,644,000	3,041	100.0000	.750	7,983,000	41. South Carolina	2,542,000	1,655	150.0000	1,125	2,859,750
15. Indiana	4,885,000	2,544	100.8648	.756	3,695,434	42. South Dakota	703,000	1,879	136.5620	1,024	720,023
16. Iowa	2,760,000	2,376	107.9966	.810	2,235,530	43. Tennessee	3,845,000	1,859	138.0312	1,085	3,980,475
17. Kansas	2,234,000	2,346	108.3777	.820	1,832,624	44. Texas	10,551,000	2,188	117.2761	.880	9,280,351
18. Kentucky	3,179,000	1,830	140.2186	1.052	3,343,162	45. Utah	990,000	2,156	119.0167	.894	883,699
19. Louisiana	3,534,000	1,877	136.7075	1.025	3,623,432	46. Vermont	397,000	2,199	116.6894	.875	347,443
20. Maine	993,000	2,132	120.3565	.903	896,355	47. Virginia	4,457,000	2,239	114.6047	.860	3,830,948
21. Maryland	3,519,000	2,867	100.0000	.750	2,639,250	48. Washington	2,990,000	2,635	100.0000	.750	2,242,500
22. Massachusetts	5,348,000	2,965	100.0000	.750	4,011,000	49. West Virginia	1,812,000	1,965	130.5852	.970	1,774,653
23. Michigan	8,218,000	2,755	100.0000	.750	6,163,500	50. Wisconsin	4,144,000	2,490	103.0522	.778	3,202,862
24. Minnesota	3,554,000	2,375	108.0421	.810	2,879,862	51. Wyoming	340,000	2,441	105.1209	.788	268,058
25. Mississippi	2,321,000	1,438	150.0000	1.125	2,611,125	52. Guam	71,000	1,438	150.0000	1,125	79,875
26. Missouri	4,497,000	2,600	100.0000	.750	3,372,750	53. Puerto Rico	2,636,000	1,438	150.0000	1,125	2,965,500
27. Montana	706,000	2,252	113.9432	.855	603,329	54. Virgin Islands	42,900	1,438	150.0000	1,125	48,262
						55. American Samoa	21,100	1,438	150.0000	1,125	23,738"

¹ Allotment percentages for States with per capita income equal to or greater than U.S. per capita income are established at 100 and no State is assigned an allotment percentage higher than 150.

I shall be watching the grant allocation with great interest to make sure that the formula provides an equitable distribution of funds. The purpose of such programs is to direct federal assistance to those areas in which the need for health services is the greatest. Funds need to be channeled into areas which are financially disadvantaged and cannot afford these services as well as their richer neighbors.

State and local health agencies bear the major responsibility for assuring the availability of high quality public health services. S. 3008 would provide Federal financial support for State planning and comprehensive health programs. Our country can and must provide the best in health care for all of its citizens. This legislation works toward this end. I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent from the Senate today. He is a member of the Health Subcommittee and

takes a great interest in this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966, approved by the Senate today, is the most important piece of basic health legislation acted upon by the Senate this year. Though this legislation may lack the dramatics of other recent health measures, its consequences for the future well-being of all our citizens will, I believe, be just as important.

The essence of this legislation is found in that section dealing with the authorization of grants to states and communities to assist them in financing comprehensive health

planning that would identify public health problems and establish priorities for health services. For too long we have witnessed the existence of adequate health services in our nation's communities going unutilized because of a lack of adequate planning and rational ordering of these services to meet the needs of those demanding health care. By calling upon the states to begin to plan now for the creation of structures whereby good health care will be made available to all who seek it we will be assuring the efficient use of the medical skills and technologies that other actions of Congress have produced.

I have been concerned with the difficulties that those seeking health care, especially the poor, encounter in their local communities. For this reason I have amended the Poverty bill that we will be discussing later today to provide for the creation of Neighborhood Comprehensive Health Centers. It is my ultimate hope, however, and that of the Public Health Service, that comprehensive health

care will not be directed only to the poor but to all who seek it. The funds in S. 3008 calling for state planning is the first and most important step in this direction.

But it will also be necessary if states are to plan the ways in which to best deliver health care, that the federal government also be concerned with establishing national health goals. For this reason I introduced the amendment to S. 3008 authorizing the Surgeon General to establish a set of national health goals and to formulate comprehensive guidelines to assist states in developing their health plans. It appears that with both the Federal government and the States working together on this problem we will hasten the day when our health services will be organized in a fashion that will guarantee the best health care for all.

This bill also contains another matter that I was fortunate enough to introduce to the Committee. Much has been learned of the value of physical education in the overall educational development of the normal child. There is also much promise of the use of physical education in assisting the retarded child to better learn. A growing body of clinical and experimental evidence shows that improved motor ability and motor skills is an important step toward improving the general learning ability of the retarded.

Unfortunately, this is an area which has been overlooked in the programs developed by the Congress dealing with mental retardation. The inclusion of a physical education program for the retarded in this legislation, however, will allow the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to make grants to public and other non-profit institutions to assist them in providing professional or advanced training for students going into this field as well as to undertake research and demonstration projects in this area.

The success of this legislation in the Senate today is an additional tribute to the work of the Senior Senator from Alabama, LISTER HILL. Those of us interested in health are aware that if it were not for his guidance and assistance the hopes that we have in this field would be difficult to achieve. So I wish to again express my admiration to chairman HILL for his years of work and dedication to the health of our nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the bill having been yielded back, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 3008) was passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Subsequently the following proceedings were had:

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered an amendment which I agreed to as chairman of the committee and manager of the bill. We found in the examination of the amendment, after the amendment had been agreed to, that the amendment did not carry out the intent and purpose of the junior Senator from Illinois or my intent and purpose.

The amendment as drafted left out any authorization for any health program for the year 1969. The intent and purpose of the Dirksen amendment, as agreed upon, was that these programs should be authorized through 1970.

I have consulted with the junior Senator from Illinois. He said that, if need be, he would come on the floor. He authorized me to speak on the matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the passage of S. 3008 was agreed to.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the votes on the third reading and passage of S. 3008; and I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Dirksen amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to make corrections in the amendment of the Senator from Illinois so as to carry out the intent agreed upon in the debate and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 22, insert "each" after "\$10,000,000".

On page 3, lines 23 and 24, strike out "\$20,000,000 each for the next three fiscal years" and insert "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970".

On page 9, beginning with "1968" on line 3, strike out all through "years" on line 5, and insert "1968, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

On page 9, beginning with "1968" on line 17, strike out all through "years" on line 19, and insert "1968, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970".

Beginning with "1968" on page 9, line 23, strike out all through "1972" on page 10, line 4, and insert "1968, and for each of the next two fiscal years \$230,700,000".

On page 15, line 18, insert "each" after "\$125,000,000".

On page 15, beginning with "\$150,000,000" on line 19, strike out all through "years" on line 20, and insert "and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970".

On page 32, beginning with "1968" on line 18, strike out all through "necessary" on line 22, and insert "1968, \$12,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970".

On page 34, beginning with "1969" on line 7, strike out all through "\$3,000,000" on line 8, and insert "1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$2,000,000 each".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 3008) was passed, as follows:

S. 3008

An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes

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 "Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966".

Findings and Declaration of Purpose

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress declares that fulfillment of our national purpose depends on promoting and assuring the highest level of health attainable for every person, in an environment which contributes positively to healthful individual and family living; that attainment of this goal depends on an effective partnership, involving close intergovernmental collaboration, official and voluntary efforts, and participation of individuals and organizations; that Federal financial assistance must be directed to support the marshaling of all health resources—national, State, and local—to assure comprehensive health services of high quality for every person, but without interference with existing patterns of private professional practice of medicine, dentistry, and related healing arts.

(b) To carry out such purpose, and recognizing the changing character of health problems, the Congress finds that comprehensive planning for health services, health manpower, and health facilities is essential at every level of government; that desirable administration requires strengthening the leadership and capacities of State health agencies; and that support of health services provided people in their communities should be broadened and made more flexible.

National Health Policy

SEC. 3. In order to assure planning and direction on the national level leading to the construction of a national health policy, the Surgeon General is authorized during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1972, to conduct studies, research, and investigations to establish a coherent set of national health goals and to formulate comprehensive guidelines to assist States in developing health plans consistent with the purposes of this Act.

Grants for Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services

SEC. 4. Section 314 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246) is amended to read as follows:

"Grants for Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services

"Grants to States for Comprehensive State Health Planning

"SEC. 314. (a) (1) AUTHORIZATION.—In order to assist the States in comprehensive and continuing planning for their current and future health needs, the Surgeon General is authorized during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1972, to make grants to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General, State plans for comprehensive State health planning. For the purposes of carrying out this subsection, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$10,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(2) STATE PLANS FOR COMPREHENSIVE STATE HEALTH PLANNING.—In order to be approved for purposes of this subsection, a State plan for comprehensive State health planning must—

"(A) designate, or provide for the establishment of, a single State agency, which may be an interdepartmental agency, as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the State's health planning functions under the plan;

"(B) provide for the establishment of a State health planning council, which shall include representatives of State and local agencies and nongovernmental organizations and groups concerned with health, and of consumers of health services, to advise such State agency in carrying out its functions under the plan;

"(C) set forth policies and procedures for the expenditure of funds under the plan, which, in the judgment of the Surgeon General, are designed to provide for comprehensive State planning for health services (both public and private), including the facilities and persons required for the provision of such services, to meet the health needs of the people of the State;

"(D) provide for encouraging cooperative efforts among governmental or nongovernmental agencies, organizations and groups concerned with health services, facilities, or manpower, and for cooperative efforts between such agencies, organizations, and groups and similar agencies, organizations, and groups in the fields of education, welfare, and rehabilitation;

"(E) contain or be supported by assurances satisfactory to the Surgeon General that the funds paid under this subsection will be used to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the level of funds that would otherwise be made available by the State for the purpose of comprehensive health planning and not to supplant such non-Federal funds;

"(F) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Surgeon General shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Surgeon General to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

"(G) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Surgeon General finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(H) provide that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its State plan approved under this subsection and submit to the Surgeon General appropriate modifications thereof;

"(I) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the State under this subsection; and

"(J) contain such additional information and assurances as the Surgeon General may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

(3) (A) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—From the sums appropriated for such purpose for each fiscal year, the general States shall be entitled to allotments determined, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of the population and the per capita income of the respective States; except that no such allotment to any State for any fiscal year shall be less than 1 per centum of the sum appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to paragraph (1). Any such allotment to a State

for a fiscal year shall remain available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection and the State's plan approved thereunder, until the close of the succeeding fiscal year.

"(B) The amount of any allotment to a State under subparagraph (A) for any fiscal year which the Surgeon General determines will not be required by the State, during the period for which it is available, for the purposes for which allotted shall be available for reallocation by the Surgeon General from time to time, on such date or dates as he may fix, to other States with respect to which such a determination has not been made, in proportion to the original allotment to such States under subparagraph (A) for such fiscal year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Surgeon General estimates such State needs and will be able to use during such period; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts were so reduced. Any amount so reallocated to a State from funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection for a fiscal year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subparagraph (A) for such fiscal year.

(4) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—From each State's allotment for a fiscal year under this subsection, the State shall from time to time be paid the Federal share of the expenditures incurred during that year or the succeeding year pursuant to its State plan approved under this subsection. Such payments shall be made on the basis of estimates by the Surgeon General of the sums the State will need in order to perform the planning under its approved State plan under this subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to take account of previously made underpayments or overpayments. The 'Federal share' for any State for purposes of this subsection shall be all, or such part as the Surgeon General may determine, of the cost of such planning, except that in the case of the allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each of the next two fiscal years, it shall not exceed 75 per centum of such cost.

Project Grants for Areawide Health Planning

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1972, to make, with the approval of the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under subsection (a), project grants to any other public or nonprofit private agency or organization to cover not to exceed 75 per centum of the costs of projects for developing (and from time to time revising) comprehensive regional, metropolitan area, or other local area plans for coordination of existing and planned health services, including the facilities and persons required for provision of such services; except that in the case of project grants made in any State prior to July 1, 1968, approval of such State agency shall be required only if such State has such a State plan in effect at the time of such grants. For the purposes of carrying out this subsection, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$10,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Project Grants for Training, Studies, and Demonstrations

"(c) The Surgeon General is also authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1972, to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, institution, or other organization to cover all or any part of the cost of projects for training, studies, or demonstrations look-

ing toward the development of improved or more effective comprehensive health planning throughout the Nation. For the purposes of carrying out this subsection, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$5,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Grants for Comprehensive Public Health Services

(d) (1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated, \$170,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the next two fiscal years \$230,700,000 to enable the Surgeon General to make grants to State health or mental health authorities to assist the States in establishing and maintaining adequate public health services, including the training of personnel for State and local health work. The sums so appropriated shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General, State plans for provision of public health services.

(2) STATE PLANS FOR PROVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES.—In order to be approved under this subsection, a State plan for provision of public health services must—

"(A) provide for administration or supervision of administration by the State health authority or, with respect to mental health services, the State mental health authority;

"(B) set forth the policies and procedures to be followed in the expenditure of the funds paid under this subsection;

"(C) contain or be supported by assurances satisfactory to the Surgeon General that (i) the funds paid to the State under this subsection will be used to make a significant contribution toward providing and strengthening public health services in the various political subdivisions in order to improve the health of the people; (ii) such funds will be made available to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, in accordance with criteria which the Surgeon General determines are designed to secure maximum participation of local, regional, or metropolitan agencies and groups in the provision of such services; (iii) such funds will be used to supplement and, to the extent practical, to increase the level of funds that would otherwise be made available for the purposes for which the Federal funds are provided and not to supplant such non-Federal funds; and (iv) public health services under the plan will be established and maintained for individuals confined to institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded;

"(D) provide for the furnishing of public health services under the State plan in accordance with such plans as have been developed pursuant to subsection (a) and, effective July 1, 1970, provide that except to the extent permitted in regulations, such services will be provided thereunder only to the extent included in and in accordance with the plans so developed;

"(E) provide that public health services furnished under the plan will be in accordance with standards prescribed by regulations, including standards as to the scope and quality of such services;

"(F) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Surgeon General shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are found by the Surgeon General to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

"(G) provide that the State health authority or, with respect to mental health services, the State mental health authority,

will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review and evaluate its State plan approved under this subsection and submit to the Surgeon General appropriate modifications thereof;

"(H) provide that the State health authority or, with respect to mental health services, the State mental health authority, will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Surgeon General may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Surgeon General finds necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(I) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursement of an accounting for funds paid to the State under this subsection; and

"(J) contain such additional information and assurances as the Surgeon General may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(3) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—From the sums appropriated to carry out the provisions of this subsection the several States shall be entitled for each fiscal year to allotments determined, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of the population and financial need of the respective States.

"(4) (A) PAYMENTS TO STATES.—From each State's allotment under this subsection for a fiscal year, the State shall be paid the Federal share of the expenditures incurred during such year under its State plan approved under this subsection. Such payments shall be made from time to time in advance on the basis of estimates by the Surgeon General of the sums the State will expend under the State plan, except that such adjustments as may be necessary shall be made on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments under this subsection.

"(B) For the purpose of determining the Federal share for any State, expenditures by nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and groups shall, subject to such limitations and conditions as may be prescribed by regulations, be regarded as expenditures by such State or a political subdivision thereof.

"(5) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share for any State for purposes of this subsection shall be 100 per centum less than percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the United States; except that in no case shall such percentage be less than 33 1/3 per centum or more than 66 2/3 per centum, and except that the Federal share for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 2/3 per centum.

"(6) DETERMINATION OF FEDERAL SHARES.—The Federal shares shall be determined by the Surgeon General between July 1 and September 1 of each year, on the basis of the average per capita incomes of each of the States and of the United States for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce, and such determination shall be conclusive for the fiscal year beginning on the next July 1. The populations of the several States shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures for the population of the several States available from the Department of Commerce.

"(7) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS WITHIN THE STATES.—At least 15 per centum of a State's allotment under this subsection shall be available only to the State mental health authority for the provision under the State plan of mental health services. At least 70 per centum of such amount and at least 70 per centum of the remainder of a State's allotment under this subsection shall be available only for the provision under that

State plan of services in the communities of the State.

"Project Grants for Health Services Development

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$125,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, for grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization to cover part of the cost of (1) providing services to meet health needs of limited geographic scope or of specialized regional or national significance, (2) stimulating and supporting for an initial period new program of health services, or (3) undertaking studies, demonstrations, or training designed to develop new methods or improve existing methods of providing health services. Such grants may be made pursuant to clause (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence with respect to projects involving the furnishing of public health services only if such services are provided in accordance with such plans as have been developed pursuant to subsection (a) and, effective July 1, 1970, except to the extent permitted in regulations, only to the extent such services are included in and are furnished in accordance with plans so developed.

"Interchange of Personnel With States

"(f) (1) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' means a State or a political subdivision of a State, or any agency of either of the foregoing engaged in any activities related to health or designated or established pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subsection (a); the term 'Secretary' means (except when used in paragraph (3) (D)) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the term 'Department' means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized through agreements or otherwise, to arrange for assignment of officers and employees of States to the Department and assignment to States of officers and employees in the Department engaged in work related to health, for work which the Secretary determines will aid the Department in more effective discharge of its responsibilities in the field of health as authorized by law, including cooperation with States and the provision of technical or other assistance. The period of assignment of any officer or employee under an arrangement shall not exceed two years.

"(3) (A) Officers and employees in the Department assigned to any State pursuant to this subsection shall be considered, during such assignment, to be (i) on detail to a regular work assignment in the Department, or (ii) on leave without pay from their positions in the Department.

"(B) Persons considered to be so detailed shall remain as officers or employees, as the case may be, in the Department for all purposes, except that the supervision of their duties during the period of detail may be governed by agreement between the Department and the State involved.

"(C) In the case of persons so assigned and on leave without pay—

"(i) if the rate of compensation (including allowances) for their employment by the State is less than the rate of compensation (including allowances) they would be receiving had they continued in their regular assignment in the Department, they may receive supplemental salary payments from the Department in the amount considered by the Secretary to be justified, but not at a rate in excess of the difference between the State rate and the Department rate; and

"(ii) they may be granted annual leave and sick leave to the extent authorized by law, but only in circumstances considered by

the Secretary to justify approval of such leave.

Such officers and employees on leave without pay shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be entitled—

"(iii) to continuation of their insurance under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, so long as the Department continues to collect the employee's contribution from the officer or employee involved and to transmit for timely deposit into the funds created under such Acts the amount of the employee's contributions and the Government's contribution from appropriations of the Department; and

"(iv) (I) in the case of commissioned officers of the Service, to have their service during their assignment treated as provided in section 214(d) for such officers on leave without pay, or (II) in the case of other officers and employees in the Department, to credit the period of their assignment under the arrangement under this subsection toward periodic or longevity step increases and for retention and leave accrual purposes, and, upon payment into the civil service retirement and disability fund of the percentage of their State salary, and of their supplemental salary payments, if any, which would have been deducted from a like Federal salary for the period of such assignment and payment by the Secretary into such fund of the amount which would have been payable by him during the period of such assignment with respect to a like Federal salary, to treat (notwithstanding the provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head 'Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund') their service during such period as service within the meaning of the Civil Service Retirement Act; except that no officer or employee or his beneficiary may receive any benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, or the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, based on service during an assignment hereunder for which the officer or employee or (if he dies without making such election) his beneficiary elects to receive benefits, under any State retirement or insurance law or program, which the Civil Service Commission determines to be similar. The Department shall deposit currently in the funds created under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and the civil service retirement and disability fund, respectively, the amount of the Government's contribution under these Acts on account of service with respect to which employee contributions are collected as provided in subparagraph (iii) and the amount of the Government's contribution under the Civil Service Retirement Act on account of service with respect to which payments (of the amount which would have been deducted under that Act) referred to in subparagraph (iv) are made to such civil service retirement and disability fund.

"(D) Any such officer or employee on leave without pay (other than a commissioned officer of the Service) who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during an assignment hereunder, shall be treated, for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as though he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within

one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

"(4) Assignment of any officer or employee in the Department to a State under this subsection may be made with or without reimbursement by the State for the compensation (or supplementary compensation), travel and transportation expenses (to or from place of assignment), and allowances, or any part thereof, of such officer or employee during the period of assignment, and any such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation utilized for paying such compensation, travel or transportation expenses, or allowances.

"(5) Appropriations to the Department shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations or, with respect to commissioned officers of the Service, the joint travel regulations, the expenses of travel of officers and employees assigned to States under an arrangement under this subsection on either a detail or leave-without-pay basis and, in accordance with applicable law, orders, and regulations, for expenses of transportation of their immediate families and expenses of transportation of their household goods and personal effects, in connection with the travel of such officers and employees to the location of their posts of assignment and their return to their official stations.

"(6) Officers and employees of States who are assigned to the Department under an arrangement under this subsection may (A) be given appointments in the Department covering the periods of such assignments, or (B) be considered to be on detail to the Department. Appointments of persons so assigned may be made without regard to the civil service laws. Persons so appointed in the Department shall be paid at rates of compensation determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Service for the purposes of (A) the Civil Service Retirement Act, (B) the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, or (C) unless their appointments result in the loss of coverage in a group health benefits plan whose premium has been paid in whole or in part by a State contribution, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. State officers and employees who are assigned to the Department without appointment shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Department, except as provided in subsection (7), nor shall they be paid a salary or wage by the Service during the period of their assignment. The supervision of the duties of such persons during the assignment may be governed by agreement between the Secretary and the State involved.

"(7) (A) Any State officer or employee who is assigned to the Department without appointment shall nevertheless be subject to the provisions of sections 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(B) Any State officer or employee who is given an appointment while assigned to the Department, or who is assigned to the Department without appointment, under an arrangement under this subsection, and who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during such assignment shall be treated, for the purpose of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as though he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a

State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents, in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

"(8) The appropriations to the Department shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations, during the period of assignment and in the case of travel to and from their places of assignment or appointment, for the payment of expenses of travel of persons assigned to, or given appointments by, the Service under an arrangement under this subsection.

"(9) All arrangements under this subsection for assignment of officers or employees in the Department to States or for assignments of officers or employees of States to the Department shall be made in accordance with regulations of the Secretary.

"General

"(g) (1) All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States under subsection (a) shall be made after consultation with a conference of the State health planning agencies designated or established pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subsection (a). All regulations and amendments thereto with respect to grants to States under subsection (d) shall be made after consultation with a conference of State health authorities and, in the case of regulations and amendments which relate to or in any way affect grants for services or other activities in the field of mental health, the State mental health authorities. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General shall obtain the agreement, prior to the issuance of such regulations or amendments, of the State authorities or agencies with whom such consultation is required.

"(2) The Surgeon General, at the request of any recipient of a grant under this section, may reduce the payments to such recipient by the fair market value of any equipment or supplies furnished to such recipient and by the amount of the pay, allowances, traveling expenses, and any other costs in connection with the detail of an officer or employee to the recipient when such furnishing or such detail, as the case may be, is for the convenience of and at the request of such recipient and for the purpose of carrying out the State plan or the project with respect to which the grant under this section is made. The amount by which such payments are so reduced shall be available for payment of such costs (including the costs of such equipment and supplies) by the Surgeon General, but shall, for purposes of determining the Federal share under subsection (a) or (d), be deemed to have been paid to the State.

"(3) Whenever the Surgeon General, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the health authority or, where appropriate, the mental health authority of a State or a State health planning agency designated or established pursuant to subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subsection (a), finds that, with respect to money paid to the State out of appropriations under subsection (a) or (d), there is a failure to comply substantially with either—

"(A) the applicable provisions of this section;

"(B) the State plan submitted under such subsection; or

"(C) applicable regulations under this section;

the Surgeon General shall notify such State health authority, mental health authority, or health planning agency, as the case may be,

that further payments will not be made to the State from appropriations under such subsection (or in his discretion that further payments will not be made to the State from such appropriations for activities in which there is such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Surgeon General shall make no payment to such State from appropriations under such subsection, or shall limit payment to activities in which there is no such failure.

"(4) For the purposes of this section—

"(A) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any private agency, institution, or organization means one which is a corporation or association, or is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

"(B) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia and the term 'United States' means the fifty States and the District of Columbia."

Continuation of Grants to Schools of Public Health

SEC. 5. Effective July 1, 1967, section 309 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) There are also authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants, under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by regulations, for provision, in public or nonprofit private schools of public health accredited by a body or bodies recognized by the Surgeon General, of comprehensive professional training, specialized consultive services, and technical assistance in the fields of public health and in the administration of State or local public health programs, except that in allocating funds made available under this subsection among such schools of public health, the Surgeon General shall give primary consideration to the number of federally sponsored students attending each such school."

Continuation of Authorization for Training of Personnel for State and Local Health Work; Cooperation Between the States

SEC. 6. (a) Effective July 1, 1966, section 311 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "311." and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) The Surgeon General shall encourage cooperative activities between the States with respect to comprehensive and continuing planning as to their current and future health needs, the establishment and maintenance of adequate public health services, and otherwise carrying out the purposes of section 314."

"(b) Effective July 1, 1967, section 311 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding at the end of subsection (b) thereof the following new sentence: 'The Surgeon General is also authorized to train personnel for State and local health work.'

Effective Date and Repealer

SEC. 7. The amendments made by section 4 shall become effective, and section 318 of the Public Health Service Act shall be repealed, as of July 1, 1966, except that the provisions of sections 314 of the Public Health Service Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act shall be effective until July 1, 1967, in lieu of the provisions of subsections (d) and (e), and the provisions of subsection

(g) insofar as they relate to such subsections (d) and (e), of section 314 of the Public Health Service Act as amended by this Act. Effective July 1, 1967, section 316 of the Public Health Service Act is repealed.

Grants for Initiating Services at Mental Retardation Facilities

Sec. 8. The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act is amended by adding at the end of title I, the following new part:

"Part D—Grants for costs of initiating services in community mental retardation facilities

"Authorization of Grants

"SEC. 141. For the purpose of assisting public and nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions to initiate, extend, and improve services in facilities for the mentally retarded principally designed to serve the needs of the particular community or communities in or near which the facility is situated, the Secretary may, in accordance with the provisions of this part, make grants to meet not to exceed 75 per centum of the costs (determined pursuant to regulations under section 144) of providing services in such facilities for the mentally retarded.

"In making such grants after June 30, 1968, the Secretary shall give preference to new or expanded services part of the cost of which will be borne out of State or local public funds.

"Applications and Conditions for Approval

"SEC. 142. Grants under this part with respect to any facility for the mentally retarded may be made only upon application, and only if—

"(1) the applicant is a public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution which owns or operates the facility;

"(2) the services to be provided by the facility will provide principally for persons residing in a particular community or communities in or near which such facility is situated, one or more of the types of services for the mentally retarded which are determined by the Secretary to be basic and necessary services for the mentally retarded;

"(3) the Secretary determines that the types of services to be supported are not sufficiently available in other facilities in said communities;

"(4) the Secretary determines that, with respect to the particular type or types of service to be so assisted, Federal financial assistance is not, in fact, available to the applicant under any other Act (or portion thereof) which is administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(5) the Secretary determines that there is satisfactory assurance that Federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds for mental retardation services that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the services described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds; and

"(6) in the case of an applicant in a State which has in existence a State plan relating to the provision of services for the mentally retarded, the services to be provided by the facility are consistent with the plan.

"Payments

"SEC. 143. Payment of grants under this part may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and on such terms and conditions and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

"Regulations

"SEC. 144. The Secretary shall prescribe general regulations concerning the eligibility of facilities under this part, determination of eligible costs with respect to which grants may be made, and the terms and conditions (including those specified in section 142) for approving applications under this part.

"Payments under this part with respect to any project may be made for a period of not to exceed five years beginning with the commencement of the first fiscal year for which any payment is made.

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 145. There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, \$12,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to enable the Secretary to make grants under the provisions of this part."

"DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 9. Subsections (e) and (f) of section 401 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'construction' includes construction of new buildings, acquisition of existing buildings, and expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such new, newly acquired, expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated buildings.

"(f) The term 'cost of construction' includes the cost of architects' fees and acquisition of land in connection with construction, but does not include the cost of off-site improvements."

SEC. 10. The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE V—TRAINING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATORS AND RECREATION PERSONNEL FOR MENTALLY RETARDED AND OTHER HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

"Grants; Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 501. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing professional or advanced training for personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as physical educators or recreation personnel for mentally retarded and other handicapped children, or as supervisors of such personnel, or engaged or preparing to engage in research or teaching in fields related to the physical education or recreation of such children.

"(b) For the purpose of making the grants authorized under subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$2,000,000 each. Any sums appropriated for any such fiscal year and not obligated before the end thereof shall remain available for the succeeding fiscal year for the purpose for which appropriated.

"Research and Demonstration Projects in Physical Education and Recreation for Mentally Retarded and other Handicapped Children

"SEC. 502 (a) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$1,000,000, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, \$1,500,000, to enable the Secretary to make grants to States, State or local educational agencies, public and nonprofit private institutions of higher learning, and other public or nonprofit private educational or research agencies and organizations, for research or demonstration

projects relating to physical education or recreation for mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other children with specific or serious learning disabilities, who by reason thereof require special or modified physical education and recreation activities to enhance their physical and mental development.

"(2) Grants under paragraph (1) shall be made in installments, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and on such conditions as the Secretary may determine.

"(b) The Secretary shall from time to time appoint panels of experts who are competent to evaluate various types of research or demonstration projects under this section, and shall secure the advice and recommendations of one such panel before making any grant under this section.

"Advisory Committee

"SEC. 503. (a) (1) The Secretary shall appoint an advisory committee which shall consist of fifteen members to advise him on matters of general policy relating to the administration of this title. Seven members of such committee shall be individuals from the field of physical education, five members thereof shall be individuals from the field of recreation, and three members thereof shall be individuals with experience or special interest in the education of the mentally retarded or other handicapped children.

"(2) The Secretary shall, from time to time, designate one of the members of such committee to serve as the chairman thereof.

"(b) Members of the advisory committee and members of any panel appointed pursuant to section 502(b), who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, shall, while serving on the business of such committee or such panel, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular place of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Delegation of Functions

"SEC. 504. The Secretary is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this title to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

"Reorganization Plan

SEC. 11. The provisions enacted by this Act shall be subject to the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1966.

MR. HILL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in less than a week, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] has directed the passage of two measures vital to the progress and development of the Nation.

I, of course, refer to the Labor-HEW appropriations bills passed last Tuesday and to the most important measure just adopted—the comprehensive health bill.

Senator Hill has thus achieved a feat difficult to match. And the accomplishment speaks highly for the devotion, the talent, and the great ability of the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] is similarly to be commended for stating his views on the comprehensive health bill in typically clear and persuasive fashion. We certainly thank him and others for splendid support and cooperation and for joining to assure swift and successful action on this measure today.

BORDER HIGHWAY ALONG THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, the hour of 2 o'clock not having arrived, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1625, H.R. 11555, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11555) to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the language of S. 2630, as reported, as a substitute amendment for H.R. 11555.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Secretary of Commerce, herein-after referred to as the Secretary, is authorized to (1) construct a border highway in the city of El Paso, Texas, between the approximate point of the beginning of the rectified boundary channel, two blocks west of Santa Fe Street in El Paso, thence along the international boundary to the International Bridge at Zaragosa Road—about twelve and a half miles east: *Provided*, That the design plans and specifications for this highway shall be developed to meet design and construction standards established by the Secretary; that the Secretary may work through the Texas State Highway Department in accomplishing any part of this project; that the planning, design, and construction schedule, and works shall be subject to review by the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, to assure coordination with the relocation of the river channel and relocation of related facilities, pursuant to the American-Mexican Chamizal Convention Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 184): *And provided further*, That the Secretary may at his discretion request that the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, plan and perform such part of the engineering and construction of the highway as may be warranted to assure coordination and efficient construction, and the Secretary may transfer to the Secretary of State funds necessary for such purpose; (2) acquire lands necessary for the border highway in accordance with the approved plans, through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission: *Provided*, That the provisions of the American-Mexican Chamizal Conven-

tion Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 184) for the acquisition of lands for the purposes of that Act will also apply to the acquisition of adjoining lands required for the border highway, and the Secretary may transfer to the Secretary of State funds necessary for such purposes.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the highway authorized to be constructed by this Act to the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, except that the Secretary shall not construct any highway under authority of this Act until such time as he shall have entered into an agreement with the State of Texas wherein the State agrees to pay to the Secretary of the Treasury at such time as may be specified by the Secretary an amount equal to 50 per centum of the cost of constructing such highway, including all costs of acquiring such additional lands or interests in such lands as may be required for the construction of the highway authorized by this Act and all preliminary engineering costs, and the State of Texas or the city of El Paso, Texas, agrees to accept all right, title, and interest to the highway upon completion of construction and agrees to maintain such highway for such period and in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines necessary to protect the interests of the United States. Amounts paid by the State of Texas under this section shall be available to the Secretary, together with sums appropriated pursuant to section 3, for use in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury not to exceed \$6,000,000, which shall be available for paying the Federal share of the costs of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 936 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment to the amendment is as follows:

On page 3, beginning with the word "State" in line 10, strike out through the words "and the" in line 17.

On page 3, beginning after the period in line 22, strike out through the period in line 25.

On page 4, line 3, strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,000,000".

On page 4, line 4, strike out "the Federal share of".

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to restore \$6 million in funds which was cut from the bill by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

This is something of a matter of honor with the Government of the United States. When this was negotiated with the people of El Paso, they were encouraged and convinced that they should accept the Chamizal settlement. The people of El Paso were promised in effect that this highway would be built.

Inadequate funds are provided in this bill and no matching funds are available

from State or local government with which to complete the highway.

The Mexican Government has undertaken a beautification program at Juarez, on the other side of the border. I think it is appropriate that we do the same.

THE CHAMIZAL HIGHWAY: FULL FUNDING IS A MUST

The Chamizal Treaty, ratified on January 14, 1964, peacefully settled a 100-year-old dispute between Mexico and the United States over the sovereignty of a several-hundred-acre tract known as the Chamizal, which was formed north of the present channel of the Rio Grande in El Paso, Tex., by movement of the river southward in 1864-67. That treaty provides that approximately 630 acres of land in southerly downtown El Paso be transferred to Mexico and 193 acres of land under Mexican jurisdiction be transferred to the United States.

During negotiations leading to the Chamizal Convention and Treaty, a complementary program to develop the American section of land was proposed by our Federal Government, working in close cooperation with the county and city of El Paso. El Paso has throughout been extremely helpful and cooperative in adjusting itself to the provisions of the settlement, even though a significant segment of its lands was involved.

The treaty provides for the relocation of the Rio Grande channel, for relocation within the Chamizal section of the irrigation canal, and for compensating occupants of the lands involved in the transfer. These efforts are already well underway.

Additional aspects of the harmonious development include the Chamizal National Memorial, which has already been approved by the Congress, a parallel relocation of the American irrigation canal, and the construction of the Chamizal Memorial Highway. While these developments are not included in the treaty itself, being entirely domestic projects and not, therefore, properly includable in an international treaty, they have been an integral part of the negotiations with the city of El Paso.

Mexico has initiated a handsome border beautification program on its side of the international border in Ciudad Juarez, and it is highly appropriate that the United States equally express itself in this development program.

Prior to its being settled, the Chamizal boundary dispute created serious difficulties for the area of El Paso affected by this bill—approximately 630 acres of the southern part of downtown El Paso. Private developers had been reticent to invest in the area, and no Federal projects could be begun before title to the land was clear.

The Chamizal Treaty with Mexico, ratified by the Senate in 1963, established the permanent boundary between the United States and Mexico, providing for relocation of the Rio Grande and creation of a concrete-lined channel. The treaty also provided special compensation for relocation of private residences and places of business, flood control, and prevention of pollution.

The Chamizal border highway is another aspect of the settlement.

The proposed highway would occupy land areas obtained in the treaty adjustment and would extend 12.5 miles from the beginning of the relocated channel to the point of intersection with the International Highway crossing the Rio Grande on Zaragoza Bridge. The expected volume of traffic on the highway justifies construction of a four-lane highway. It would cost \$12 million. Such a highway would help provide for traffic needs and orderly development of the city of El Paso. Its construction would be just reparation for the earlier lack of highway facilities and would assist the city in adjusting to the relocation of the Rio Grande northward. I want to assure the Senate of the full support of the community of El Paso concerning this project.

The Johnson administration has recommended construction of the highway. So did the Kennedy administration. The highway has always been regarded in El Paso and in the executive branch as closely related to the Chamizal project itself.

Implementation of the Chamizal settlement is now approximately 60-percent complete. The highway should be constructed as a part of this project.

This highway would replace certain connecting street and road links which no longer can be used because they now lie outside the international boundaries of the United States. More significantly, it would connect three very busy points of international entry and exit to and from the United States with Mexico, at the busiest port of entry on the entire southern border of the United States. Some 60 million crossings occur annually at these points.

In losing the territory under the treaty, the city of El Paso lost certain roads and streets that connect with points of international entry, and in addition lost some \$27 million worth of property from its tax rolls. The city further deeded to the U.S. Government without charges a parcel of municipal property, valued at approximately \$250,000 for Federal use as a border station.

Ambassador Thomas Mann at the time of working out the details of a settlement with the citizens of El Paso, Tex., promised them that he would recommend to the Congress as an adjustment for their loss in tax revenues, as a replacement for the lost streets and roads, and as a long-needed connection between these points of entry on our border, such a highway as this bill now would authorize.

The merits of the legislation are seen in the three considerations of need, fairness, and value to the United States.

First. Need for the highway is implicit in the fact that El Paso is the busiest port of entry on our entire border. Sixty million people cross annually at the three points which this road would connect. This number is equal to almost one-third the total population of the United States.

The U.S. Border Patrol has said that the mobility of such a highway would assist in their patrolling of the border at this vital point. Such a highway was first proposed in 1927 but was incapable

of being built through all these years because of the long-pending Chamizal settlement and the fact that the title to the land was clouded.

Second. A measure of fairness to the city of El Paso would be provided by the Federal construction of this highway through a part of the city. El Paso gave up 630 acres willingly and freely to cooperate with the U.S. Government in removing this festering sore of recurrent conflict between our country and the neighboring Republic of Mexico.

The city surrendered approximately \$27 million of property from its tax rolls in order to facilitate this settlement. This obviously represents a considerable annual loss to the city, and the provision of this highway will assist them in accommodating to this loss.

Third. The value to the United States is unquestionable. The cost is small in comparison. At an estimated \$12 million, it will come to only about 20 cents for each citizen who crosses the border at this location this year. And, it is a one-time cost.

It will provide a better flow of traffic, long and sorely needed, for these 60 million annual crossings. And it will greatly improve the first impression for the millions from Latin America who enter our country from that point for visits each year. El Paso is, for much of Latin America, a window to the United States. Moreover, it is an international city for many other official visitors.

There are 43 nations of the free world which train troops at Fort Bliss and the White Sands missile complex. The impression they get at El Paso is their impression of the United States. Mexico has underway a very impressive program of development at Juarez on its side of the border. At this point Mexican improvements come to about \$8.8 million.

The \$12 million bill has been recommended by the U.S. Boundary Commission, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Departments of Commerce and State. It is approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

It obviously serves a true national need, as distinguished from a purely local need, and it seems to me that the most impressive and compelling fact of all is the fact of these 60 million crossings every year.

The people of El Paso accepted this irrevocable loss of territory for several reasons. Their lives are entwined in international good will and they believe in the need for good international relations.

The U.S. Government came to the people of El Paso and asked them to accept this settlement for the higher purpose of international relations, to remove the great stigma that has balked negotiations of the United States over the years.

The Federal Government said to the people of El Paso, "Your fellow Americans are asking you to give up a net of 427 acres of land in your growth area; to relinquish \$320,000 of annual taxes and to displace 5,500 residents."

What did El Paso ask for in return? They are not asking to build a whole new

part of their city. They are asking only that this road be built as promised.

El Paso did not even receive reimbursement of 7 miles of roadway that she lost as well as the road that was lost along the levee.

Although this is an international border, El Paso is not, even now, asking that the United States maintain the road hereafter. The State of Texas and the city of El Paso will maintain it.

This plan was developed for very real reasons in the best interests of the United States. The Bureau of the Budget has approved this program.

The \$12 million figure stated is only an authorization and includes acquisition costs. It is not an appropriation. The road work can never be done more cheaply than right now, because it can be built simultaneously with the construction of the levee on the river. Any delay would be costly.

Now, Mr. President, even though this bill is supported by two administrations and has been passed intact by the House, the Senate committee has slashed it by 50 percent. This is a crippling cut. If it stands the entire project is doomed. With all due respect to the committee, I think their action must in all reason and fairness be reversed.

We should meet our obligations as the executive branch has and the House has and provide the full \$12 million for this project.

There is an excellent example of a road built wholly at Federal expense nearby. This is the highway to the Dulles Airport. In contrast with the present proposal the Dulles Highway costs the Government for continuous maintenance.

The Dulles Highway cost a great deal more than this Chamizal Highway and serves many fewer people. In the first 3 years the Dulles Highway carried fewer than 3 million people. It is estimated that this new Chamizal Highway will carry per year 60 million people. That is more than three times as many persons as annually visit the city of Washington.

If we bring this down to a per-user cost, the taxpayers paid \$5 for each passenger using the Dulles Highway in the first 3 years of its operation, and the Chamizal, by way of a comparison of cost, will only represent about 7 cents for each international passenger who can be expected to use it in its first 3 years.

Now, Mr. President, so that every Senator may understand just how the people of El Paso feel, I want to read into the RECORD a very candid memorandum sent to me by that city's mayor, the Honorable Judson F. Williams. It reads:

The citizens of El Paso note with deep concern the September 22nd action in which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee members voted to limit Federal participation in the proposed Chamizal Border Highway to 50% of the cost.

Construction of this border highway is tremendously important to this area as a part of the Chamizal settlement and this amendment, if allowed to stand, would be a tragic economic blow to El Paso. If the original bill, S2630, is not acted upon favorably in which the Federal Government provides the entire cost, it is my feeling that the impact

upon the citizens of El Paso will forever place a cloud upon what has been a wonderful spirit of international accomplishment.

The City of El Paso cooperated and worked with the Federal Government in the achievement of the settlement of the Chamizal border dispute. As the Chief City Official, I was probably best informed as to the impact such a settlement would have on our community.

On June 5, 1963, when the late President John F. Kennedy visited in El Paso, this matter of the border highway as partial reparation to the City of El Paso in the Chamizal settlement was discussed with him, and he pledged his complete support of the project.

In June, 1964, Presidential Assistant Ralph Dungan advised City officials that President Johnson was carefully studying the proposed four-lane highway along the new river channel. In September, 1965, President Johnson announced that the Federal Government would provide the funds for the border highway. On September 11, 1965, Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH cited President Johnson's approval in Washington of the border highway.

This proposed highway is not sugar coating on the settlement but has been a part of every discussion held since the summer of 1962, when Ambassador Thomas C. Mann and U.S. Commissioner J. F. Friedkin first approached the officials and other civic leaders of the City of El Paso in an effort to work out a solution to the Chamizal dispute.

There had been and was much opposition to this settlement treaty on the part of El Pasoans and Texans. In fact, there appeared to be strong objections throughout the United States to surrendering sovereign territory on questionable claim. Secretary Mann explained the national requirement for settling the border dispute and appealed to El Pasoans to support a settlement stating that the loss to El Paso would be minimized by a federal border improvement plan.

The plan, illustrated in drawings and pictures, presented a four-lane scenic road and traffic way along the border. This road was to resolve many El Paso traffic problems and to greatly improve the unattractive United States frontier facing Mexico.

While the Treaty was an expression of national policy undertaken to advance the national interests of both national states, it was the people of El Paso, Texas, who were immediately affected. The six-hundred and thirty acres of land within the oldest and most heavily populated section of El Paso were to be transferred to Mexico. Approximately five-thousand residents of El Paso would be required to find new homes, business and industries would be required to relocate, and in excess of \$2,386,610 worth of public improvements were to be transferred to Mexico. In addition, El Paso's public investment in the land to be transferred to Mexico for which it will not be reimbursed is quite substantial.

Further, the City of El Paso would forever forgo the collection of tax revenues from the 630 acres of land now within the City. The annual tax revenue from the land to be transferred based on 1964 valuations is in excess of \$306,895.00.

In response to the great need as expressed by Ambassador Mann for the United States and Mexico to end this one-hundred year old boundary dispute and with the very definite feeling that the Federal Government would assist the City of El Paso in adjusting to the change and that the Border Highway would be provided at no cost to the City, city officials, civic leaders, including news media editors and managers, agreed to pursue an all out program to sell acceptance of the Chamizal treaty to El Pasoans.

This El Paso acceptance eliminated or minimized opposition from other parts of Texas, and subsequently, other opposition in the United States.

With the ratification of the Chamizal Treaty, the City of El Paso then set out to do everything possible to fully accomplish the objectives of the Treaty. Further feeling that the relocating of the Service Alien Detention facilities on the land to be owned by the Federal Government adjacent to the new international bridge would be incompatible with the objectives of the Treaty, the City of El Paso donated to the Federal Government a twenty-seven (27) acre site valued in excess of \$250,000.00 for the Border Patrol Sector Headquarters and the Immigration and Naturalization Service Alien Detention facility.

That the Congress would in effect refute what El Paso felt was an agreement and an understanding of its own great contributions to this cause, is difficult to understand, and will cause serious problems in El Paso and in Mexico, where the progress of this program is under close scrutiny.

Your support of the legislation to provide this facility is vital to the image of the United States throughout the world.

Sincerely,

JUDSON F. WILLIAMS,
Mayor, City of El Paso.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Texas has stated the case very well. I personally would like to agree that the sum be increased by the amount requested. However, in view of the debate which occurred in the Committee on Foreign Relations on this matter, I would hope that the distinguished Senator from Texas would bear with us at this time.

I assure him personally that, as far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, he will do his best in the next session of Congress to be of assistance in this particular matter. I do think it is a situation which involves our honor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator, the very able majority leader, for his comments.

Mr. President, with that understanding, I withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 11555) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1624, S. 2630, be postponed indefinitely.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3164) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 937 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

S. 3164

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964—INCREASED MEMBERSHIP OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SEC. 26. (a) Subsection (a) of section 705 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-4(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) In the first sentence thereof (A) strike out "five" and insert "seven", and (B) strike out "three" and insert "four".

(2) In the second sentence thereof (A) immediately after "members" insert "first taking office on June 1, 1965", and (B) immediately after "title," insert "and one of the original members first taking office after June 1, 1965, shall be appointed for a term of three years and one for a term of five years, beginning from the date of enactment of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966".

(3) Between the second and third sentences thereof insert the following new sentence: "In making appointments to the Commission, the President shall give due consideration, among other reasonable factors, to whether there is maximum feasible representation provided among the membership of the Commission for persons of all the various groups throughout our Nation without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 705 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-4 (b)) is amended by striking out "three" and inserting "four".

(c) Members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission appointed to hold either of the two additional offices created by the amendments to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 made by this section shall receive compensation at the same rate authorized for other members of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, not including the Chairman thereof.

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

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MADAM CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S STATUS IN UNITED STATES QUESTIONED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before I make a few remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article entitled "Madam Chiang Urges United States To Halt Mao."

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

MADAM CHIANG URGES UNITED STATES TO HALT MAO

LINCOLN, NEBR.—Madame Chiang Kai-shek Thursday described America's foreign policy as projecting "an image of fear" and called upon the United States to use its power to overthrow Red China.

The 70-year-old wife of Nationalist China's leader said this is the only way to stop the military expansion of Red China under Premier Mao Tse-tung.

"United States foreign policy conveys to neutrals, skeptics and fence-sitters as well as to the Chinese Communists an image of fear through using what might be described as timidity and techniques of 'push, pull, click, click' in dealing with the Communists," Madame Chiang said in an address at Nebraska Wesleyan University.

"There are two solutions to the problems facing Russia and the United States as well as Southeast Asia and ourselves: Bash in the door with overwhelming force so that all the rottenness will fall out of its own accord, or use the proper key and unlock the door that will be the beginning of the end for the inquisitorial Maoist orgies."

Madame Chiang was here to accept an honorary doctor of humane letters degree at a convocation at Nebraska Wesleyan. She is making a 1-year tour of the United States.

An expected protest walkout by a group of Wesleyan professors and students failed to materialize. A spokesman for the Methodist Church-sponsored college explained that attendance at the convocation was not compulsory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is an article reporting upon a speech by Madam Chiang Kai-shek in Lincoln, Nebr., calling upon the United States to use its power to overthrow Red China.

Mr. President, it seems most unusual to me—in fact, I do not know of any precedent—for the wife of a head of state of an important ally of this country to come to this country for a year, as the article indicates, seeking to influence directly a major foreign policy of this country.

I do not know what kind of visa Madam Chiang Kai-shek carries. I do not know under what auspices she comes, or whether the State Department requested her to come to help support its policies. I think it is a very interesting subject. I would like the State Department to inform the public and the Senate the precise status of this very well known woman, who is the wife of the chief of state of one of our allies, and under what auspices she has come to seek to influence our foreign policy.

BUILDING UP IN THAILAND

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, since the officials of our Government who are responsible for our policies in Asia, and more specifically Thailand, decline to testify in public session before the Committee on Foreign Relations, I be-

lieve it is my duty as chairman of that committee to make a brief statement on the subject. When I say "decline," I speak from personal knowledge, because I personally invited members of the Department of State—specifically, the Secretary of State—to come and testify in public session, and my cordial invitation was declined.

I believe it is my duty simply because it seems to me that the people of my country are entitled to know to what extent their sons and their fortunes are being committed in Thailand.

I believe this enormous expenditures of our resources in Thailand should, at the very least, be the subject of discussion and serious consideration by the Congress, especially by the Senate, before the commitment is final and complete. It seems to me that Members of the Senate, who share in the responsibility for Government policies, should at least know what those policies involve. It is not solely because I disapprove of our policy of enlargement of the war in southeast Asia that I believe it is my duty to present publicly in one statement the information which has come to my attention about Thailand. Regardless of my views, I believe the expenditure of billions of public funds, and the exposure of American lives to destruction 12,000 miles away in Asia, is a matter of sufficient importance to warrant congressional consideration and approval.

On January 1, 1965, there were 23,000 American military men in South Vietnam. On June 1, 1966, there were 25,000 in Thailand, and I gather that there are now more than 30,000 there.

We are building up in Thailand—building barracks, air bases, ports, and supply depots. What are the reasons for this new military involvement in southeast Asia? What is the legal basis and the political justification? Are we trying to apply the lessons learned in Vietnam; are we falling into the same errors; or are the two situations not analogous? We are building up in Thailand but do we know what is building up in Thailand?

For answers, Americans must turn, paradoxically, to the press, for a curtain of official secrecy surrounds our activities in Thailand. We have been told from time to time, by officials, to be skeptical of press reports from Vietnam but now we are given no alternative but to rely on the press for our information about Thailand because the officials are reluctant to speak.

From the press we learn that most of the 30,000 men we have in Thailand are in the Air Force. They fly a majority—some reports say as much as 80 percent—of the bombing and reconnaissance missions that are flown over North Vietnam and northern Laos from a half dozen American-built air bases in Thailand—which are legally Thai bases and fly the Thai flag. We are building a giant sea and air base complex at Sattahip which will have runways long enough to accommodate B-52 bombers and which is costing hundreds of millions of dollars—either \$100 million or more than \$500 million, depending on which paper one reads. We are also training and equipping the Thai Armed Forces to fight

Communist insurgents in the northeast, although we are, reportedly, not participating directly in the fighting. On this point there is a conflict in the stories reported by the press.

Officially, as I say, we have been told nothing about all this—unless, that is, we happened to see Mr. William Bundy, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, on television early in September. It is rather curious that he went on "Meet the Press" in September, but has declined to appear in open session before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In the first official statement that some of the thousands of young Americans on the streets of Thai villages are not soldiers on leave from Vietnam or tourists, Mr. Bundy told us that there were "about 25,000" American servicemen in Thailand. He also told us that there was "a real threat of insurgency, particularly in the northeast area of Thailand" but that it was "on a very limited scale—a scale that on the Vietnamese benchmark would be perhaps on the level of 1959 or 1960 rather than any of the later periods—in numbers involved it is probably only in the hundreds." He added that—

The Thai are absolutely determined to deal with this themselves . . . our role is to supply them equipment and to assist them in training as they may desire.

When asked about the exact nature of "our commitment" to Thailand, Mr. Bundy replied:

Well, we have a treaty relationship with Thailand, of course, in that they are a member of the SEATO treaty, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, so that we have a fully complete treaty relationship there. Now that applies to action in accordance with our constitutional processes in the event of external aggression and for consultation in the event of subversion. What you have now is some kind of—well, a real threat of insurgency, particularly in the northeast area of Thailand.

Obviously, we have not sent 25,000 or 30,000 men and hundreds of planes to Thailand, and obviously we are not building multimillion-dollar bases capable of handling the largest strategic bombers we have, in order to meet a threat arising from "hundreds" of insurgents. The Thais themselves should be able to handle a military threat of such dimensions. Thailand's Armed Forces total 130,000 men—an Army of about 85,000, a Navy of 25,000, and an Air Force of 20,000—and their defense budget for 1965-66 was over \$90 million.

It is quite clear that we are using Thailand as a base from which to launch air attacks against North Vietnam. To justify what we are doing by referring to the insurgency in the northeast and tying this threat of insurgency to paragraph 2 of article IV in the SEATO treaty, the paragraph relating to the threat of subversion, is specious at best. Mr. Bundy could have said that we were acting in Thailand under paragraph 1 of article IV which refers to "aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area." But in that case he would have had to address himself to the requirements that action taken under this paragraph be in accord with the "constitutional processes" of the party acting and

that the measures taken "be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations." I will return to this subject of "constitutional processes" in a few moments.

Hence, directly from the press and inferentially from what Mr. Bundy has said on television, one is lead inevitably to the conclusion that we are building up in Thailand primarily a complex of airbases for use in the war in Vietnam—and apparently secondarily a supporting, or if necessary alternative, military supply and logistics base. We are also helping the Thai with equipment and training to control their insurgent problem, but it is not because of the insurgency that we have 30,000 troops there. We are, I gather again from the press, precluded from saying all this because the Thai Government has asked us to remain silent, and we have agreed.

Why is the Thai Government so insistent on this point? After all, in 1962 we sent 5,000 troops to Thailand when a Laotian Communist army neared the Thai border. At that time statements were issued by President Kennedy and by the Thai Government, and the United Nations Secretary General was informed of the action in writing. In fact, the Thai Government apparently felt it important to inform the Thai people, for the Thai statement, issued on May 15, 1962, included the following sentence:

It (the stationing of United States forces in Thailand) is hereby announced to the people of Thailand with the request that they cooperate fully with the Government in the firm determination to protect and maintain the freedom, integrity, independence and sovereignty of the Thai nation.

If it was judicious to make such an official public statement then, why is it undesirable to do so now?

I wish that I knew the answer to this question. Perhaps a part of the explanation lies in the Thai Foreign Minister's reported statement at the United Nations a few days ago that Thailand had not asked for American forces to be stationed there and could, if necessary, do without them. The Thais, the Foreign Minister said graphically, "are not hanging on to your GI's by their shirt-tails."

Another element that may explain—at least in part—Thai reluctance to discuss the subject of U.S. military activities in Thailand is the fact that the Thai Government may feel that the Thai people would react adversely and that Thailand's political stability would be affected. For Thailand is not the politically progressive country so many say it is. In fact, it never has been. Until the early 1930's, Thailand—then known as Siam—had been for centuries a relatively benign monarchy. In 1932, a group of young military officers and civil servants seized power and induced the King to promulgate the first Thai constitution. A legislature was established, whose members were appointed not elected, but it gained little of the power that had been lost by the King. Power was instead generally exercised by a shifting oligarchy in the Council of Ministers or Cabinet, composed primarily

of leaders of cliques in the Army, the police and the civil service.

In the 26 years after the coup of 1932, there were 26 separate coups and the constitution of 1932—a modest constitution at best—was inoperative for much of this time, including the years of World War II when Siam, a reluctant if not unwilling ally of Japan, was under a dictatorship.

In 1958, Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat, commander of the Thai Armed Forces, seized power. He abrogated the constitution, dissolved the National Assembly and the Council of Ministers, banned all political parties except his own "Revolutionary Party," and proclaimed martial law. In early 1959, an interim constitution was promulgated and a Constituent Assembly appointed, more than three-quarters of its members from the military profession, to draft a new constitution and to serve as an interim legislature. The Constituent Assembly has yet to recommend a constitution and no parliamentary elections have taken place since 1957. The present Prime Minister of Thailand, Gen. Thanom Kittikachorn, became Premier in 1963 following the death of Sarit, who died an astonishingly wealthy man. The popular and dedicated King of Thailand exerts a beneficial—though apparently limited—fluence on policy. In sum, as one expert on Thailand has written:

The Thai political system has fallen between absolutism and democracy.

There is, therefore, cause for concluding that the Thai Government has largely itself—and not external forces—to blame for the disaffection that exists in the country and particularly in the northeast. The northeast region has long been a problem for Thai authorities. Geographically remote from Bangkok, it has been ignored by the capital. Economically backward its inhabitants have a lower standard of living than their fellow Thais. A large number of the inhabitants of the region are culturally Laotian, and some 50,000 Vietnamese refugees of the French-Indo-Chinese war also live there. Terrorism began in 1964 and has increased since then. Six persons were killed in 1964, 30 in 1965, and there have been over 70 political murders this year. Estimates of the number of guerrillas range from the hundreds to more than 3,000. The formation of a Thai patriotic front to lead a war of liberation in Thailand was announced in Peking last year. Southern Thailand has also been plagued by increased Communist-led terrorism involving some experienced guerrillas from the Malayan insurgency, although this seems to be a less serious problem mainly because there is no contiguous territory under Communist control.

Is the insurgency in the northeast similar to that in Vietnam in the early stages? The few public statements issued by our Government officials indicate that they believe it is. Some reporters also see a parallel. Others, however, do not. They suggest that the threat is being exaggerated and misrepresented by Thai officials in the hope of obtaining more American aid and better American weapons. Those who are

skeptical that an analogy can be drawn point out that the guerrillas cannot appeal to rural villagers in the name of anticolonialism or reunification, but can capitalize only on the resentment of the people in the northeast toward the Thai Government—resentment arising from the Government's neglect and abuse of the region. As former Ambassador to Thailand, Kenneth T. Young, now president of the Asia Society, wrote recently of the situation in the northeast:

The key to Thailand's lasting safety lies in a better revolution to fill the rural vacuum. This means creating a whole new national identity in two directions. Only a self-restrained civilian and military officialdom knowing how to gain the respect and trust of the rural people can win them over. And only a self-propelled rural people feeling their own stake and welcoming outside aid in developing and protecting their homes, temples, rice fields, schools and villages can repel Communist agents and insurgents.

Testifying before Congress in 1951 on President Truman's decision to deploy four Army divisions to Europe, the then Secretary of Defense, Gen. George C. Marshall, said:

My opinion in the matter is that Congress is certainly entitled to know what we are planning and as Senator Smith (of New Jersey) very plainly pointed out, what we do has to have the support of the people.

How times have changed. Apparently we no longer believe that "what we do has to have the support of the people." The people obviously cannot support a course of action of which they are kept in ignorance or confusion. I deplore our decision not to discuss what we are doing in Thailand because the Thai do not wish us to do so. We are weakening our democratic processes either because our troops are in Thailand on shaky legal and political grounds or because of the Thai Government's political vulnerability or perhaps because of both reasons.

As for the role of Congress with respect to the buildup in Thailand, E. S. Corwin, in his distinguished book on the Presidency, asked this question on the relationship between the executive and legislative branches:

Shall it be the relationship of cooperation between constitutionally equal partners, or shall it be the relationship of principal and instrument; a relationship resting on jointly held convictions as to what the interests of the United States require, or on the calculation that when Congress is presented with a sufficiently imperative fait accompli it can be counted on to come to heel?

Our involvement in Thailand may prove to be just such an "imperative fait accompli." At a time when the United States is building a vast sea and air complex in Thailand, when more than 25,000 of our forces are stationed there, and when these bases are being used by our forces in an undeclared war in which we are a principal combatant, the Senate is asked only to give its advice and consent to a double taxation treaty with Thailand and to another treaty concerning commerce and navigation. This is hardly a "relationship of cooperation between constitutionally equal partners." It is quite the reverse. Congress is in danger of becoming the "instrument" of

the President and is becoming so easily and compliantly—if not enthusiastically.

We are building up in Thailand. We are moving into Thailand. We are moving in men and planes and steel and cement. We are moving in American dollars—over 433 million in economic aid in fiscal years 1946 through 1965 and somewhat over 60 million in fiscal year 1966; 415 million in military aid through 1963 when the figures began to be classified and I suppose about 40 million more a year since then; hundreds of millions in construction costs in the past few years—certainly well over a billion in all. And the end is apparently not in sight. In the joint communique issued on February 15, 1966, at the conclusion of talks between Vice President HUMPHREY and the Prime Minister of Thailand, the Vice President "emphasized the determination of the United States to provide all necessary assistance to enable Thailand and the other countries of southeast Asia threatened by Communist aggression to defend themselves and to achieve in peace their just economic and social aims."

We are apparently trying, single-handedly, by executive fiat, to change the face of Asia. We are taking on the role not only of policeman but also of provider for all the non-Communist countries there. Even if we could afford to assume this burden—and I question whether we can—is our objective realistic? We—a white, western country—are trying to reform an oriental culture in our image, ignoring the warning of the poet laureate of an older imperialism, Rudyard Kipling, who wrote:

The end of the fight is a tombstone white
with the name of the late deceased.
And the epitaph drear: "A fool lies
here who tried to hustle the East."

In a celebrated commentary in 1899 on the United States and the Philippines, Kipling also wrote:

Take up the White Man's burden—
And reap his old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard—

The resentment of client states toward those on whom they have become dependent is as insidious and inevitable in the 20th century as it was in the 19th. Never colonized, traditionally suspicious of foreigners, the Thais surely do not rejoice in being militarily dependent on the United States, as the Thai Foreign Minister's statement at the United Nations shows. And because of the resentment and xenophobia that even benign foreign intervention brings, massive infusions of men and money may well hinder the Thais from developing, rather than help them to develop, a sound political environment in which insurgency cannot flourish. For strong and viable societies must be homegrown products. They cannot be transplanted. We can help prepare the soil, we can help protect the seeds from being trampled underfoot, but what grows must be suited to the land and cultivated by those who tend it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the

article entitled "FULBRIGHT Chided by Thai Official," written by Seth S. King, and published in the New York Times of September 24, 1966.

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

FULBRIGHT CHIDED BY THAI OFFICIAL—THANAT SAYS PEOPLE RESENT CHALLENGE TO U.S. POLICY

(By Seth S. King)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 23.—Thanat Khoman, Thailand's Foreign Minister, said today that his country bitterly resented Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT's effort to challenge the Johnson Administration on its policy in Thailand.

"We resent being used as a club for striking at the President over his policies in Vietnam," Mr. Thanat declared.

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said Tuesday that he would press for public hearings on American activities in Thailand.

He said he was "very dubious" about the long-range objectives there and wanted to pursue the question of whether the United States was getting involved in "another Vietnam."

In an interview at the United Nations, where he is attending the General Assembly, Mr. Thanat said Thailand had not appealed for the stationing of American forces there and could, if necessary, do without them.

"If Senator FULBRIGHT does not want them there, let him start a move to bring them home. We are not hanging on to your G.I.'s by their shirttails," Mr. Thanat declared.

Earlier this week, Senator FULBRIGHT's committee held closed hearings on Thailand and subjected William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, to a four-hour questioning.

"We would rather go down fighting Communism by ourselves than be a pawn for Senator FULBRIGHT," the usually placid Thai Foreign Minister asserted. "We are not the 51st state."

Thailand is a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. In the last five years a number of large American bases have been built in that country.

For nearly two years the major effort of the Air Force against targets in North Vietnam has been mounted from Thailand. However, neither the United States nor Thailand has publicly acknowledged this.

Planes from American bases in Thailand have also been used constantly against the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos and against pro-Communist Pathet Lao forces there.

THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND AMERICANS IN THAILAND

After Tuesday's hearings committee members disclosed that American military forces based in Thailand now totaled nearly 35,000 men. This was three times their strength in December, 1965.

The Democratic Senator from Arkansas said he was not disturbed by the Administration's "short-range policies" in using Thai bases but by the "Administration's long-range objectives in Thailand and the rest of Southeast Asia."

"The Thai people are getting fed up with reading the criticisms and insinuations about all this," Mr. Thanat said. "They say let the Americans take their soldiers home if this is the way they feel."

The Thai Foreign Minister said Communist efforts to subvert northeast Thailand were at a lower scale now than earlier this year.

"But this is something they turn on and off like a thermostat," he said. "We are moving against this and can handle it. It is not something that will get out of hand without American help."

DEATH OF BERNARD GIMBEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the death in New York of Bernard Gimbel at the age of 81.

Bernard Gimbel was one of our most distinguished New Yorkers, the head of the Gimbel chain of department stores, an athlete, a great civic leader, and a great humanitarian, belovedly known to all New Yorkers as, "Bernie."

Mr. President, with respect to the magnificent life he lived, most of us would say that we hope to live as long and as well as Bernie Gimbel.

Bernie Gimbel has been known, among the people of our city and the Nation, as a merchant, a merchant prince really. But he also led countless civic movements with illustrious distinction, reflecting credit on himself and all those associated with him.

His funeral yesterday in Temple Emanu-El, in New York City, was attended by many New Yorkers from every walk of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the obituary notice, the editorials, and the news reports of yesterday's funeral services and on the life of Bernard Gimbel be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 30, 1966]

BERNARD GIMBEL, NEW YORKER

Bernard F. Gimbel loved New York with a passion second only to that with which he loved life itself. Like so many devoted New Yorkers, he was born in the Midwest and grew to manhood elsewhere, but for six of his eight decades he was a vibrant part of the city of his adoption.

A merchant of great enterprise, he combined business shrewdness with a strong sense of civic responsibility. He devoted much time and effort to committees that dealt with such recurring problems as parking, water supply, subways, labor disputes, hospitals and city finances. He was a director of both New York World's Fairs.

Mr. Gimbel, rich in friends, lived life with tremendous gusto. He will be missed as one who helped give New York its distinctive flavor.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 3, 1966]

GIMBEL FUNERAL ATTENDED BY 1,000—TUNNEY AND GRIFFIS SPEAK AT TEMPLE EMANU-EL RITES

Final tribute was paid yesterday to Bernard F. Gimbel, the gregarious patriarch of New York's retail merchants, who died Thursday at the age of 81.

Nearly 1,000 persons gathered at Temple Emanu-El at Fifth Avenue and 65th Street for the simple, 30-minute funeral service.

The Reform service was led by the Rev. Dr. Nathan A. Perlman, rabbi of Temple Emanu-El.

The pearl-finished bronze coffin containing the body of Mr. Gimbel, a vigorous man who ran the Gimbel's and Saks Fifth Avenue department stores for a quarter of a century, was in the sanctuary under a blanket of red roses. It was placed at the foot of the Sukkah, which was covered by a rich display of autumnal fruits.

FAMILY IN FIRST ROW

The Sukkah, or hut, was erected last week to commemorate the festival of Succoth, a reminder of Biblical times when Jews lived in such dwellings during their wanderings in the desert before they reached the Promised Land.

Mr. Gimbel's widow, Alva, a black veil draped over her silver-locked hair, sat in the first row of the sanctuary and faced the towering ark that contains the Torah. With her were her sons, Bruce and Peter; her daughters, Mrs. David Solinger and Mrs. M. Joseph Lebworth, and other members of the immediate family.

The service began with the clear, calm voice of Dr. Perilman who explained the Sukkah as symbolic of the joyous festival of Thanksgiving and of the "frality and brevity of life."

Dr. Perilman then recited the 90th Psalm, which begins, "Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations," and the 121st Psalm, which begins, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help."

Then he turned to one of Mr. Gimbel's favorite poems, John Donne's "Death Be Not Proud" and read it in a deliberate voice.

After the choir sang Handel's "In Thee, O Lord, Have I Trusted," Stanton Griffis, former Ambassador to Argentina and Spain and a lifelong friend of Mr. Gimbel, stepped up to the pulpit to deliver the first eulogy.

Addressing the congregation in a deep, resonant voice with a Churchillian intonation, Mr. Griffis told how Mr. Gimbel, a noted sportsman, had struggled against cancer in the last months of his life.

"Today is, and should be, a happy day for all of us," he said. "After months of pain and suffering and an indomitable battle against life's worst enemy, Bernie is released from pain and we are gathered here to rejoice with him. The hurricane has gone out to sea and the sun is upon us."

THE IMMORTAL LIFE

Mr. Griffis spoke of the close and loving relationship Mr. Gimbel had with his wife and of the pleasure he derived from his children and friends and from sports and philanthropy.

"If he thought of the immortal life beyond all," the former envoy said, "he probably knew without any special pride that his life would go on as it is going on and perhaps immortality would come to him through his children and those golden grandchildren whom he loved so well and of whom he was so proud."

Gene Tunney, the former world heavyweight champion, delivered the other eulogy and traced the impact of the Gimbel family on American retailing since Mr. Gimbel's grandfather arrived in New Orleans from Bavaria in the early 1800's.

"After many notable achievements it was left to Bernard to build the great empire called Gimbel Brothers-Saks Fifth Avenue," Mr. Tunney said. "Not only did he build a great empire with the help of those associated with him, but he eventually became one of the great men of his time."

TWENTY-THIRD PSALM IS SUNG

The service ended with Dr. Perilman's prayer and with a song by Schubert set to the verse of the 23d Psalm, "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want."

Mr. Gimbel's coffin then was lifted out of the sanctuary and carried slowly down the long center aisle. The honorary pallbearers were led by David Sarnoff, chairman of the Radio Corporation of America and a trustee of the temple, and Samuel Berliner Jr., sexton of the temple.

Outside the temple the honorary pallbearers formed two columns and faced each other as the coffin was lifted into a hearse.

The honorary pallbearers and others attending the funeral included James A. Farley, Thomas S. Gates, Monroe Green, Walter Hoving, William W. Kamm, Robert Lehman, John D. Lodge, Charles E. McCabe, Louis Marx, Robert Moses, Samuel Nass and Alfred E. Perlman.

Also, Samuel F. Pryor, Frank Regan, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker, Sidney Rheinstein, Jack I. Straus, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, Robert F. Wagner and Charles Zadock.

Mrs. Gimbel, and the immediate family followed the coffin to Ferncliff Cemetery in Hartsdale, N.Y., where Dr. Perilman intoned the Kaddish, the traditional Jewish prayer for the dead.

The ashes will be buried in the family plot at Mount Sinai Cemetery in Philadelphia.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 30, 1966]

BERNARD F. GIMBEL DIES AT 81—LED CHAIN OF STORES 34 YEARS

Bernard F. Gimbel, the exuberant merchant who brought Gimbel's to New York in 1910 and became one of the world's dominant retailers as he ruled over his family's expanding network of department stores, died early yesterday in his suite at the Pierre Hotel.

Mr. Gimbel, who was 81 years old, had been ill with cancer for about 18 months. Mrs. Gimbel was at his bedside when he died at 12:45 A.M., as were his two sons, Bruce A. and Peter R. Gimbel.

The man who ran the Gimbel's and Saks Fifth Avenue department stores as president from 1927 to 1953 was chairman of the board at his death. He began with the company in 1907 as a muscular young man just out of college, where he had played football and water polo. His first job was as a helper on the receiving platform at the Philadelphia store, but he soon became the chief advocate of the company's move to New York.

The funeral service for Mr. Gimbel will be conducted at 2 P.M. on Sunday in Temple Emanu-El on Fifth Avenue at 65th Street, where 2,500 seats will be available. The Rev. Dr. Nathan A. Perilman will preside.

Gene Tunney, the former heavyweight champion of the world and a long-time friend and sometime sparring partner of Mr. Gimbel (the heavyweight champion at the University of Pennsylvania), will deliver one of two eulogies at the service. The other will be by Stanton Griffis, former United States Ambassador to Spain.

His body will be on view at the Frank E. Campbell funeral chapel at Madison Avenue and 81st Street from 2 P.M. to 9 today and tomorrow. Interment at the Ferncliff Cemetery in Hartsdale, N.Y., will be private, the family said.

Mr. Gimbel, who frequently referred to the shopping public as "the boss," repeatedly told his family and top executives of Gimbel Brothers, Inc., that "stores of this kind are public institutions." He directed that all stores remain open without interruption to normal service and hours, describing such continuity as "the greatest tribute" that could be paid to him at his death.

Samuel Nass, vice president and treasurer of the company and one of the men closest to Mr. Gimbel since 1929, said that all stores in the chain would remain open in express obedience to Mr. Gimbel's wish.

IT BEGAN WITH A PEDDLER

The Gimbel empire was started by Mr. Gimbel's grandfather Adam Gimbel, a Hoosier peddler who had sold goods out of an oilcloth pack along the Mississippi River. In 1842, the founder, a Bavarian immigrant, opened a wooden-fronted pots-and-lace store near the Wabash River in Vincennes, Ind., never dreaming what it would come to.

Mr. Gimbel's father, Isaac, was president until his son took over in 1927. Bernard Gimbel was thus the third generation merchant chief in his family, and he handed the leadership over to the fourth generation in the person of his own son, Bruce, who succeeded him as president in 1953 and became chief executive officer in 1961. Adam Gimbel's great-grandson still holds both posts.

The multi-millionaire, sportsman and philanthropist was known as Bernie to droves of friends, including just about every Mayor of New York in the last half-century, and he often played an important behind-the-scenes role as an adviser on major municipal improvements.

DIRECT AND UNCOMPLICATED

"Fish where the fish are," he once enunciated in typically direct and uncomplicated fashion while giving counsel on building new stores. The robust outdoorsman took the expression from his pursuit of salmon in cold Canadian waters. In fishing, as in many of his activities, he wanted challenge and action, not pool-gazing tranquillity.

Even in his seventies, Mr. Gimbel, a zestful man whose huge enjoyment of life was almost instantly evident to others, continued golfing, quail-hunting and underwater swimming off Montauk, L.I., and Palm Beach, Fla.

The unpretentious squire of Greeley Square ruled his merchandising network from a big leather swivel chair behind a desk in a 10th-floor office of his Broadway store, seated beneath an oil painting of his father, Isaac. He came to his office daily until about 18 months ago, and directed all his interests there. Often he rode the subway to work because he wanted to "be where the people are." Two years ago, he took his large suite high in the Pierre, overlooking Central Park, partly because it was handy to a subway.

Mr. Gimbel served nine terms as president and chairman of the New York Convention and Visitors Bureau. Robert Woodruff, head of the Coca-Cola Company, described his business and golf associate as a man with "a brilliant business facility that is as simple as common sense."

Isaac Gimbel expanded the family business by opening stores in Milwaukee in 1887 and Philadelphia in 1894. Bernard Gimbel became the leading advocate in the family for the opening of a store in Manhattan, and his arguments carried the day. The 10-story store was so costly to put up—\$4½ million—that if it had failed it would have rocked the chain financially.

It was the first major department store to be opened here in full size (the others had grown bit by bit), and it had nearly a million square feet of floor space. It opened in 1910 at its present site.

The family business took in \$15-million in 1907, the year Mr. Gimbel joined it. The volume had risen to \$122-million by 1927, when he became president. And it more than doubled to \$286-million when he relinquished the presidency in 1953.

RULER OF 53-STORE REALM

If ever a modern American could lay claim to being a merchant emperor, that man was Bernard Gimbel. At his death, he was the kingpin in a domain that he had nurtured and expanded for more than half a century into 52 stores with gross annual sales of \$600-million.

In accomplishing this, he lived a public and private life of imperial zest. Whatever he did—selling merchandise, going to the races, playing gin rummy, golfing, taking a Turkish bath, trading in the stock market, giving away pockets full of toys, advising New York on its municipal problems—he did with monarchic gusto.

Unlike an emperor of old, however, he did not live in splendid isolation. He was extraordinarily gregarious, and many kinds of people were his friends. At an 80th birthday party last year, just for close friends, 300 cronies crowded the grand ballroom of the Pierre.

Among them were Benay Venuta, the singer; Mr. Tunney, Jack I. Straus, the head of R. H. Macy & Co.; George Champion, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank; James A. Farley, the former Postmaster General; the late Bernard M. Baruch, the financier; Sidney Rhinstein, a stockbroker; Louis Marx, the toy manufacturer; Mayor Robert F. Wagner, and Newbold Morris, the Park Commissioner.

One explanation for Mr. Gimbel's variety of friends was that he was straightforward, without evasion or ostentation. "I am a simple man," he once said. According to those who knew him intimately, he was.

He made no pretensions to intellectualism; he would much rather play gin rummy (he was an intense player) with his friends or sit in the steam baths at the Biltmore Hotel with his pals, or spar with boxers, than frequent the salons.

"When I got married, my wife tried to make an intellectual out of me," he recalled. "I went to the New School with all those hard chairs and those brain fellows. It wasn't for me."

"The only fun I had out of it was when a friend said to me, 'Bernie, do you know Walter Lippmann?' and I said, 'Yes,' jokingly. 'He used to sit next to me at the New School and look over my shoulder and copy all the answers.' Lippmann heard about it, and he didn't like it."

OPERA "TOO DANGEROUS"

His wife had no greater success when she tried to stir Mr. Gimbel's interest in opera. He was napping during a Caruso aria when a pair of binoculars from the balcony crashed onto his foot.

"If it had hit me on the head, it would have killed me," he told his wife. "No more opera for me. It's too dangerous."

Mr. Gimbel was just under six feet tall, stocky and superbly conditioned. Even when he was nearing 80, he could swim the length of the Biltmore's pool without coming up for air.

He kept at 190 pounds, more or less, and his size 46 custom-made Saks suits gave him a trim appearance, even though, on occasion, he wore shirts with frayed cuffs.

Mr. Gimbel was a perpetually restless man. "I sleep about five hours a night, and always have," he told a recent interviewer. "That figures to about six years less sleep than the average fellow. Now I don't recommend this, but it's given me a pretty good handicap. I'm not quick, and I know it. It takes me a long time to read everything I want to read."

ALWAYS AN EARLY RISER

All his adult life, Mr. Gimbel was usually up before 7:30 A.M., whether at the Chieftains, his 200-acre estate in Greenwich Conn.; at his Fifth Avenue apartment or at his house in Palm Beach, Fla. By 8, he had doffed the knee-length, long-sleeve English woolen undershirt he slept in, had shaved and was working his way through the morning newspapers as he ate a bowl of dry cereal with skimmed milk.

Mr. Gimbel delighted to eat, and breakfast was usually his only Spartan meal. He had a passion for corned beef and cabbage; it was a regular dish at the Gimbel's table even when there were guests. When it was lacking, he downed rare roast beef, lobster, corn on the cob, baked potatoes.

Jack Daniels bourbon was his tipple, with or without lemon and honey or water. His devotion to Turkish baths was a natural

consequence of his diet. He liked to say he shed 1,000 pounds a year in them.

Mr. Gimbel liked contact with people. For years he rode the subway in the rush hours, clinging to a post or an overhead handle. He was the same way at the track, where he talked to jockeys, stable boys, trainers, tipsters, ushers, railbirds, in an effort to get onto a good thing.

TOYS ALWAYS AT HAND

Toys and Mr. Gimbel were never far apart. He kept a pocket full of them, supplied by Mr. Marx, and he pressed them into the hands of children, women, grown men, cadets—anyone who asked him for a good-luck piece.

In attempting to explain Mr. Gimbel's interest in everything around him, Mr. Tunney, a prizefight crony for 40 years, said:

"Bernie always likes to sit up front. He doesn't want to miss anything. I don't think he does."

As one of the country's most successful merchants, Mr. Gimbel sat up front. He was chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Gimbel Brothers, Inc. (he had been its president from 1927 to 1953); and chairman of the board of Saks & Co., a subsidiary.

In New York, his stores were Gimbel Brothers and Saks-34th Street, both at Greeley Square, and Saks Fifth Avenue, at 50th Street. Other principal stores were in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, San Francisco and Beverly Hills, Calif.

"Retail," Mr. Gimbel said on many occasions, "is one of the most interesting of all businesses. You've got to know how to organize, how to get along with other people, how to be observing. You have got to know the other fellow's point of view."

Of his approach to his own stores, he said:

"Our undertaking collects from distant points and offers at a center conveniently located to customers merchandise of good quality used by them in everyday life. The prices must constitute good value to the buyer and yield fair profits to the seller."

"No one man does all this himself. There are a lot of people, and you have to have some breaks."

Bernard Gimbel was born in Vincennes on April 10, 1885. He was sent to the Penn Charter School in Philadelphia before attending the University of Pennsylvania, from which he was graduated in 1907.

Upon his graduation he joined Gimbel's, and shortly afterward he was pleading with his elders to buy the site on which the Manhattan Gimbel's now stands. When he won, he jubilantly shoveled the first dirt for the 10-story building. At that time he was vice president of Gimbel's. He shortly moved his office to New York, where he directed most of the company's expansion.

One of his most notable coups came in 1923 when he persuaded his father and uncles to buy out the Saks stores. He negotiated the deal himself with the late Horace A. Saks, returning by train from a weekend in Elberon, N.J., although the two had to retreat to the baggage car for privacy. They agreed on the \$8.1-million settlement there, sitting on an empty coffin.

INTEREST IN COCA-COLA

Aside from his stores, Mr. Gimbel had a business interest in the Coca-Cola Company as a member of its executive committee, and he was one of the original stockholders in the Madison Square Garden Corporation.

Mr. Gimbel had a strong sense of civic responsibility. He served on countless municipal committees that dealt with such problems as off-street parking, health and medical research, water supply, labor disputes, subways, hospitals and general finance. He was a director of the New York World's Fairs in 1939 and in 1964 and 1965.

He was interested in city politics as a registered Democrat.

In 1912, he married Miss Alva Berheimer. They had five children, including two sets of twins. They were Bruce A.; Caral G. (Now Mrs. M. Joseph Lebworth); Hope A. (Mrs. David Solinger), and Peter R. The fifth child, David A., died in 1957. Mrs. Lebworth and Mrs. Solinger are twins, and Peter and David were twins.

David A. Gimbel, who was 29 years old at his death, was with the investment house of Lehman Brothers. Peter R. Gimbel is an investment banker well known for his explorations, including the underwater inspection of the sunken liner Andrea Doria in 1957 and a trek through previously unexplored wilds in the Peruvian Andes in 1963.

Over the years, Mr. Gimbel received many citations and awards. Among them were the John H. Finley Medal of City College; the Mercantile Award of the New York Board of Trade; the Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; the Legion of Honor, and the Order of Orange-Nassau, from the Netherlands.

For his success and his honors, Mr. Gimbel credited the influence of five men. In an 80th-birthday interview, he explained how they had fashioned his life:

"First, my father. He was a man who didn't care to go out and mix. But he insisted that I do. Getting around and about shaped my character, my thinking. What was just as important, I had him to come home to, to consult with, to share my experiences."

"Next, there was Julius Rosenwald [chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co.], a great man, great philanthropist and a great finder of good men. He made Robert E. Wood president of Sears Roebuck in 1929. Wood was the greatest merchant of our time.

"Then I'd put Louis Horowitz [president of the Thompson-Starrett Company, building contractors]."

CASPER, WYO., JOB CORPS CAMP

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to state for the RECORD at this time certain facts that have come to my attention concerning the Job Corps Camp in Casper, Wyo. These facts may be stated quickly and simply. They speak for themselves:

First. The operational cost per job corpsman for fiscal year 1966 was \$6,125 per year per man. It should be noted, however, that these figures are exclusive of construction and property cost of the camp. Thus, this \$6,000-plus figure gives no accounting of the cost of the camp or of the trucks, bulldozers, buses, equipment, and so forth, that are presently being used at that camp.

Second. The attrition rate since the center opened in April 1965 has been phenomenal. There have been 356 enrollees passed through the Casper camp. Since April of 1965, 256 Job Corpsmen or potential job corpsmen have left the camp. Of this number, 22 were transferred to other poverty programs, 15 were discharged for disciplinary reasons, 5 were discharged for medical reasons, 13 accepted placement elsewhere, and 56 were graduated from what appears to be an indeterminate course of study. The remaining number, 142, resigned. The Office of Economic Opportunity tells me that such resignation is completely voluntary. Most of the enrollees resign within the first 30 days of their arrival

at the camp. The Office also tells me that, of course, their transportation home from camp is paid by the U.S. Government.

This leaves 100 still at the camp, and it is planned to increase the camp's capacity to 200. I was very much shocked to learn that 48 staff members are presently at the Casper Job Corps camp. In a word, this is one instructor for every two enrollees.

Third. One half of the job corpsman's day is spent in conservation work. The other half of the day is spent in instruction in a number of dissimilar fields. Of special interest is the fact that while the living quarters of the camp are located at the Casper airport, the conservation projects are being conducted at Alcova-Gray Reef and Pathfinder Reservoirs. The distance between the camp and the project site is over 50 miles.

Fourth. Of the 356 enrollees who have gone through the camp at Casper, it upsets me no little bit to learn that only 2 are from the State of Wyoming. It seems clear to me that Wyoming has unwillingly had forced upon it this Great Society project, but has found little need to request this outlandish form of help for its own citizens.

AMERICA'S NO. 1 POLICEMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, we can take great pride in our Nation's policemen. In spite of the danger and unpleasantness in their jobs, they serve day in and day out to keep the peace.

It was therefore with great pleasure that I read yesterday in Parade magazine that Sgt. Philip T. Dwyer, of St. Louis, Mo., has been selected by Parade and the International Association of Chiefs of Police to receive the first annual Police Service Award.

I know I speak for all Senators when I offer our heartiest congratulations to Sergeant Dwyer. He has served with distinction on the St. Louis police force for 33 years and today continues in the daily task of unraveling homicide cases.

But there is more to the Sergeant Dwyer story.

He is president of St. Elizabeth's Academy Parent Teachers Association, a part-time athletic coach in his parish church at St. Philip Neri, and founder of Scout Troop No. 274. He is known and respected both as a private citizen and as an outstanding detective.

Philip Dwyer, Mr. President, is symbolic of the many police officers in Missouri and across the country who take a strong personal interest in the betterment of their communities over and above that required by their official responsibilities.

Let us also, today, as the International Association of Chiefs of Police opens its 1966 convention in Philadelphia, pay tribute to Parade and the chiefs for launching this new award. It is a welcome step in our efforts to spotlight the contributions of our Nation's policemen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Parade article about Sergeant Dwyer be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMERICA'S NO. 1 POLICEMAN—HE'S SGT. PHILIP DWYER OF ST. LOUIS, FIRST WINNER OF THE NEW POLICE SERVICE AWARD

(By John G. Rogers)

Sgt. Philip T. Dwyer, of St. Louis—probably the only pistol-packin' P.T.A. president in the nation—has been selected by Parade and the International Association of Chiefs of Police to receive the first annual Police Service Award.

The veteran officer, on the job a relentless homicide detective, off it a gentle man who works with children, is chosen as symbolic representative of the nation's 400,000 peace officers.

At a time when public attitudes and court decisions have made the task of law enforcement and recruitment of police more difficult than ever, the Police Service Award has been established to focus attention on the necessary and dedicated role police play. Its aim is to thank Dwyer and men like him for what they do for the community under all kinds of conditions.

At the opening session of the chiefs' association 1966 convention in Philadelphia tomorrow, Dwyer will be presented with a bronze plaque honoring him as policeman of the year. Nine other policemen from across the U.S. will receive honorable mention plaques.

The Police Service award also is intended to dramatize the fact that police do more than chase criminals, arrest speeders and keep order. They serve the community in myriad other ways. In soliciting nominations from all over the U.S., Parade and the association found countless policemen who had performed deeds of bravery, worked diligently on their own time to solve cases or free innocent men, devoted themselves to helping the forgotten or friendless, devised new ways of enforcing the law more effectively and fairly. Indeed, after reading the qualifications of the many nominees, the judges had a most difficult time singling out Dwyer and the other nine.

As the 57-year-old Dwyer—father of six, grandfather of four and nemesis of hundreds of criminals—accepts the award Parade urges a renewal of public appreciation of the men who keep the peace on the home front.

When Dwyer learned recently of the award, he reacted briefly in terms of personal satisfaction, but then remarked, "You know, the force can be proud."

THE CHIEF'S PRIDE

And proud indeed was St. Louis Police Chief Curtis Brostrom—for his 2,060-man force, for himself and for Sgt. Dwyer. Holding the little blue card that sums up Dwyer's 33 years in the department, Chief Brostrom observed:

"Ten departmental awards have gone to Phil Dwyer, including the Meritorious Service Award—the highest one we have. If you had a couple of thousand Phil Dwyers, you'd have quite a force."

As the country's 1966 honor man, Dwyer said:

"Of course there are some bad cops and I wouldn't defend them for a minute. But the police don't always get a full understanding from the public. For example, take that cry of police brutality. There's no way in the world for a policeman to handle a resisting person than by using the necessary force. And that's no justification for hollering 'police brutality.'

"Speaking personally, I like my job and I'm proud of my record and I simply want to ask those who scream loudest against the

police, 'Would you like to try living in a city that had no police?'"

Going back only 10 years and limiting the list to major cases in which Dwyer played a major part, the St. Louis police present a dossier of more than 15 murderers brought to justice. A few of the cases:

A patrolman gunned down in a holdup . . . an elderly woman strangled in her home . . . two B-girls shot in a bar . . . a woman strangled in the back seat of her car . . . a college student stabbed after a basketball game . . . a woman raped and murdered in a rooming house. . . . These have been typical Dwyer problems.

If a "typical policeman" is a somewhat grim fellow, cold-eyed, a bit beefy and all business, Dwyer doesn't qualify. There's a mild quality to his appearance. He weighs 160, stands 5'9", wears glasses and could easily be cast as a teacher. This causes August Ernst, chief of detectives, to explain:

"I don't mean to imply that Phil Dwyer pushes people around but he long ago demonstrated that he can take care of himself when necessary. This is not a pantywaist."

REAL GUNS AND BALL GAMES

At St. Elizabeth's Academy where Dwyer's youngest daughter is a senior and he is P.T.A. president, he again is not what he seems. The principal, Sister Angeline, says:

"He's so refined, so dependable, so courteous, I have to pinch myself to realize that he carries a gun and deals with murderers. To us he's a persuasive man who knows how to get people to serve on committees."

That same persuasiveness has pulled a confession out of many a killer, but that aspect matters little to the kids at Mark Twain School's playground a few blocks from the Dwyers' modest six-room, red brick home atop a green terrace on Geraldine St.

As Dwyer strolled into the playground the other day, a chorus of ballplaying moppets cheered:

"Here comes the Sergeant! Here comes the Sergeant! It's his turn to pitch!"

At St. Philip Neri, his parish church, they also know him well—not as an officer who often goes out of state to bring back a slayer, but as part-time athletic coach and a founder of Scout Troop 274.

Dwyer's even temperament enables him to move without shock between these two worlds—from singing ballads around the living room piano to a slum hellhole where a homicide victim sprawls.

"Nature has fortified me against the blues," he says. "This is my job and I do it."

Dwyer says that assembling sufficient evidence for conviction is harder all the time because of court crackdowns on use of confessions. But he welcomes the challenge:

"I'll tell you one of the greatest kicks in police work. It comes when you know you've got the right guy, the one who pulled the trigger—but he won't confess. And then you go out and dig up enough evidence to make him end up by saying, 'All right, I did it.'

"And you get your evidence by hard work, door-to-door drudgery, asking questions. You ought to see me laugh at the TV crime shows. All that stunting. In a way they're the funniest shows on the air."

Not funny to Dwyer is the refusal of people to cooperate with police, the reluctance to become involved. He doesn't mind if they play hard-to-get for a while—in fact, he enjoys a bit of cat-and-mouse trying to coax a witness or suspect into talking. But flat refusal burns him up:

"I had this case of a woman and two men in the front seat of a car. In the back were her five kids, the oldest about 12. One of the men pulled a gun and killed the other. The woman wouldn't answer a single question and she told her kids not to answer. A

great way to teach children respect for the law."

Dwyer's faculty of wonderment over man's reasons for murder is never exhausted. "Not long ago," he recalls, "we had a fellow killed in a tavern for singing in the wrong key. Can you imagine that? Another one was stabbed to death because he borrowed a nickel and played a jukebox tune the lender didn't like."

Dwyer's lineage is Irish as far back as he can trace. He was born in St. Louis' Kerry Patch section and as a youth was called "Fire Engine" because of his red hair. Today, it's dark brown; he doesn't know why it changed. His father died early and Dwyer spent several years in an orphanage before joining his mother and stepfather. The need to work made him a high school dropout but he attended night school and got his diploma. He was a 50-cent-an-hour spot welder in 1933 when a neighbor told him of an attendant's job in a police garage. Its \$110-a-month smacked of security to the 23-year-old and he took it. Today he puts his life on the line for the people of St. Louis for \$736.66 a month.

Only three times in his career has Dwyer pulled his own trigger. He's never killed anyone, although seven years ago he plugged a wrench-wielding assailant in the legs, and the man later jumped to his death from a hospital window.

WOULD HE KILL?

Would it bother him to kill a person?

"Yes, I think it would, even if I'd have to do it to protect my own life. I've had plenty of chances to shoot at people running away from arrest but I just couldn't do it."

Dwyer and a crew of colleagues received a big compliment earlier this year after their crisp, efficient investigation solved the savage murder of Joseph Klearman in his coalyard. In a few days a large billboard across the street from Police Headquarters blossomed with this message:

"Thank God for our police department."

It was signed, "The Family and Friends of Joseph Klearman."

In a letter to the department, Melvin Klearman, the victim's son, saluted the police who "day in and day out . . . confront men of violence, risking their lives."

Dwyer tends to minimize the danger in his job but admits that he never tells his wife, Imogene, ahead of time if he has a perilous assignment.

"No use her worrying," he says.

But she does. At the top of the stairs in the Dwyer home stands an Infant Jesus which she illuminates the moment her husband leaves for work. "This means Somebody's watching over him," she says.

The Dwyer children—four girls and two boys ranging in age from 18 to 27—reason that their dad can take care of himself. "He always has," says 22-year-old Philip, Jr. Both sons pay Dwyer a nice compliment—they, too, want to be law enforcers. Philip favors the FBI while 20-year-old Arthur likes the St. Louis force.

The Dwyers are a very close family. The father has seen so much sordidness, and how easy it is for young people to slide into serious trouble, that at times he's been overstrict with his children.

Says 23-year-old Imogene, one of the four Dwyer girls, "Daddy would look our dates over so closely, the poor guys thought they were in a police lineup. Once he sent a boy packing because he didn't take off his hat."

In a final peek at Sgt. Philip Dwyer, he's at his fourth-floor desk in Police Headquarters, a desk jammed with such crime mementoes as pistols, loaded dice, checkbook from an abortion case and all sorts of pictures of malefactors. The first winner of the Police Service Award has two things nagging at his mind—when he can find time to go to Texas to run down a lead on a recent, gruesome

St. Louis murder, and who he can get to take over the entertainment committee at St. Elizabeth's P.T.A.

PROGRESS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

MR. TYDINGS. Mr. President, concern over the growing need for undergraduate college education for our young people has often been voiced by educators and legislators. The problems involved in providing a college education for anyone who is capable and willing are well known; facilities are limited; faculties are inadequate in number, underpaid, and overworked.

The University of Maryland, in its attempt to provide higher education for Maryland's young people, is trying to solve these problems. The university has made much progress of which it can be justly proud: the increased caliber of its students, the improved quality of its facilities, and its proposals for expansion.

In his convocation address last April, President Wilson H. Elkins discussed some of the university's answers to the pressing problems of modern education. Because this is an area of interest and concern to us all, I ask unanimous consent that President Elkins' address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Diamondback*, Apr. 21, 1966]
"A YEAR OF REFLECTION AND A FUTURE OF EDUCATIONAL EMINENCE"

(The following is the prepared text of University President Wilson H. Elkins' 1966 convocation address.)

This has been a year of reflection in higher education. The stormy campus protests have subsided, and most institutions, like most communities, have been relatively free of disorderly conduct. Reason has supplanted emotion as students, faculty and administration have sought to analyze the disturbances and to make any needed adjustments. Out of the voluminous testimony provided by the informed and the uninformed, one clear deduction may be made; higher education is in a state of transition from minority student representation to a situation wherein a heterogeneous majority of college age youth are included; and from relatively simple structures to large and complex institutions. And, I think there has been some realization that if the colleges and universities are to retain their exalted place in society and preserve their freedom to seek the truth and stimulate the mind, they must proceed in an orderly, responsible manner.

In view of the wholesome condition of this campus, and in the light of what happened after my last convocation address, I was reluctant to make a talk this year. You may recall that in response to my congratulating the students on their orderly conduct and constructive criticism, a small group of them were stirred to protest no protests and too much tranquillity. *TIME* magazine, in its imitable style, suggested that I should have kept quiet. Before the year was over, there was a frantic search for controversial issues which, at one point, resulted in counteraction and one student proclaiming himself the "Supreme Defender of Tranquillity." Perhaps we were saved by the summer bell.

DECIDES TO SPEAK

Despite my inclination to remain quiet this spring, I decided to speak after being urged by a few of my colleagues. Not all of

them were from my office, and I may have mistaken their motives. Even if there have been evil influences, I wish to leave above all else today the thought, in my judgment student behaviour on this campus is a tribute to your generation. And, of further satisfaction, most of you dress properly and use effective deodorants.

These statements are not intended to arouse those who may have been waiting in the corners to come out against administrative tyranny. I believe as strongly as any of you in freedom to discuss all of the issues, but I do not believe that anyone should be forced to engage in controversy for the sake of dissent. The college population has been maligned because of the questionable activities of a few students, and this gives a bad image. Fortunately, the voice of the majority has been raised on several issues and has reached an unmistakable crescendo. I do not underestimate the significance of minority rights and action, but the awakening of the majority has helped to reaffirm my deep faith in youth and to support a conviction that this college generation can be depended upon to keep America strong and free.

SGA MATURITY

On this campus there have been encouraging developments. The Student Government Association has shown evidence of maturity and, although there have been unfavorable comments about recent election shenanigans, the governing group has acted in a responsible manner. Looking back a few years to my empty reign as president of a student body, the contrast is remarkable. The Student Government Association, prodded and perhaps irritated little by the award-winning Diamondback, has become interested in matters that vitally affect the life and achievement of the student, notably, the quality of the educational program. Without demanding to appoint the faculty and administration, as some student organizations have in other places, student leaders have sought to influence scholarship by discussion and recommendation. The Association has performed admirably in the difficult but important area of discipline. The celebrated Martz-Pearman case is significant only because the faculty and the administration were confronted with the general problems of disciplinary procedures and leadership responsibility. Although interesting, I suppose it is beside the point that the political life of Mr. Martz was not saved.

In regard to the quality of teaching, I viewed the evaluation of courses with some relief. It took the spotlight off the reformers of the administration, and put it on the area which must be the core of any program of improvement. And, too, the faculty is much more sheltered under the impenetrable robes of academic freedom. Suffice it to say that the Course Guide was a conscientious effort to provide useful information to students, even though most students gained little value from it as it was incomplete and most professors were dealt with compassionately.

Another notable development during the year was the purloining of a professional football coach. While all of us who recognize football as a legitimate activity were dismayed and bewildered by disturbing developments during the past season, we did not expect any sensational solution. Lou Saban has established more than one record. He has been voted the outstanding coach in the American Football League for two consecutive years, and his appointment at Maryland elicited only one letter in which I was called an S.O.B. He is now enjoying his second honeymoon, and I hope that it will last through next fall.

Still another development has been the crowding and expansion of the campus. There is danger of being trampled in the Student Union Building, and the distance be-

tween certain classrooms is providing even more prospects for Coach Kehoe's great track teams. The parking lots are over subscribed and more parking meters are frustrating the nonconformists. To provide relief, additional facilities are on the drawing boards, consideration is being given to lengthening of time between classes, and recommendations will be made to deny resident freshmen (and subsequently sophomores) the use of automobiles.

LOOKING AHEAD

And, now, I should turn, at least briefly, to the subject announced for this convocation. No one can predict accurately the future of this University or any other. From the past and the present we can make helpful, although not entirely reliable, predictions. We can be almost certain that public universities will grow larger, and that there will be some decentralization of most of them. We can be reasonably sure that universities will continue to teach, to engage in more research, and to increase their public services. The universities will set higher admission requirements, and the proportion of upper classmen and graduate students will increase. They will continue to enroll a large number of freshmen—and not just for the purpose of fielding a strong football team. The financial support of the universities will increase markedly, and the professor who can teach and do research will be the most illustrious and the most coveted person in our society. There will be renewed attention to teaching, and the universities will look more closely at the impact of federally sponsored research on the welfare of the students and on the kind of scholarship that a university ought to pursue. The federal purse will become increasingly influential, and universities will have to guard zealously their integrity and strive to maintain a balance between interdependence and independence. The universities will consolidate their position in the center of society, but each university will find it exceedingly difficult to achieve a higher rank among institutions. With all of the faith in higher education and all of the reliance upon the products of the universities, the competition will be so severe that to pass another institution will require a large commitment and an extraordinary amount of initiative, resolution and teamwork.

The University of Maryland has expanded at an extraordinary pace. The total operating budget for next year will be almost one hundred million dollars. (In any place except Washington, D.C., that would seem to be a lot of money.) Twenty years ago the total operating budget of the University was approximately five million dollars. The capital appropriations for the University for 1966-67, recently approved by the General Assembly, amount to \$14,629,800. Ten years ago the capital appropriation was \$1,654,480. While I realize that money isn't everything, it surely makes life easier for me. To a very considerable extent it determines the quality of the University.

The enrollment on this campus last semester was 26,322. The summer enrollment was 7,784. In Baltimore, the enrollment was about three thousand. The evening enrollment stateside was 8,743, and overseas the enrollment was 13,748. During this year the University will enroll for credit between sixty and seventy thousand individuals, and will accommodate thousands more who attend conferences, institutes and miscellaneous short courses. I do not mention these impressive figures to boast of quantity, but rather to show the important role of the University in the effort to make education available to all who can qualify. Despite the heavy load imposed by mounting enrollments, the University, in my opinion, is in good condition, financially and academically.

You know, perhaps better than I, that conditions are not perfect and that we dare not be complacent. During the past two years the University has undergone a self-evaluation of many of its programs and has had the benefit of evaluations from outside visitors representing several associations. Generally, the reports have been favorable and encouraging. There has been a confirmation of our pre-judgment that some departments and colleges are stronger than others and that more attention should be directed to certain places, although unevenness in a university can never be eliminated. There is general agreement on the need for continuous study of the curriculum and, of course, for more financial support. As usual, there was too little attention to the educational experiences of the freshmen and sophomores who, on our large campuses, have had a pretty Spartan existence. As a result of the self-studies and evaluations, we know more about ourselves and, hopefully, we shall proceed more intelligently and perform more efficiently as we go into the future. The challenge is to improve our position.

CRITICAL DECADE

In my judgment, the next decade will be a critical one in higher education and especially for the universities. The long discussed proposition that a college education should be accessible to all who are qualified is becoming a reality. The demand for more post-high school education will be intensified at a time when the universities are trying to raise their admission requirements. Obviously, vital decisions must take into consideration the welfare of the individual and the status of other segments of higher education. While decisions will not be easily made, they cannot disregard the fact that unless individual differences are recognized the advent of universal higher education will reduce quality. In addition to the problems of enrollment and distribution of students, other issues related to growth and change will require attention.

The University of Maryland will continue to serve as many as it can accommodate adequately. I have learned that establishing a maximum number is a useless sort of exercise. After passing the previously proposed figure of 25,000, we are now talking about an upper limit of 40,000. This limitation should be kept, but it will require a policy decision and careful planning. It should not be kept, however, at the expense of students who are qualified to do college work, and it should not penalize students who are interested in a program provided only by the University. The further development of the University (including the new campus in Baltimore County), the expansion of the state colleges and the rapid growth of the community colleges, may provide the facilities and the programs required by the public institutions for the college population. If it does not, then the University should consider additional branches.

SYSTEM ESSENTIAL

To take care of the needs of Maryland youth and a desirable number of students from other states and from foreign countries, a system of higher education is essential. This system must be a "consciously coordinated organization" of the three segments of public higher education: the community colleges, the state colleges and the university. Admission requirements should be established which are clearly defined and which will enable most of the high school graduates to pursue some kind of post-high school education. These requirements may change from time to time, with the development of the physical facilities and educational programs, but they should always be set to provide opportunity and facilitate the movement of students.

The importance of educational opportunity in a democracy where technical and social advancement has reached a high level cannot be over emphasized—unless responsibility is ignored. The clamor for conditions which will enable the individual to go as far as he is capable of going is getting louder and louder. The American commitment to an egalitarian society cannot be withdrawn. The movement toward civil rights, social refinement and economic betterment will never be stopped. While nothing can provide equal capacity, education is the only way to satisfy the insatiable appetite for as much learning and training (particularly the latter) as the individual can take. Unless this is provided, the relatively quiet revolution of today will become a violent revolution tomorrow. There is no turning back; we can only hope for orderly evolution. The individual demands fair play, and society requires it. Consequently, it is incumbent upon the educational institutions and forces to keep the doors open so that all can proceed toward their chosen destinations as far as ability will permit. This is the crucial problem in higher education.

AT THE APEX

The University, at the apex of the educational structure, is obligated to assume leadership. To lead effectively it must have its own house in order. The primary question is whom will the University serve? In trying to arrive at reasonable predictive criteria for success in the University of Maryland, the faculty, administration and Board of Regents are considering many complex factors, including those related to present educational opportunity. The University will probably announce a change in admission requirements within a year and should put them into effect within two or three years. It must also consider requirements for transfer students, especially those from the junior colleges of Maryland. Furthermore, attention should be given to the graduate school so that future growth will be as orderly as possible and characterized by quality. Academic requirements of the University will change as the educational structure in Maryland grows and develops, but they should always be related to student welfare.

The Catonsville campus, opening next September in finished or unfinished buildings, will take some of the pressure off the College Park operation. It will be pushed vigorously and moved into a multi-program institution as rapidly as enrollment and facilities permit. The Governor and the General Assembly have given it a top priority so that it may provide help in accommodating those who are qualified and who desire to enter the University. It will not attempt to duplicate all of the existing programs, e.g., agriculture, home economics, and engineering, but it will expand its offerings as enrollment increases and will become a center for graduate education in the Baltimore area. This major facility will not be bound by all of the traditions, practices, procedures, prejudices and vested interests at College Park, and it is hoped that through innovation and experimentation ways will be found to improve all of its activities. The opening and development of UMBC will cause the percentage of high school graduates entering from the Baltimore area to increase, and with the proposed building of self-supporting dormitories, it will become, within ten years, an institution of more than ten thousand students enthusiastically cheering their teams to victory against the University of Maryland at College Park.

In Baltimore City, major changes will be made within the next five years, and by 1975 the enrollment will have doubled in several of the professional schools. The University is beginning a large building program for the benefit of the colleges of Medicine, Dentistry

Nursing, Pharmacy, Law, and Social Work and the University Hospital. These professional schools provide most of the services for Maryland in their respective fields, and they will expand in proportion to the needs of the State. Within ten years the campus will be transformed as approximately \$40,000,000 will be spent for new and improved facilities.

I have indicated that physical facilities for the increasing number of students, though they may not be in good time nor fully adequate to satisfy all requirements and all professors, will be provided in some form. But, while bricks and mortar are important, they are not my major concern about the future. The elements of greater concern which are more uncertain and, in some respects, less tangible, are undergraduate teaching, meeting the competition for personnel, freedom on the campus, and institutional, autonomy. These elements, in large measure, will determine the status of the University of Maryland ten years hence.

The plight of the undergraduate is a concern of many critics and educational observers. John Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, says that "We must restore the status of teaching." He says that teaching of undergraduates "is being slighted today." Many other writers, mostly outside of the colleges and universities, have expressed the same judgment. They have a point, but it is not as strong as they think. Research in the universities has grown and has attracted the spotlight, but it has not necessarily damaged teaching. In many instances, probably the majority, it has improved teaching; and there is plenty of evidence that departments strong in research are the strongest in teaching undergraduates. And there is no conclusive evidence that teaching in universities is inferior to that in small or medium sized colleges.

STATUS SHAKY

The status of teaching is a little shaky because it has not been given sufficient weight in the advancement of the faculty member, and it may be seriously weakened if there is no consciously developed plan to identify effectiveness. Certainly, teaching needs attention, and it is a proper concern of serious-minded students. In the University of Maryland there are many large classes for freshmen and sophomores. It is in the lower division that teaching may suffer—and I think that this is our weakness. Teaching assistants in some departments are not given adequate supervision, and at least a few of them (and occasionally others) still start their courses by impressing on students how many are going to fail and how difficult the course will be. This is inexcusable. They should be examining their own effectiveness in an effort to help as many as possible to pass without lowering standards. This applies to all of us. If the University is interested, as it should be, in doing everything possible for freshmen and sophomores—the most difficult years—then it should consider the feasibility of some changes. I suggest that certain departments could experiment with more independent study by upper classmen, thereby allowing more time for teaching and supervising the lower group. In selected disciplines class hours might well be reduced for the juniors, seniors and graduate students, for there is nothing sacred about meeting three or four hours a week. Whatever the best approach, the faculty and the administration should focus attention on that segment of the undergraduate division which is in need of the best instruction. While in the main this is a departmental problem the resolution of it demands a recognition of the status of teaching and an extraordinary devotion to the welfare of the least experienced students.

A second element in the character and reputation of the University is the appoint-

ment and retention of faculty and staff. During the past ten years substantial improvement has been made, but our relative position has not been appreciably bettered. Now advancement has become even more difficult; all universities and colleges are striving for excellence. In order to move ahead of others, the pace must be even faster than it has been. To cope with the situation, the University must be more discriminating in appointments and promotions. Merit will have to be recognized and the market for professors will have to be considered. The University will require more funds for the entire faculty and staff but, if it is to achieve notable distinction in the academic world, it will have to meet the competition for the relatively few professors who are truly distinguished. Making judgments in this matter will require the wisdom of Solomon and the courage of Daniel.

Whatever amount of money may be available and however it may be used will be of little value in the development of a great university unless freedom of inquiry and discussion are preserved. The underlying purpose of a university is to pursue the truth wherever it may lead. In order to do that the faculty must be free to discuss any topic and to search for information wherever it may be. While the students have not qualified for the same latitude of freedom, they should be guaranteed the right to learn about all issues. But even in this enlightened age there are efforts to circumscribe the research and teaching of universities, and I expect that it will continue. Even while the government is seeking to find ways to improve relations with all peoples, there are recurrent movements to erect walls against some of them so far as university campuses are concerned. Those who advocate restriction presume to protect the "tender" minds of youth, but either they are misinformed about youth or they do not understand the futility of artificial barriers. To prevent the erection of barriers to knowledge and to the advancement of the universities there will have to be continuing vigilance. For if in today's academic climate undue restrictions are imposed upon a particular university, they will not only impair progress but they will surely ruin the institution.

I hasten to add at this point that freedom is never absolute and should be exercised with responsibility and with due regard to the feeling of external forces. Academic freedom is predicated upon professional competence and it depends, to some extent, upon good judgment. To flaunt personal convictions solely to attract attention, or to create a disturbance, would seem to be contrary to the best interest of the teaching profession. With respect to the issue of speakers on the campus, it would seem to be unwise to invite just anybody simply to prove that freedom does exist. There should be an educational purpose. The campus should not be a platform for fools or individuals who advocate the overthrow of the government by physical force. The proper exercise of freedom requires an educated citizenry, conscious of the need to preserve fundamental rights and sensitive to the many factors which should determine action. The University, in guarding its freedom, should strive to inculcate a sense of responsibility in all who come under its guidance.

AUTONOMY NEEDED

Finally, the future welfare of the University depends upon the maintenance and strengthening of institutional autonomy. In a complex structure engaged in teaching, research and service, and depending for its soundness and vigor on academic freedom and an atmosphere in which discussion and inquiry may proceed without fear or suspicion, the power of management must be in

the hands of a board of laymen whose integrity cannot be compromised by politics or special interests. In the first place, the University cannot operate efficiently without the power of management; and, in the second place, the purpose of the University would be endangered if it were constantly subjected to pressure from the outside. Obviously, a public institution cannot be completely independent of the people's representatives. The governing board, the administration and the faculty must operate within funds appropriated by the state, and they must be accountable for their management and activities. The University of Maryland does not seek independence from responsible state officials and representatives, nor does it seek to avoid a soundly conceived coordination of higher education. It does seek to retain that degree of independence which will facilitate operation and insure the maintenance of a first class institution. There is a tendency, often of good intention, to invade the power of management and thereby erode that autonomy so essential to a university of high quality. Your welfare and the welfare of generations to come demands a strong protection of the University's unique position in the framework of state government and among state institutions.

FUTURE GOAL

The University of Maryland is moving toward educational eminence. The goal for the future has not changed. The University seeks the approval of its students, the gratitude of parents, and the acclaim of the academic world. The first concern should be teaching, both undergraduate and graduate. Research, as an integral part of the educational pattern, will be encouraged and supported to the end that it will increase knowledge and enrich teaching and service. As a land-grant institution, with a long tradition of service, and as the State's only public university, the future will witness a closer, more extensive relationship with all parts of the social and economic structure.

From time to time, we should remind ourselves that we cannot do everything nor can we be everything to everybody. But, this reminder should not be made to reduce our efforts. It should be made only to help all of us take the high road to greater institutional and individual achievement.

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES SUPPORTS USE OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS FOR MASS TRANSIT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the city of Los Angeles has long been considered the freeway capital of the world. In recent years, however, the residents of Los Angeles have come more and more to realize that roads alone are not an adequate solution to the urban transit problem.

Last spring, the council of the city of Los Angeles officially adopted a resolution urging Congress to enact S. 2339. This bill, which I introduced as a companion to a bill introduced by Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, in the House, would authorize moneys in the highway trust fund to be used, at the option of the Governor of each State, to construct rapid transit systems in urban areas.

The city council points out:

In view of the pressing needs for revenue at the local level and mounting evidence that the movement of people within an urban area involves a coordinated system of freeways, local streets, bus lines, and a rapid

transit system, it seems appropriate that a portion of the gasoline tax now paid by local users to the federal government should be appropriated to the development of an adequate area-wide transportation system.

The Council "endorse[s] in principle the possible diversion and allocation of a portion of Federal Aid Highway Trust Funds to other purposes only after the presently constituted system of Federal Interstate and Defense Highway Program is completed, which is scheduled for completion by 1972."

I deeply appreciate the support and interest of the City Council of Los Angeles. It realizes, perhaps, better than most cities the desirability of a balanced transportation system.

I ask unanimous consent that their resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
April 26, 1966.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building, Room 6241,
Washington, D.C.:

I hereby certify that the attached State, County and Federal Affairs Committee report was adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles at its meeting held April 26, 1966.

WALTER C. THIEL,
City Clerk.
By RICHARD H. BOWERS,
Deputy.

STATE, COUNTY, AND FEDERAL AFFAIRS

During the First Session of the 89th Congress, Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS of Maryland introduced SB 2339 which would permit a state to elect to use federal funds from the Highway Trust Fund for their purpose of urban mass transportation. Several identical or similar bills were also introduced in the House of Representatives including H 10126 (BINGHAM), H 10170 (ASHLEY), H 10171 (FARBSTEIN), H 10172 (HALPERN), and H 10765 (HELSTOSKI). Senator TYDINGS' bill was referred to the Senate Public Works Committee and the House bills were referred to the House Public Works Committee where they all await further action. In the Second Session, Representative THOMAS REES of Los Angeles has introduced a measure, H 12934 which is substantially the same as the Senator TYDINGS' measure.

The Tydings bill and similar measures would authorize an appropriation to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator from the Highway Trust Fund of the Federal Government for the use of each state for urban mass transportation purposes. The Governor of a state could elect to have all or part of one or more of a state's Federal Highway Aid apportionment for a fiscal year made available to the HHFA for making these grants for urban mass transportation purposes during that fiscal year to the appropriate public body or local agency of the state in accordance with provisions of Section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. If the amount of funds made available to HHFA under this provision is not expended or obligated in the fiscal year in which apportioned, the balance remaining at the end of the year would not be available for urban mass transportation but would be added to the amount appropriated to the states' Federal Aid Highway Funds in a succeeding fiscal year on a proportional basis.

In view of the pressing needs for revenue at the local level and mounting evidence that the movement of people within an urban area involves a coordinated system of freeways, local streets, bus lines, and a rapid transit system, it seems appropriate that a

portion of the gasoline tax now paid by local users to the federal government should be appropriated to the development of an adequate area-wide transportation system.

Your Committee therefore recommends that the Council endorse in principle the possible diversion and allocation of a portion of Federal Aid Highway Trust Funds to other purposes only after the presently constituted system of Federal Interstate and Defense Highway Program is completed, which is scheduled for completion by 1972.

We further recommend that the City Clerk in cooperation with the Chief Legislative Analyst and the Chief Legislative Representative be instructed to advise the authors of the bills above referred to, the Chairman of the Senate and House Public Works Committees, as well as the two Senators and members of the Congressional delegation from the State of California of the position of the Council in this matter.

Respectfully submitted.

STATE, COUNTY AND FEDERAL
AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with very deep regret that I noted the retirement of Arthur Krock from the editorial staff of the New York Times.

Able, articulate, with an extraordinary capacity to package much wisdom in a few words, Mr. Krock was more than that. He was a friend in the best sense of the word and he will be sorely missed by all of us who knew him, and because of his basic integrity, had great respect and affection for him.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MENTAL
HEALTH

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, last Friday and Saturday at Yale University we dedicated the new Connecticut Mental Health Center. The high point of the 2-day ceremony was the speech given Friday evening by Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur J. Cohen.

I had the privilege of introducing my good friend and former colleague to the distinguished audience in New Haven, and I ask unanimous consent that both my introductory remarks and Secretary Cohen's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR ABRAHAM RIBICOFF
INTRODUCING WILBUR J. COHEN, UNDER
SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

They say that a social security expert is a man who knows Wilbur Cohen's telephone number.

Well, all I can say is that I had that number when I was named Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. President Kennedy gave it to me. He gave me many others too. But Professor Cohen's was the one I used and I never have been sorry.

I still have that telephone number, by the way. I don't know if this makes me a social security expert or not. But I do know that it has added a great, great deal—of factual knowledge, of creative talent, and of plain hard work and accomplishment—to the record of the Administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

I have known many outstanding officials during my years of public life. But I have never worked with a man of more ability, more understanding, and more old-fashioned strength of character than Wilbur Cohen.

I was delighted, then, when I had the chance to extend an invitation to one of my favorite people to speak at the formal dedication ceremonies of one of my favorite projects—the Connecticut Mental Health Center.

I have had the dream of a Connecticut Mental Health Center for many years. One of the joys of public service is seeing such dreams translated into constructive reality.

Our state, and this university have a proud record of pioneering accomplishment in the field of human service. The new Center will now add to this record. In Washington, we will all watch the progress of the Federal-State-private partnership here at the Center with interest. It will, of course, be productive. I would hope it would be that, and more. I would hope you will initiate programs so fine, so creative, so ingenious, that the people of all the nation will turn to this Center as a model.

This should be particularly true in the field of child care and treatment. This is surely the biggest challenge confronting the psychiatrists and their professional—and non-professional—allies today, as Secretary Cohen will agree. We are hoping for suggestions from the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, set up under legislation I was proud to sponsor. But we look for answers from all of you, as you work out your problems here, as well.

All this may seem far from my assigned task, the introduction of Under Secretary Cohen. But it isn't. For he is an expert at spotting the creative constructive idea, and translating it into nationwide reality through the legislative process.

I know him well. But to check up on myself, I asked the Library of Congress to send me any feature articles on him published in the last years. They found exactly one, dated August 22, 1960.

Now Secretary Cohen may have a passion for anonymity, or a lot of newspapermen may be foolish. Anyway—many Americans don't know much about one of their most serious and effective public servants.

At any rate, here are the bare facts, excerpted from the bare biographical sketch he sends out.

Wilbur J. Cohen was appointed Under Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare on June 1, 1965. Before that I drafted him—as I have told you—as Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

He is on leave as Professor of Public Welfare Administration at the University of Michigan where he taught from 1956 to 1961. He was Chairman of President Kennedy's Task Force on Health and Social Security in 1960. He was the research assistant to the Executive Director of President Roosevelt's Cabinet Committee on Economic Security from 1934 to 1935 which drafted the original Social Security Act. He has been intimately connected with all of the legislative developments in the social security and public assistance programs since 1934 and has been closely associated with the recent medicare, medical school, and education legislation. (That is an understatement.)

Mr. Cohen was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1913. He is married to Eloise Bittel of Ingram, Texas, and is the father of three sons. He graduated from the University of Wisconsin in economics in 1934 and also received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws in 1966. He is the author of several books and many articles in the social security, health and welfare field and is a recipient of a number of awards for distinguished service in health, education, and welfare.

Between the dull lines of that piece of mimeographing lurks an outstanding American and a great guy—Wilbur Cohen.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MENTAL HEALTH

(By Wilbur J. Cohen, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

For every one of us here this evening, the dedication of the Connecticut Mental Health Center is a very happy and exciting occasion. This center is tangible proof that the concept of community-based mental health services is becoming a functioning reality across the land.

First, this evening, I would like to review some of the thinking and some of the events that made it possible to develop this center. Senator RIBICOFF has played one of the leading roles, both onstage and backstage, in securing legislation to provide health services—including mental health services—not only for the people of this State but for the entire Nation.

He has served the people of Connecticut and the entire country in many ways. He has never ceased to work for the health and welfare of the people.

This was true during his years as Governor of this State, and I can testify personally that it was certainly true when he served as the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in President Kennedy's Cabinet.

Since that time, the voice of Senator RIBICOFF addressing the United States Senate, has been heard across the country as he fought and worked for health legislation—particularly to provide treatment for emotionally disturbed children.

I

The delivery of health services to all Americans can be successfully achieved only through a partnership of local, State, and Federal Governments with various groups within the private sector of the community.

The Connecticut Mental Health Center is proof of this. It represents a three-way partnership among State, Federal, and the private sector.

The State of Connecticut has invested \$4 million in this center; the Federal Government's support—through the Hill-Burton Act and the Federal Research Facilities Program totals approximately \$900,000; and Yale University, as a privately endowed institution, has contributed \$100,000.

Yale's contribution goes beyond the establishment of this center. The considerable talents of the Department of Psychiatry of its Medical School will guarantee its innovative operation, under the direction of the able Chairman of that department, Dr. Frederick C. Redlich.

Located as it is, within the structure of Yale University, the Connecticut Mental Health Center can surely be developed as one of the models for the Nation.

And certainly, here at Yale, it should become a matter of daily practice that the results of research are used immediately in treating patients in the center. This direct application of research knowledge is a goal emphasized continuously by President Johnson and his Administration and one that can be demonstrated here.

Teaching, in the context of this new program, presents a tremendous challenge to university medical schools and departments of psychiatry.

The university medical centers can provide an adequate research and educational framework to prepare the physician—in whatever specialty—for his new role in society. Such students would be prepared to improve the quality of living for entire communities within our population.

II

In the past few years we have witnessed a revolutionary change in thinking about, and doing something about the problems of mental illness—problems that have been with mankind since the beginning of time. But the significant factor is that we are now doing something about them—in a person-

alized, humanized way. We have begun to wage a war on mental illness.

What sparked this phase of the war was the report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Mental Health which was published in 1961. The report, "Action for Mental Health," spoke for people who could not speak for themselves—the mentally ill, emotionally disturbed and deeply confused people among us.

As the result of that report the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the leadership of Dr. Robert Felix, then Director of the National Institute of Mental Health and "Bo" Jones, the Assistant to Secretary Ribicoff, developed the details for the national mental health program.

With the strong support of President Kennedy, Senator HILL and Congressman HARRIS, the Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 was enacted authorizing a Federal program to assist States and communities in the construction of community health centers. The Senate version of the bill included funds for staffing of the centers. But the House opposed this provision and it was dropped from the final 1963 bill. But in 1965, the staffing grants were enacted under legislation proposed by President Johnson. The two laws authorize Federal funds totaling \$375 million.

As of June 30, 1966, Federal grants totaling \$57 million had been made for the construction and/or staffing of 128 new centers in 42 states, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. They will provide services for some 22 million Americans. These centers are truly a revolutionary new concept in the field of mental health. They have ushered in a new era in the care of the mentally ill—a shift from custodial care and quarantine institutions set apart from communities to a new emphasis on prevention and community centered treatment and rehabilitation.

Federal funds were provided to support comprehensive mental health planning in every State. And programs were initiated to improve treatment in State mental hospitals and to upgrade the skills of nonprofessional aides who provide most of the daily care to mental hospital patients.

Through the National Institute of Mental Health support is being given to programs to train the core mental health professions—psychiatrists, psychologists, nurses, and psychiatric social workers.

Research programs have been extended and expanded. There is a determined effort to find knowledge of the causes, treatment and prevention of mental illness.

But in addition to these new Federal programs and increased financial support, there are other indications of changes in thinking about and coping with the problem of mental illness.

There is growing recognition that the problems of mental illness are complex. A single solution does not suffice. We are increasingly concerned with the totality of man—his physical well-being as well as his mental and social well-being.

Health and welfare can no longer be considered separately because the two are most often intertwined. Many of the new programs that have been established are concerned with both health and welfare services. A colleague of mine, Professor Darwin Palmerie of the University of Michigan, has termed these programs "healfare."

We are assuming our responsibility to think about the wholeness of each man and the interrelatedness of his wants, needs and aspirations. And to carry out our responsibility we are attempting to coordinate the programs dealing with his needs—for income, housing, employment, education, health care, and recreation.

The National Institute of Mental Health, under the able leadership of Dr. Stanley Yolles, is expanding its program activities in an effort to clarify the relationship of

social and environmental problems to the mental health of the population.

The National Institute of Mental Health has asked more than 200 distinguished individuals from the academic and scientific communities—as well as State mental health program officials and representatives of various private and voluntary agencies—to meet during October as members of 13 ad hoc Committees.

The meetings are intended to help crystallize programs of the Institute under its new administrative reorganization, the first major realignment of program responsibility since the National Institute of Mental Health was established in 1949.

One of the ad hoc Committees, the one on Metropolitan Problems, will discuss the whole urban condition as it relates to mental health. A universal cry of our day is that we don't know what is actually happening in the cities' social systems.

The mental health field has some obligation to push for coordination of social services as an ostensibly sensible goal. Also the Committee will help to stimulate broadscale research into the full character of urban life.

This is extremely important when we realize that nearly every important public decision that basically affects the public's mental health is made through the political process and is shaped by planners in the fields outside of the health, welfare or educational areas. For example, those who plan for urban renewal, economic development, transportation system design and public housing.

These discussions, therefore, will be based on the belief that planning for mental health and planning for physical environment must be integral parts of planning for people.

In addition to its concerns about crime, delinquency, alcoholism, drug abuse, the National Institute of Mental Health will also study the mental health implications of poverty—with its chronic stresses—family breakdowns, divorce; of the work environment, where automation causes changing job requirements and increased leisure time.

There are other indications of changes in our thinking about mental illness. A recent decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the case of Catherine Lake vs. Dale C. Cameron (No. 18809 decided May 19, 1966), is a significant indication of the movement for more humane, effective and specific methods for assisting and treating the aged. And it also points up the need for finding alternative methods of care. The Court, through the distinguished Chief Judge, David L. Bazelon, found that a mentally ill aged person unable to care adequately for herself but of no danger to anyone else cannot be involuntarily hospitalized in a mental hospital without full exploration of all possible other alternatives available for her care and treatment in the community. The Court made it quite clear that the old methods of treatment of the aged should no longer be acceptable.

The 1965 Amendments to the Social Security Act, which established Medicare and Medicaid (Title XIX) and amended the Public Assistance provisions of the Act, opened up many new avenues for the care of the mentally ill.

Under the Medicare program, many of the aged will now be able to get the medical and psychiatric care that they could not afford in the past. Payments may be made for inpatient or outpatient psychiatric care under certain conditions. Medicare will also contribute to improved standards of care of the aged in mental hospitals and nursing homes and encourage the use of alternative methods of care.

Title XIX, the new Medical Assistance program, authorized increased Federal grants to the States to help them provide medical care for persons with low incomes in all age groups. The intent of this new program is

to develop a program of comprehensive, high quality health care for the medically needy. The medical services provided may be as broad as the States wish to make them but they must include inpatient, outpatient hospital services, physicians' services, skilled nursing home services, and laboratory and X-ray services. The largest group who could benefit from the program are children under age 21. Under these provisions all medically needy children can be assured full comprehensive medical care, if the State implements the Federal provisions.

Sponsored by Senator RUSSELL LONG, a significant—but often overlooked—provision of the new title XIX and of an amendment to Title I (the public assistance provisions of the Act) directly benefits people aged 65 and over who are in mental institutions. Under the new law, Federal payments may be made to States for cash assistance payments or for medical care for such persons. As a condition for receiving the payments, a State must develop alternatives to institutional care and must be making satisfactory progress in developing comprehensive mental health programs, including establishment of community mental health centers.

Some 13 States have included aged mental patients under their Title XIX programs. However, many of the States, Connecticut among them—have not taken advantage of these important provisions. I hope that Connecticut will be able to do so soon.

Nevertheless, we are making progress in the field of mental health and within recent years a dramatic breakthrough in mental illness has occurred. During the past year, more progress was made against mental illness than in any of the past 20 years.

The number of patients in State mental hospitals was reduced by 15,000—the largest annual reduction since 1955.

Over a 10-year period, the number of patients in State hospitals has dropped from a high of 558,000 in 1955 to the current low of 475,000 at the end of 1965. This overall reduction of 83,000 resident patients in the short span of a decade has saved the States an estimated \$2 billion in patient care costs and \$4 billion in capital construction costs over that period of time.

There is general agreement that two major developments have contributed to this unprecedented reduction in the number of hospitalized patients—the widespread use of psychoactive drugs and the doubling of psychiatric personnel available for treating patients in these institutions.

As a Nation we are spending a total of about \$40 billion annually on all aspects of medical care, and of this about \$2.8 billion is for mental health services. Yet, there are many who need treatment and who are not getting it. It has been estimated that one person in ten will need professional psychiatric help sometime during his lifetime. Unfortunately certain groups including children, the poor, the uneducated, "the poor treatment risks"—have been neglected. We must step up our efforts to provide services for these people. This will take not just money but bold new ways of helping them. The challenge to the new community mental health centers is to design programs to reach these groups.

III

Let us look specifically at one of these neglected groups—our Nation's children.

There are about 4 million children under age 14 who are in need of some kind of psychiatric help because of emotional problems. About a half million to a million of these children are so seriously disturbed that they require immediate psychiatric help.

The disturbing fact is that very few of these children are getting the treatment they need. Although close to 300,000 children were seen in outpatient psychiatric clinics in 1963, in most cases there were no facilities for the necessary prolonged treatment.

About 14,000 children are confined in State mental institutions. Both the admission rates and the resident population rates for children have increased at an accelerated pace during the last 10 years. For example, the number of boys between the ages 10 and 14 in mental hospitals has increased almost sixfold. By 1973, we can expect a 116 percent increase in the number of children age 10-14 in mental hospitals. For older children (15-24) the number will increase about 70 percent.

The toll taken by the major mental and emotional disorders is not restricted to the adult years. Among public mental hospital patients under eighteen, 43 percent were diagnosed as psychotic, 27 percent as retarded or suffering acute and chronic brain syndromes and the remainder as victims of a variety of personality disorders reflecting both constitutional deficiencies and environmental trauma.

Despite the great need reflected in these figures, there are very few services available to these children. In many of the institutions where children are confined, there are no specialized units of care for them. Thus, they become lost in overcrowded, understaffed adult wards. Of the Nation's some 1,800 mental health clinics, less than one-fourth are child guidance clinics. In 15 States there are no residential treatment centers for children from low and middle income groups, and 24 States have no public facilities to care for them.

There really is not a single community in the Nation which provides an acceptable standard of services for its mentally ill children, ranging from early intervention to social restoration in the home, school or community.

These facts should spur us on to mobilize all of our resources for the year ahead—to provide the knowledge, techniques and services that are necessary to assure the well-being and mental health of our youth.

In its 1961 report, the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Mental Health said that it had not studied the special problems of mental illness in children and recommended that this be done.

Senator RIBICOFF introduced a bill in the Senate providing for a panel of advisors to study the problems of children. The bill also proposed a Nation-wide program of services for children and would have established a program of Federal grants to develop community services for emotionally disturbed children or children who were in danger of becoming emotionally disturbed.

As a result of Senator RIBICOFF's persistent efforts, the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children was established as a part of the Medicare legislation of 1965. This Commission, funded by a grant of \$500,000 from the National Institute of Mental Health, has begun a two-year task of assessing the needs for treatment of emotionally disturbed children and for preventive mental health services.

The Commission, which is made up of representatives of many different professions ranging from psychiatrists, educators, social workers and psychologists, under the chairmanship of Dr. Reginald Lourie, will direct an inter-disciplinary study of the mental health problems of children.

When the Commission reports its findings and recommendations to the Congress, we are confident that the report will make fresh and innovative proposals for solving some of these problems. They are expected to provide a sound basis for establishing community mental health services to meet our children's needs.

Action, however, can be taken now in certain areas to attack the problem of the mentally ill child.

A vast opportunity to improve mental health services for children has been opened

up through Title XIX. Now children in low income families can be given psychiatric help, psychological testing and evaluation, and follow-up treatment. Connecticut is one of the States providing a full range of these services under its Title XIX program.

The newly established community mental health centers can serve as the focal point for new approaches and to coordinate the services for children.

They can experiment with new facilities, skills, new kinds of professional personnel, new patterns in the development of greatly needed manpower. They can help provide the means to reach out to help children in their homes and schools. They can assist the traditional social systems in fostering the good development of children and come to the support of these institutions when healthy development goes astray. Consultative services can be made available through the centers to the people who come in daily contact with the children—public health nurses, physicians, pediatricians, teachers, settlement house workers, recreation workers, and the courts. The center can provide training in basic health principles to these persons and encourage them to construct their programs in ways that will strengthen and promote the child's mental health, as well as help them identify children with problems and engage them in rehabilitation and correction efforts.

IV

One of the severest limitations on our national effort is the health manpower shortage. The present shortages are expected to continue in health personnel categories. According to a NIMH survey last year we will need between 120,000 and 125,000 professionals in the major mental health disciplines by 1975. We have approximately 65,000 of these professionals at the present time.

In addition to increasing the supply of these people, as we have already begun to do under several programs which provide Federal financial support for training in the health field, we must invent and create new solutions to the manpower shortage. We must explore the use of new types of personnel and new approaches to the delivery of mental health services. We can no longer afford to ignore an untapped reservoir of manpower.

We can make far more use of the nonprofessional aide—one who can bridge the social distance between the skilled professional and those who come for help. These people also can free the professional worker from routine tasks to do the work for which he was trained.

Vital to the efforts to expand our Nation's health manpower, is the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966, introduced by Senator HILL and Representative STAGGERS (S. 3102 and H.R. 13196). These bills would provide a three-year program of grants for the training of allied health personnel—such indispensable health workers as X-ray technicians, medical technologists, dental hygienists and others.

Construction and improvement grants patterned after those now available to the medical, dental and allied health professions, under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, and to nursing schools, under the Nurses Training Act, would be available for training centers.

Traineeships assisting in the advanced training of allied health professionals to serve as teachers or administrators or, to serve in fields requiring specialized training, would be administered through grants to training centers.

Funds would also be available for the development of new methods and techniques.

The House of Representatives unanimously passed the Staggers bill on June 23, and we are hopeful that the Senate will take similar

action soon on the bill sponsored by Senator HILL.

Passage of this legislation would help us meet the critical need for more trained specialists in the health field.

v

I see no limits to the effective and continuing expansion of our public-private partnership in the development and delivery of health services in the next few years.

These services must and should be community-based and community-operated, but State governments and the Federal Government are prepared to give a larger share of support to communities today and that support will increase.

Currently before the Congress, for example, is—the "Comprehensive Health Planning and Public Health Services Amendments of 1966," also introduced by Senator HILL and Representative STAGGERS (S. 3008 and H.R. 13197).

This bill embodies a major health legislation proposal made by President Johnson in his March 1 message to the Congress on health and legislation.

This bill would add to and strengthen the capacity of States to provide public health services—including mental health services—in two ways: by emphasizing comprehensive health planning and by providing funds in such a way that health resources can be used flexibly and efficiently. The legislation would provide the State and local health departments with Federal financial support to meet their responsibilities and provide the leadership and coordination that is urgently needed.

You who are about to bring a program of mental health services into being in the Connecticut Mental Health Center will soon be able to begin an evaluation of the concept of the new national mental health program. Your experience will benefit all of the communities in Connecticut, in New England and, over the next few years, in many other parts of this Nation.

MARGARET E. ADAMS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to compliment Miss Margaret E. Adams, of Baltimore, for the fine job she is doing as president of the Maryland State Teachers Association, a highly important organization in Maryland's educational system. Miss Adams is known as an excellent and persistent administrator, and the MSTA is fortunate to have her services. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article about Miss Adams published in the November-December 1965 issue of the Maryland Teacher.

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

MEET YOUR MARYLAND STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

Margaret E. Adams, MSTA's president for 1965-66, is a native of Baltimore, educated in the Baltimore schools, at Towson State College, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Maryland. She is the second "President Adams" in the history of MSTA, the first, Mary A. Adams, also of Baltimore City, having served as president of the Association in 1943. (There is some historical basis for assuming that "Adams" is a very good presidential name at whatever level of endeavor it may be found.)

If past achievement is a criterion of future performance, there is a sound basis also for assuming that MSTA's current President Adams will serve the Association well in her position of leadership. In her local association, the Public School Teachers Association of Baltimore City, Margaret has long been

known as a person who gets things done regardless of obstacles or discouragements. She served as secretary for PSTA for eight years, as chairman of the Constitution Revision Committee, and as chairman of the Membership Committee for three years. Her work with the Membership Committee was so effective that she was chosen as chairman of the MSTA Membership Committee. In this position, she continued to show outstanding results in membership increases, with the result that she remained as MSTA's Membership Chairman for three years, despite a long-standing Association policy of one-year terms for most committee chairmen.

Miss Adams has also worked for many years with the Department of Elementary Teachers, an affiliated department of MSTA, serving as secretary and as president, and helping to build this department into one of the largest and most active units in the MSTA structure. Her experience in this field was recognized by her appointment to the Arrangements Committee which had the responsibility for making arrangements for the Regional Conference of the Department of Classroom Teachers held in Annapolis a few years ago.

Our new president has also had wide experience in other areas of Association work, for she has been active in the Leadership Training programs on both the local and state levels, has often been a delegate to the MSTA Representative Assembly, and has attended TEPS Conferences as a state delegate. She served two years as a member-at-large to the MSTA Executive Board before being elected second vice-president and then president.

Margaret's teaching career began in Prince George's County, where she taught for three years before going back to school for additional study. Following this, she began teaching music at the Arlington Elementary School in Baltimore City. She explained that this was a departmental set-up, known in those days as a "platoon" school, where, in addition to music, she also taught some subject classes—arithmetic, spelling, science—according to the need.

After two years at Arlington, Miss Adams moved to the Waverly School, where she taught physical education and directed the Glee Club. "Those were the days of extravaganzas," she said, "and the Glee Club was involved in all of them." When asked about other extra duties, she smiled and said, "I expect I've dabbled in every extra-curricular activity anybody could think of organizing in an elementary school—Junior Red Cross, Safety Patrol, Student Council, just as a sample."

Extra-curricular activities in school are not Miss Adams' only "extras," however, for her hobbies include music, sewing, gardening, cooking, and travel. "The basic problem is that I don't have enough time for any of them," she said wistfully as she went on to say that her "specialty is trying out new recipes on guests" before adding them to her permanent file.

Civic and community responsibilities are not taken lightly by this energetic woman, either, for she is a Past Matron of the Patterson Chapter, Order of Eastern Star, an organizer and first president of Alpha Delta Kappa, an honorary sorority for teachers, and a member of Phi Delta Gamma, an honorary academic fraternity at the University of Maryland. She is a member of the Third Lutheran Church in Baltimore, and, for many years, taught the Women's Bible Class, and also sang in the choir. Part of her interest in music was developed during these years when she studied voice at the Peabody Institute. She was also the first president of the Towsontown Business and Professional Women's Club, and is still a member of the Board of this organization.

For thirty years, Miss Adams spent her summers working as a playground supervisor for the Bureau of Recreation.

In discussing her personal philosophy of education, Maggie, as she is known to her close friends, shows her deep concern for children: "We need to continue our efforts at meeting the individual needs of children at all levels—this means the teacher, the administrator, and those who work in special fields. I believe very strongly that the classroom teacher should be able to work more independently with children and not have to stick too rigidly with the course of study. We need a framework in which to operate, of course, but experienced classroom teachers should have the freedom to try new ideas. Particularly in the inner city schools, educators have to be aware that the role of the school is different from the traditional one, and that the school must assume greater responsibility for the growth and development of these children as times goes on. I see the inner city school as an opportunity for teachers to do intensive missionary work."

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3164) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think we shall be able to propose a unanimous-consent agreement which will accommodate all Senators and all views in respect to the pending measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a unanimous-consent request and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective upon the completion of the speech of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3164) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty, that debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]: Provided, That in the event Senator CLARK is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] or some Senator designated by him: Provided further, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received (except the amendment No. 937 of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]).

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: Provided, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal and provided that quorum calls be exempted from the time allocated above.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to make two points. First, I understand that the Senator from Montana will ask for a

short quorum call, to give Senators notice.

Second, and more important, the order of procedure is to be a little different from that set forth in the unanimous-consent request. We hope that the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] will be able to use his time and bring the debate on his amendment to a conclusion; but then, free of the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will speak, and then, following the conclusion of his speech, the unanimous-consent agreement will take effect.

Mr. CLARK. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the speech of the Senator from Vermont will be excluded from the agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement, as amended by the statement of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the poverty bill which would increase membership on the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission from five to seven members.

I do this, Mr. President, in the hope that the President will take the opportunity presented to appoint to the two additional positions persons whose background and knowledge evidences an understanding of the problems of minority groups which, up to this time, have not been represented on the Commission.

In my estimation, Americans of Latin-American heritage have not received proper representation on this Commission whose duty it is to assure that all Americans are considered for hiring, firing, and promotion on the basis of their ability and qualifications, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

It is my hope that by increasing the number of EEOC members, and by appointing persons to the Commission who are intimately familiar with the unique employment problems of Americans of Latin heritage the EEOC will have an opportunity to explore the particular problems of racial groups much in need of their assistance, but up to this time, neglected.

I believe experience has shown that a five-member EEOC is not large enough to accommodate representatives from all such specific groups, and this is the reason I propose that Commission's membership be expanded.

My amendment states that one additional member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years and another for a term of 5 years. I do this, Mr. President, to provide for a continuation of the present practice for staggered terms for members of the Commission.

In addition, language reading as follows is inserted:

In making appointments to the Commission, the President shall give due consideration, among other reasonable factors, to whether there is maximum feasible representation provided among the membership of the Commission for persons of all various groups throughout our Nation without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

There is a vital need for the services of persons who are familiar with the day-to-day employment problems of the diverse elements in our heterogeneous society. It is my hope that the Senate will take this opportunity to expand the scope of the Commission so as to enable it to be more responsive to the needs of all the members of the American community.

Mr. President, I would be less than candid if I did not note that I voted against the civil rights bill which created this Commission, but now that the Commission is in existence and is operating, I think it should operate equitably.

Thomas Jefferson said, "All men are created equal." Well, some wag has added to that, "Yes, but some are more equal than others."

I found that out when I went out for the basketball team when I was in school.

But, in any case, the fact is that the second largest minority group in this country is not being given equal treatment with the largest minority group.

It has no representation on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Therefore, I feel there is an obligation to adopt my amendment and to make legislative history which will make it plain it is our intention that the second largest minority group in this country shall be represented.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is opposed to this amendment.

Let me point out that the amendment is not germane to this bill, but permission was given to the Senator from Texas to bring it up under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TOWER. May I say that I thank my distinguished friend for giving me that privilege.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to accommodate the Senator, but the amendment is not germane to the bill and should not be made a part of it. This amendment should be offered to the basic act which created the Commission.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, may I respond to the distinguished Senator?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. I am aware that the amendment is not germane to the bill, but we would not be shattering any precedents if we adopted the amendment because it was not germane to the bill, because it has been done before on numerous occasions. I may state that I have introduced a bill addressed to the Civil Rights Act, which is the appropriate bill to which to offer the amendment, and which I would prefer to do, but that bill has not been considered by a committee. There have been no hearings. Therefore, I think that, though perhaps it is not a germane amendment, this is an appropriate bill to which to offer the amendment, because of the rush of considering legislation and the lateness of the session. There is no reason why it should not be offered to the bill. The fact is that there are millions of Spanish-Americans who should be represented. They are not represented. They strongly feel that they should be represented on this Commission.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct when he states that we would be shattering no precedents if we considered non-germane amendments. The Senator will recall that most of the nongermane amendments come from the other side of the aisle. But on our side of the aisle we like to think we proceed in a more orderly manner.

Mr. TOWER. That is because that side is in the majority. If the worm ever turns, Senators on that side of the aisle might resort to the same device.

Mr. CLARK. Nevertheless, this amendment does not belong in this act.

Proceeding on the merits of the amendment, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is quite correct in the position which it takes; that is, that membership on this Commission should not be representative of specific minority groups. There is nothing in the act which provides that members of the Commission should be selected because they are Jews, Catholics, Protestants, women, American Indians, or members of any other racial or ethnic group.

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

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. May I say, by way of explanation, that my amendment does not specifically propose to place on the Commission any member of Spanish-American background, but I am making legislative history and saying that this is what we expect should be done.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has made this legislative history. I agree that there is nothing in the language that requires the appointment to the Commission of Spanish-Americans, but the Senator from Texas makes abundantly clear that he wants to increase the Commission in order that there will be appointed a particular minority group member. This is the first effort to create such a situation and it is unsound.

Such commissions should be composed of American citizens without regard to color, racial origin, or sex. I think it would be a step backward to adopt the amendment which the Senator from Texas desires.

Let me point out that this proposal would give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission a larger membership as compared with memberships of other quasi-judicial commissions.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Thus, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which has a total of 314 employees and a budget of \$5.2 million is, relatively speaking, in terms of Federal agencies, a small operation.

The Civil Service Commission, which has 4,487 employees, and a budget of \$129,160,000, has a membership of only 3 Commissioners.

I could go down the list of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In each instance, with the exception of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Communications Commission, the membership is no greater than the present membership of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list showing the names of the quasi-judicial agencies, number of employees, budget, and the members of the Commission, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Agency	Employees	Budget	Membership
EEOC	314	\$5,200,000	5
CSC	4,487	129,160,000	3
CAB	839	12,000,000	5
FCC	1,558	17,338,500	7
FPC	1,179	14,000,000	5
FTC	1,141	14,000,000	5
ICC	2,382	27,759,000	11
NLRB	2,343	30,442,000	5
SEC	1,412	17,250,000	5

Mr. CLARK. There is presently one vacancy on the Commission. There will be another one next year. I would suggest to my good friend from Texas that he is making his views known and that his course of action should be to bring home to the President, who makes these appointments, and to the Senate which confirms them, that when these two vacancies are filled they be filled by members of the background of which he speaks.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this moment?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. The present members of the Commission are Stephen N. Shulman, white, and of Jewish faith; Luther Holcomb, white, of Protestant faith; Aileen Hernandez, a Negro woman, of Protestant faith—the name would seem to indicate some affiliation with the back-

ground, which the Senator from Texas now speaks.

Mr. TOWER. May I say that Mrs. Hernandez is married to a citizen of Latin American background, but citizens of that background do not consider that proper representation.

Mr. CLARK. The fourth member of the Commission, Samuel Jackson, is a Negro and the fifth spot is vacant.

I would think that putting this amendment into the law would be an inappropriate way to achieve his purpose.

Surely we want to avoid using representation of a special interest group as a criterion for selecting members of administrative and regulatory agencies. This is the hard rock on which my objection to the amendment is based.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, let us be very candid. The primary purpose of the civil rights bill—and I think the primary thrust behind it—was really to protect the American Negro, who has been more discriminated against than any other minority group in this country. Let us be candid further: It is not coincidental that half of the members of the Commission are Negroes.

The fact does remain that the Latin Americans are not represented on the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. They are the second largest minority group in the United States of America, and they should be represented. I know we included religion and sex and everything else, but there is very little discrimination in this country on the basis of creed. I do not even know how to define the term "creed." There is very little discrimination in this country on the basis of religion; and there is very little discrimination on the basis of sex, except some archaic laws that still discriminate against women. But there certainly is considerable discrimination against our Latin American citizens; nobody is capable of understanding the problems of our Latin American citizens except people who are members of that particular ethnic group.

It is argued that the Interstate Commerce Commission normally has five members, as do various of the other commissions, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission—which has seven, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

But those five-member commissions, and others, deal with specific types of business or trade or professional activity. We are dealing with a multifarious subject when we talk about civil rights and discrimination. We must remember that there are various kinds of discrimination against various groups in various parts of the country; and I think they should be as well represented as possible. Therefore, I think it is mandatory that we expand the membership of this commission to allow for a broader base of representation. I would say it would be a good idea for American Indians to be represented, because American Indians are discriminated against in this country, too, and they have some very special problems.

Certainly, however, the second largest minority group in the United States should be represented on the commission; and I think the only way we can make the commission broad enough to include a broad-based representation is to increase the membership. Therefore, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in conclusion, I must oppose the Senator's amendment. I believe it is unsound administratively, and would be a mistake.

There is a vacancy on the Commission. The Senator from Texas should make his representation to the President of the United States, and suggest that that vacancy be filled by a Mexican-American. There will be another vacancy next year. That is the way to do it; not by tacking a nongermane amendment on this bill.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana as much time on the bill as he may require.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would not make this request except that an unusual circumstance has developed.

BIGHORN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives on S. 491.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 491) to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) in order to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir and lands adjacent thereto in the States of Wyoming and Montana by the people of the United States and for preservation of the scenic, scientific and historic features contributing to public enjoyment of such lands and waters, there is hereby established the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area to comprise the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Proposed Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area", LNPMW-010A-BC, November 1964, which is on file in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) As soon as practicable after approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish in the Federal Register a detailed description of the boundaries of the area which shall encompass, to the extent practicable, the lands and waters shown on the drawing referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary may subsequently make adjustments in the boundary of the area, subject to the provisions of subsection 2(b) of this Act, by publication of an amended description in the Federal Register.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of the area. The Secretary is further authorized to acquire, by any of the above methods, not to exceed ten acres of land or interests therein outside of the boundaries of the area in the vicinity of Lovell, Wyoming, for development and use, pur-

suant to such special regulations as he may promulgate, as a visitor contact station and administrative site. In the exercise of his exchange authority the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the area and convey in exchange therefor any federally owned property under his jurisdiction in the States of Montana and Wyoming which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Property so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from, or pay cash to, the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. Any property or interest therein owned by the State of Montana or the State of Wyoming or any political subdivision thereof within the recreation area may be acquired only by donation.

(b) No part of the tribal mountain lands or any other lands of the Crow Indian Tribe of Montana shall be included within the recreation area unless requested by the council of the tribe. The Indian lands so included may be developed and administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitation specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary.

(c) (1) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act or of any other law, the Crow Indian Tribe shall be permitted to develop and operate water-based recreational facilities, including landing ramps, boat-houses, and fishing facilities, along that part of the shoreline of Yellowtail Reservoir which is adjacent to lands comprising the Crow Indian Reservation. Any such part so developed shall be administered in accordance with the laws and rules applicable to the recreation area, subject to any limitations specified by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary. Any revenues resulting from the operation of such facilities may be retained by the Crow Indian Tribe.

(2) As used in this subsection the term "shoreline" means that land which borders both Yellowtail Reservoir and the exterior boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, together with that part of the reservoir necessary to the development of the facilities referred to in this subsection.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall coordinate administration of the recreation area with the other purposes of the Yellowtail Reservoir project so that it will in his judgment best provide (1) for public outdoor recreation benefits, (2) for conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, and other values contributing to public enjoyment, and (3) for management, utilization, and disposal of renewable natural resources in a manner that promotes, or is compatible with, and does not significantly impair, public recreation and conservation of scenic, scientific, historic, or other values contributing to public enjoyment.

(b) In the administration of the area for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authorities otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within the recreation area in accordance with the appropriate laws of the United States and of the States of Montana or Wyoming to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment, and except that nothing in this sec-

tion shall impair the rights under other law of the Crow Tribe and its members to hunt and fish on lands of the Crow Tribe that are included in the recreation area, or the rights of the members of the Crow Tribe to hunt and fish under section 2(d) of the Act of July 15, 1958. Except in emergencies, any regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the Montana Fish and Game Department or the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than \$355,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 491, with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 6, after the word "donation", to strike the period and insert "or exchange."

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to extend my congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], to his colleague [Mr. McGEE], and to my colleague [Mr. METCALF] for the fine work the three of them have performed in getting this most important bill, which will be of such great benefit to our two States, passed, and in having added to it the amendment which will make certain that it will become law before this session completes its business.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming as much time as he may desire.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for bringing up once again on the floor of the Senate, S. 491, a bill establishing the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Wyoming and Montana. His bulldog tenacity has again prevailed.

As suggested by the majority leader, it is imperative that this bill receive the approval of the Senate at this time. Otherwise the bill is threatened with extinction. A similar bill was introduced in the 88th Congress and received passage in the Senate but failed to pass the House. This bill which we are now considering in this Congress was reported to the Senate on February 9, 1965, by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee Report No. 64. On February 10, 1965, it passed the Senate. A companion bill H.R. 2778 was introduced by Congressman JIM BATTIN, of Montana, in the House and passed the House September 10, 1966. However, the House included certain amendments concerning the acquisition of State-owned lands. Subsequently the House passed S. 491, as amended, in lieu of the previously passed Battin bill.

We now consider S. 491 again to accept the compromise language as suggested

by our majority leader. This language has been worked out between the offices of the four Senators from the States of Wyoming and Montana, the able chairman of the Senate Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON] and those interested leaders in the House of Representatives, principally Congressman BATTIN. S. 491 as amended by us here will then go back to the House for identical amendment. The bill will then be ready for the President's signature and can at long last be made law.

I urge the Senate to consider favorably the amendment as suggested by the majority leader.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3164) to provide for continued progress in the Nation's war on poverty.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a live pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from

Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 273 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Aiken	Hruska	Prouty
Boggs	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Simpson
Case	Miller	Thurmond
Cotton	Montoya	Tower
Dirksen	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Murphy	
Hickenlooper	Pearson	

NAYS—39

Bartlett	Hill	Nelson
Bayh	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Pell
Brewster	Javits	Proxmire
Burdick	Lausche	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Russell, S.C.
Cannon	Mansfield	Russell, Ga.
Clark	McCarthy	Smith
Ervin	McGovern	Symington
Fulbright	Morse	Talmadge
Gore	Moss	Tydings
Harris	Muskie	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—36

Allott	Griffin	McIntyre
Anderson	Gruening	Metcalfe
Bass	Hart	Mondale
Bennett	Hartke	Monroney
Church	Hayden	Neuberger
Cooper	Inouye	Robertson
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Smathers
Douglas	Kuchel	Sparkman
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McGee	Yarborough

So Mr. TOWER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, we commence, now, with debate on the 1966 amendments to the law which is supposed to be designed to eliminate poverty in our Nation. As ranking Republican member on the Manpower and Poverty Subcommittee which considered the pending bill, I wish to make some preliminary remarks.

First of all, all members of the subcommittee, and, indeed, all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, our parent committee, are always most agreeable to work with on this legislation or any other. The bill and its subject matter lend themselves to encouragement of short tempers and efforts to assure that no State will be short-changed when the money is handed out. Even so, Mr. President, these built-in problems have not caused undue strain among our membership, and I am glad that this is so.

Mr. President, it is little more than idle chatter to blame our spiraling inflation entirely on the war in Vietnam. Certainly that war is costly, and those bills must be paid. There has been, however, precious little effort on the part of the administration to reduce Federal spending. Last Wednesday I wrote to the President in the hope that we may have the support of the administration in our efforts to help stem the inflationary spiral. I should like to read that letter to the Senate, since it is so intimately connected with the enormous amounts of money authorized by our committee in the pending bill:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1966.

The PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Several times recently you have expressed fear that the economy was in danger of overheating.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that it is a very real and present danger. For the raging fires of inflation are destroying the value of our savings, consuming the purchasing power of our dollars and belching the black smoke of sky-rocketing interest rates over the torrid flames of spiraling increases in the cost of consumer goods.

That you are fully cognizant of what is happening is underscored by the fact that some of your key advisers are beginning to indicate the need for a general tax increase (presumably after the November elections) unless there are substantial reductions in federal spending.

If the need for reducing cash flow into the economy via public sector programs is indeed pressing, and I think it is, then I respectfully suggest we avail ourselves of this timely opportunity to exercise restraint while not sacrificing the benefits from programs previously funded, now in operation and having widespread popular appeal.

But, Mr. President, you seem to have been saying that funds for such projects as the School Lunch Program, the School Milk Program, Payments to School Districts, Student Loan Programs, various Health and Medical Programs, including heart and cancer research, and many other programs too numerous to mention should either be drastically reduced or eliminated altogether, and that the money thereby saved should be used to fund new or relatively new and untried programs which some of your aides advocate. And the only option, or so it is said, is that if Congress insists on keeping programs it believes have served our citizens well it must also accept the new proposals and the people will have to pay the bill either through higher taxes or rampant inflation or both.

I am sure that neither you nor the Congress wishes to be confronted with these alternatives so perhaps the time has arrived for the President and the Congress "to come and reason together" in the hope that meaningful compromises can be reached.

Before bringing this already too long letter to a close I should like to call attention to the action taken by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 3164 which authorizes funds for the War on Poverty.

The Committee during the final mark-up seemed determined to report the bill at any cost (no pun intended) and the final authorizations totaled \$2,496,000,000. This represented an increase of \$746,000,000 above your budget request.

Inasmuch as more than a quarter of the fiscal year has already gone it seemed wholly logical to reduce the authorizations by 25%. This would have brought about a reduction of \$624,000,000 and still left the authorizations \$122,000,000 above the budget request. But when I proposed the amendment it was summarily rejected.

And so, Mr. President, that is where the matter rests. As you know, I share something of your awareness of the needs of America's poor. To be effective the War on Poverty must have funds to assist in meeting the needs of our underprivileged children and culturally disadvantaged citizens.

Some functions of the War on Poverty are useful and constructive, but others are ill-conceived or poorly administered or carry cost factors which cannot be justified.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the program should be reviewed in its entirety and in much greater detail than was possible this year.

But in any event, it is my conviction that nothing approaching the funding authorized by the Committee can possibly be spent wisely or effectively during the balance of the present fiscal year.

If you share this view and are seriously concerned with current budgetary problems, I hope very much that the full weight of your influence and prestige will be brought to bear in order that meaningful reductions in the funding can be effectuated.

Please be assured of my full cooperation.

Sincerely,

WINSTON PROUTY.

Now a few remarks on the bill itself.

As every Member of the Senate now knows, indeed, as anyone who is even slightly interested in the legislation knows, our committee reported a measure which totals in authorizations \$2,496 million for a period of less than three-quarters of a year—for a 9-month period of time. That, Mr. President, is authorizing for this war on poverty, and with precious little effort to be selective of the more worthwhile programs, at the rate of \$3,328 million per year. That, Mr. President, is almost twice the amount re-

quested by the administration for fiscal 1967. It is also only a little bit less than twice the amount authorized by the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives for the current fiscal year.

I shall not say that our committee has acted irresponsibly. I do think though, Mr. President, that the committee has acted with little regard for the poor against whom the present undeniable inflation operates most noticeably. With the cost of living index up during August more sharply than during any month in 9 years, and with real wages after taxes having actually declined during the second quarter of 1966, \$800 million additional money in the poverty bill is precious little solace for America's poor. Whatever little help this extra money might be among the Nation's poor will be flooded over by the further inflationary effect of the spending for experiment inherent in this bill. While our hearts might prove generous, our heads will have told us that our generosity will actually exist only in the press and in our campaign leaflets. The poor will have been foiled again.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, much of the money in this bill, over and above the administration request, is for programs, the substance of which, I venture to say without fear of serious challenge, is presently unknown to anyone at poverty headquarters; indeed, probably not to anyone else.

Finally, Mr. President, programs for which no request had been made by the administration—indeed, I suspect, programs for which the Bureau of the Budget had made no commitment; indeed, had most probably counseled against were singularly successful in being adopted by the committee and the amount of authorization seemed to be of only minor consequence. And through it all, the ubiquitous poverty officials, not being required to say "yes, OEO can use the money" nevertheless, with a shrug of the shoulders and a quick little grin left with the committee what might very well have been an intended impression that yes, poverty would like very much to have any amount for whatever purpose is the committee's pleasure, without regard to the old Simon Legree of our melodrama—the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, I am well aware, as I know everyone else is, that OEO is essentially an agency that likes to think of itself as an innovator, as a sort of "think" factory from which come glamorous, imaginative and hopeful ideas for assistance to the poor. I am not at all sold on it as an action agency; it still has to prove that it is capable of managing those programs which it has devised, to accomplish its supposed reason for existence. It is a pilot agency, a demonstration group. It therefore certainly does not need \$2.5 billion to function for a 9-month period. Although the poverty officials—our committee apparently cannot operate without them constantly in the committee room during executive sessions—at one point there were no less than 13 of them—more, even, than committee and Senator's personal staff members combined—minimized the idea that

there are only 9 months to go in fiscal 1967, and that they had revised their figures to satisfy themselves that \$2.5 billion is really only 9 months' worth of poverty money, I have no doubt whatsoever that they would not have dared, indeed even have dreamed of coming into our committee in June to testify that for the full year 1967, their "revised" estimates would have shown that the poverty program would simply have collapsed unless we authorized \$3.3 billions of dollars in the face of a \$1.750 billion request by the administration. It is interesting that the "tacit" assent by the poverty officials to these vast increases in dollars, without any demonstration of need, or of hearings on the subject, is made only in executive sessions of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I am not at all sure that this administration would not be well advised to get its own house in order and learn beforehand just to what extent officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity are responsible to it when they conduct a fund drive out of hearing of the public in the normally sacrosanct privacy of a Senate committee. The administration would do well to speak with only one mouth or at least only one side of a single one.

Mr. President, I have remarked about the "think factory" nature of the poverty program offices. It apparently likes to experiment with new ideas. That is a commendable practice, but I do not think it needs one of the largest appropriations in the Government for pilot and demonstration projects. Think it can surely do, and those thoughts have indeed produced some commendable results. But it can do a much more commendable job with the funds which the administration requested.

There are many good ideas coming from OEO, and in the pursuit of their development, I think that poverty officials are being modest when they say they can use practically an unlimited amount of money in the pursuit of them. However, Mr. President, nothing has seemed to me more unrealistic, nothing appears more ostrich-like than the performance of the well-intentioned poverty officials in seclusion with our committee. And, I regret to say, nothing seems to me more illusory than the action by our committee in reporting this bill with authorizations to the tune of \$750 million above the administration request. I think floor action on this bill will demonstrate that the poor people of this Nation deserve better than a bill with high sounding phrases and naive good intentions. They deserve help with fighting inflation, with increasing the purchasing power of the dollars they have and can earn. They are entitled to action by the Senate and Congress which will enhance the economic climate in which this war on poverty can be fought. They do not deserve action by the Senate which will sink them further in the mire of economic hardship and futility during the approaching winter months.

They should not have to look forward to a winter of desperation.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that next year, a long hard look—in

depth—will be taken by our committee on all aspects of the war on poverty and its administration by the Office of Economic Opportunity. That is a fine idea, and I sincerely hope that our committee will begin this study as soon as the new Congress convenes in January.

The hope of this searching investigation into the poverty law, has caused me to decide not to offer major substantive changes in the law by way of amendment.

If we do not make substantive amendments in the poverty law, Mr. President, there is one way in which we can help the poor of this Nation. We can, indeed we must, strain every legislative muscle that we have to check the adverse effects of inflation on our Nation's poor. We can do this only through restraint on Federal spending. We can do this only by acting with responsibility on the pending legislation.

At the present time, the singularly most effective bill we can pass to help fight the war on poverty, is one which will most surely head off any future acceleration in the current inflationary spiral.

It is with the poor in mind that I hope the Senate will weigh amendments which will accomplish this purpose.

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

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk a purely technical amendment, and ask that it may be read, and I yield myself such time as may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 38, line 2, to strike out "1501" and insert in lieu thereof "1502."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this amendment corrects a typographical error. I have cleared it with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. There is no controversy about it.

I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Is the Senator from Vermont willing to yield back his time on the amendment?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 35 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President—

Laws—

Said Lord Acton—

should be adapted to the benefit of those who have the greatest stake in their community, those for whom misgovernment means not stinted luxuries and mortified pride, but want and pain, and degradation and risk to their lives and to their children's souls.

This week the Senate will be tested against that prescription of an English Tory. This week America will test itself against its own dream—a nation in which all have the opportunity to share the rights and privileges and duties of democracy. It is not the first such test, nor will it be the last. But it is perhaps the most significant test this year of whether we as a nation, we as individuals, mean what we say about equal opportunity for all.

The Economic Opportunity Act—the war on poverty—is not perfect. No one—not its administrators, not its stanchest defenders—contends that it cannot be, or should not be, improved in many significant respects. Nor is it the only Government program which in some way is addressed to the needs of the poor. There are job-training programs in the Department of Labor. There are programs for education and welfare and health in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There are housing programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. And there are private efforts, in every State and city in the Nation, which help poor people in a myriad of ways.

But the war on poverty is unique. The war on poverty, like it or not, is the single outstanding commitment this Nation has made to the principle that poverty must be abolished. Not just that fathers shall not be without jobs, and children without education, and mothers without medical care—though it is all of these. The war on poverty is a commitment to the principle that every American shall have the same opportunities to make a life for himself and for his own children—and the same opportunity to share in the government of his city and State and country, the same opportunity to share in the great enterprises of American public life.

Long ago the ideals of this program were set forth by John Adams. "The poor man's conscience is clear," he wrote, "yet he is ashamed." He feels himself out of the sight of others, groping in the dark. Mankind takes no notice of him. He rambles and wanders unheeded. In the midst of a crowd, at church, in the market, he is in as much obscurity as he would be in a garret or a cellar. He is not disapproved, censured, or reproached; he is only not seen. To be wholly overlooked and to know it, are intolerable. If Crusoe on his island had the library of Alexandria, and a certainty that he should never again see the face of man, would he ever open a volume?"

This is the legislation—this is the public declaration—that the poor of America are not ignored, not forgotten—that we

are willing to see them, and hear them and act with them to help them help themselves, to be active and productive citizens, and not passive recipients of whatever is left over from our riches.

It has been said that few oppose the principle of the war on poverty. Few would propose to eliminate it entirely. All that is proposed is that we limit this authorization to the figure proposed in the President's budget—that we authorize a total of \$1.75 billion, rather than the \$2.5 billion recommended by the committee. These are difficult times, it is said. We have a war in Vietnam, it is said. We have a threat of inflation, interest rates are too high, the stock market is tumbling. We must not spend too much.

This is a legitimate question: Why spend more than the President has requested? The answer comes from other questions: What is the need? What will the committee authorization do which the President's budget will not do?

The committee has added \$746 million to the administration request. The major elements in the addition are: \$196 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps; \$150 million for special impact programs in high concentration of poverty areas; \$200 million for Headstart programs; \$100 million for neighborhood health centers in poverty areas; \$100 million for community action programs. These increases are overwhelmingly directed to the needs of young people. They were added to the bill because the committee found—as all of us know—that the condition of poor young people in this country is a national disgrace and a profound national danger.

The evidence is all around us: Sunday, for example, the New York Times reported that young Negroes—who are poor in far greater proportion to their numbers than white young people—also fail the simple Armed Forces qualification test in far greater proportion. Sixty-seven and one-half percent of all Negro youth fail the test—67.5 percent are rejected by the Armed Forces on mental grounds alone. Whites fail this test, too—nearly 20 percent. The significance of the difference, of course, is not that poor youth of one race or another deserve greater help. We have an obligation to help them all do better. But the statistics do show, if we needed such evidence, that we simply cannot allow our youth to languish in poverty, unfit to serve the country, unable to help themselves or their families, certain to be a burden on society for the rest of their days.

And these young men are willing to serve their country—despite their deprivation and the prejudice, discrimination, and harshness that their parents and their parents' parents have faced in this country in our society. Negroes, 11 percent of the population, suffer 22 percent of all combat deaths in the jungles of Vietnam.

To allow these conditions to continue is to court certain danger, as well. In the last few months, almost every major city has seen terrible outbreaks of violence—senseless, terrible rioting, the

police forces of a dozen major cities unable to cope unaided with it. Who are why do they riot?

Our most careful and exhaustive study comes from the Governor's Commission To Study the Watts Rioting, headed by Mr. John McCone, the former head of the Central Intelligence Agency, a man I believe who justifiably commands the wholehearted respect of every Member of the Senate. The McCone Commission found that the riots were caused, more than anything else, by the terrible frustration and alienation of the young Negroes of the impoverished ghetto. The typical rioter was 17, from a fatherless home, unemployed, out of school, without any hope for the future—the typical rioter, the typical dropout, the typical Armed Forces rejectee. Do we realize that there are in our major cities over 500,000 such youth? Can we comprehend that hundreds of thousands more are literally lost to our sight—that they are unaccounted by the census, unseen by the unemployment statistics, not on the school rolls, simply drifting about our cities waiting for an explosion to happen—or to make that explosion happen? Seventeen percent of all Negro teenagers are uncounted by the census—indeed, even in the prime working age group, 30 to 34, 13 percent are uncounted. Our society now has no use, no function, for these people. Employers do not hire them; the schools have no place for them; the Army rejects them. They are for all the world like so many starlings or spent matches, there but unseen—until, on occasion, they riot. We all see them then.

Last month, the Labor Department reported that 950,000 new jobs were created for teenagers in the last year. But only 33,000—about 3 percent—went to Negroes. A Department spokesman said that "they just don't have the connections." Nor do they—connections to education or jobs or family. That is what the committee is trying to remedy.

First, the committee bill tries to connect them to education. There are 3 million children of poor families in the United States just between the ages of 3 and 5. Children of poor families participate in regular preschool programs far less than do children of families which are not poor: 38.1 percent of poor 5-year-olds are enrolled in such programs, for example, as against 77.6 percent of 5-year-olds who are not poor. Yet clearly, children of poor families need such programs the most. It is the children of poor families who suffer from mental retardation at a rate seven times greater than children from families who are not poor. Operation Headstart is designed to meet this need. In city after city, State after State, Headstart has done what its name says—it has given tens of thousands of poor children their first window on the world, their first understanding of language and color and number, some minimal preparation for learning. The administration bill would provide for full-year Headstart programs for only 170,000 children—out of the 3 million children of poor families aged 3

to 5. The Office of Economic Opportunity already has on hand registration of intent forms, filed by local agencies all over the country, for 320,000 children, and says that the total will shortly climb to 400,000. But under the administration request, 30 out of the 50 States will be barred from starting any new Headstart programs.

That is why the committee authorizes an additional \$200 million for Headstart: to meet at least that demand for programs which can be reasonably expected to be fully used this year, 328,000. The extra money will make a difference for over 150,000 children. And perhaps, 10 or 15 years in the future, our successors will not have to ask—at least as to these 150,000 children—why 67.5 percent of them cannot pass an eighth-grade equivalent test.

The committee has also attempted to connect poor youth to education at a higher level—at high school. The Secretary of Labor has testified that there are at least 1.2 million young people in this country between the ages of 16 and 18, who should be in school—and need part-time work to earn the money they need to stay in school. In city after city, the Neighborhood Youth Corps has helped them earn that money—and stay in school. In Providence, R.I., for example, the dropout rate decreased by 30 percent; in Detroit, the dropout rate for participants in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program was half the rate for those who could not participate. Every one of these young people adds to the strength of this country when he stays in school, and learns the value of work, and learns that we care what happens to him.

There are other young people, already dropped out of school, for whom the inschool programs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps are inapplicable. They need full-time work, and counseling, and supplementary education especially tailored to their situation. Some of these youth are in the cities, the homeless and jobless and alienated; others sit in rural hollows, farm jobs gone, or mines closed, without the education and training needed by an increasingly industrial society. For all of these the Neighborhood Youth Corps offers new opportunity, new hope, a chance for useful activity now and a life of contribution and self-sufficiency later. From Kinloch, Mo., to Oakland, Calif., from Covington, Ky., to Newark, N.J., the Neighborhood Youth Corps has proved its worth—most dramatically in the sharply lower rates of juvenile crime that have followed its progress.

That is why the committee has increased Neighborhood Youth Corps funds by \$196 million, from \$300 million to \$496 million: to provide 65,000 more part-time jobs to keep young people in school; and 25,000 more jobs for those who have already left school.

If we were to try to meet the full need, we might have provided billions for the Neighborhood Youth Corps alone; the committee figure is the amount that it is absolutely clear can usefully be spent under the present administrative competence of the Labor Department

and relevant local agencies. It is also the least we can do.

The committee would also move further to connect poor youth to work—both directly and through their parents. Unemployment is now the most serious problem facing poor people—particularly Negroes, particularly young people, most severely of all the young Negroes of the urban ghetto. The White House Conference on Civil Rights placed employment and income problems of Negroes at the head of its agenda for action in the United States.

Negro unemployment—

It said—

is of disaster proportions.

Even in today's booming economy, the unemployment rate for Negroes is about seven percent—more than twice the average for whites.

And the latest Department of Labor studies show that Negro unemployment in this "overheated" economy is increasing, and is now over 8 percent.

The gap between whites and nonwhites—

Continued the White House Conference—

is even greater for married people and heads of households who are most in need of a job to support their families.

In some areas such as Watts in Los Angeles, the rate of unemployment among Negroes is as high as forty percent.

The McCone Commission looked into the Watts riots—and said that the most serious problem in Watts is unemployment. The Wall Street Journal looked at Oakland—and said that the core of Oakland's plight is unemployment. Kenneth Clark's pioneering Haryou study looked at Harlem—and said that Harlem's key problem is unemployment. We simply must do more to see that people get off welfare, off the streets, and into decent, productive jobs. This is so for men and youth; it is even more important for their children. We know the importance of strong families to development; we know that financial security is important for family stability and that there is strength in the father's earning power. But in dealing with Negro families, we have too often penalized them for staying together.

As Richard Cloward said:

Men for whom there are no jobs will nevertheless mate like other men, but they are not so likely to marry.

Our society has preferred to deal with the resulting female-headed families not by putting the men to work but by placing the unwed mothers and children on public welfare—substituting check-writing machines for male wage-earners.

By this means we have robbed men of manhood, women of husbands, and children of fathers.

To create a stable monogamous family, we need to provide men (especially Negro men) with the opportunity to be men, and that involves enabling them to perform occupationally.

But we are not now meeting this challenge. No Government program now operating gives any substantial promise of meeting the unemployment crisis affecting the Negro of the cities. The Manpower Development and Training

Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Economic Development Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—these and similar efforts have been going on for some years. Yet in the last 5 years, while family income nationally was increasing 14 percent, family income in Watts dropped by 8 percent. And though special censuses have not been taken in other cities, anyone who walks the streets of Bedford-Stuyvesant or Harlem or Southside Chicago knows that the same decrease of income, the same collapse into deeper misery, has been occurring all over the country.

Therefore the committee has acted on two provisions to improve employment among the poor. The first is in section 205 of the act. This is a program for the employment training of poor people to work in fields related to the public welfare, such as health or community redevelopment, in which there are presently unmet needs for better service, for more hands to improve our society.

The second is an extension of this principle to the areas of greatest need within our society—training and employing poor people, through private industry and local agencies, to work on the improvement of the ghettos of poverty where they now live. This program will provide, on an experimental basis, a minimum of 30,000 jobs for those in the greatest need of employment. The program does not begin to meet the universe of need. In our urban ghettos alone, as I have said, there are hundreds of thousands of young people and adults desperately in need of the jobs that will be created by this program. The extent of the need is further apparent from the shocking statistics of Federal aid to dependent children: in New York City alone, ADC costs the Federal Government \$20 million each month; in our five largest cities, the annual ADC bill is over \$500 million. Housing, an appropriate subject for programs under this amendment, is an equally great need; 43 percent of all Negro housing is inadequate, and 14,000 children are injured or infected by rat bites each year. Child health—which may be acted upon by programs under this amendment, as well as by the neighborhood health center program of title II—is poor and care inadequate. Infant mortality in the ghettos is more than twice the rate outside—for example in Bedford-Stuyvesant in New York, whose rate of over 40 per thousand is one-third higher than the rate in the underdeveloped Communist country of Yugoslavia. Half of all babies born in Manhattan last year had no prenatal care at all; the rate of mental retardation among poor people in these poverty ghettos is seven times higher than the rate among the more fortunate.

But if this program does not begin to meet our needs, still it is a beginning of a beginning—an attempt to show that we can, with the cooperation of private enterprise, make all our cities decent places to live and work and raise a family. And it is a program which the executive departments have assured the committee that they can administer, an

authorization they know they can spend well within their capacity to administer. For this program—for this minimal attention to the greatest present cause of tension and difficulty in our domestic order—the committee has authorized \$150 million.

Still the question comes: even if we know that more is needed—and we know that more is needed; even if we know that the executive departments can usefully administer greater sums—and they have assured us that they can administer the increased amounts; still, is there not a war in Vietnam, a straitened budget, a need to curtail Government expenditure? Certainly none of us is against economy; none of us wants to spend more than we need to. But where is the truest economy? When we talk of taxation, we too often think—in this Chamber—of Federal excise and income taxes only. But the burden of local property taxes in cities and counties across the country is already the heaviest property owners can reasonably be expected to bear. And the cost of juvenile delinquency, of mental retardation, of extra police, of the myriad welfare programs we must provide for the jobless, the hopeless, the abandoned, the unemployable—these costs, in the billions of dollars, are paid by these local property owners. When a man goes to work, when his family goes off the relief rolls, when he moves from subsidized housing, when he begins to pay taxes, local tax rates can decline or be held within reasonable bounds. But the burden on property owners can only increase if we continue to shirk programs which prepare people for jobs in favor of leaving them to public charity.

The Secretary of Labor testified that the juvenile delinquency rate in some cities has dropped as much as 80 percent when poverty programs were undertaken. What is the cost of a juvenile delinquent who burdens society all his subsequent life? The Director of OEO estimated that one of these lost youth could cost us at least \$100,000 during his lifetime. If a child's early deprivation results in mental retardation, it will cost the State nearly a quarter of a million dollars to care for him in an institution for his lifetime. The Watts riot alone cost over \$40 million. So there should be no question of where the true economy lies.

And let us consider also the other items, the other programs, on which the executive branch, and we in the Congress, have thought it worthwhile to spend money. I cite these examples not to say that they are necessarily wasteful, that they should be abandoned. Many of them I have voted for, and will continue to support. What I do cite them for is to show how meager in comparison is the sum we propose, as a nation, to spend on the key to our future—the elimination of the inequalities of poverty. When we consider whether to spend \$150 million for employment; or \$200 million more for Headstart; or \$100 million more for health centers; let us consider also that we are willing to spend \$100 million for a single irrigation project; \$180 million for the development of a supersonic transport for an aviation

industry which had a net profit, in 1965, or of over \$366 million; \$50 million to subsidize the construction of airports; \$82 million for water recreation areas; \$92 million for highway beautification; \$3.9 billion for interstate highways; \$500 million in agricultural subsidy payments to the 2 percent of American farmers whose gross income is over \$100,000 annually; \$143 million for farmers to withdraw land from production; \$80 million to supplement the income of domestic sugarcane producers. Eighty-five million dollars for forest roads and trails, and \$33 million more for forest highways.

And the list goes on and on: \$5 billion to go to the moon, \$500,000 for free rifle ammunition to gun clubs, \$300 million for college housing and \$210,000 to promote the sale of cigarettes last year in three Asian countries alone. The poor, those in greatest need, do not generally water ski, nor do they use airports, and they are less concerned with a highway's width and beauty than with whether there is a job waiting at the end of it. We, the fortunate, are providing for our own needs, and the needs of our children, and our hopes for the future. But we have a greater responsibility to provide for those who cannot help themselves unless we help them to do it.

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 10 additional minutes on the bill to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. And let us also keep faith with those who have striven and sacrificed in the cause of a better life for all Americans—not just those who now stand on the battlefield in South Vietnam, so many of whom are from the very households who most need help; but also with the young of every age who are working now, in every city and State in the war on poverty.

The VISTA volunteers, for example, living and working on Indian reservations, and in the hills of Appalachia and in the city slums—giving in our own country the same measure of devotion and sacrifice that the Peace Corps gives to our country abroad. These people are to be congratulated; but more than congratulations they deserve our support, measure for measure with their own discomfort and danger and devotion to country.

The President has rightly pointed out that every dollar we authorize and appropriate now will have to be paid for in taxes later. We might as well face up to that now. The committee does not allege that this bill will not cost Americans more tax money now. But in the long run it will cost far less.

And the underlying issue—the fundamental moral question before us—was nowhere better stated than in the following words:

There are men who cry out that we must sacrifice. Well let us rather ask them, Who will they sacrifice?

Are they going to sacrifice the children who seek the learning, or the sick who need

medical care, or the families who dwell in squalor that are now brightened by the hope of home? Will they sacrifice opportunity for the distressed, the beauty of our land, the hope of poor?

Time may require further sacrifices, and if it does, then we will make them. But we will not heed those who wring it from the hopes of the unfortunate here in a land of plenty.

I believe that we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam. But if there are some who do not believe this, then in the name of justice let them call for the contribution of those who live in the fullness of our blessing, rather than try to strip it from the hands of those that are most in need.

And let no one think, that the unfortunate and the oppressed of this land sit stilled and alone in their hope . . . Hundreds of their servants and their protectors sit . . . in this great chamber.

Those are the words of President Johnson, in his state of the Union message. That is our responsibility. I believe we should keep the commitment made in these eloquent words. I think that is our responsibility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I support the war on poverty in the manner in which it is attacking poverty in my State. In Arkansas there is a new demonstration program under the Nelson amendment, called Project Green Thumb. The Green Thumb program is sponsored by the Farmers Union and is employing older and retired low-income farmers to beautify the highways in Arkansas.

Poverty in the rural areas of my State, primarily, is centered in two groups—the young and the old. For the young, the war on poverty offers such excellent programs as Headstart, college work programs, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. New hope has been created through these programs for thousands of young people from low-income families.

However, little opportunity for employment has existed for the older, low-income farmers despite the best efforts of the Arkansas Employment Service. Green Thumb has given hope and opportunity to these men. They have the knowledge and skills that we, as a Nation, have an opportunity to use to beautify America.

Arkansas is rapidly becoming one of the leading tourist States in the Nation. Our Ozarka tourist program is doing much to improve the economy in Arkansas. Increased tourist trade reduces unemployment and poverty.

The tourist business does not flourish where the roadsides are scarred by erosion, littered by beer cans, overgrown with weeds and void of flowers, shrubs, trees, and roadside parks. Green Thumb worker-trainees are helping the State highway department and local government to do a job which they cannot do now because of lack of funds.

The State highway department and other State and local agencies and groups are contributing help, materials, and supplies at an estimated value almost equal to the Federal grant for this program.

Most of the money in the Green Thumb program in Arkansas is used to pay these worker-trainees whose average income last year was less than \$800. None re-

ceived more than \$1,450 last year. Their average age is 69 and a number are in their eighties. One has just passed his 89th birthday. As Green Thumbers they receive \$1.25 an hour and work 3 days a week. Three-fourths of them are receiving social security payments but have little or no other income. Most are married and own their own small homes and a few acres. The goal of Green Thumb is to let them earn an additional \$1,500 a year thus bringing them above the poverty line.

In Newton County which is a very low-income county, these Green Thumbers have planted dogwood trees every 15 feet along 40 miles of highway. They supplied the trees from their own farms and farms of neighbors. They have repaired the guard rails and safety rails which had become run down, unsafe and unsightly. They built an overlook which for the first time lets tourists look down 1,000 feet upon one of the most beautiful valleys in Arkansas.

In Madison County, Green Thumbers created one of the most attractive roadside parks in all America. It is built in part under a cliff which makes it as cool in summer as any air-conditioned building and it is sheltered against the rain—it looks over a beautiful 10-mile valley. Congressman TRIMBLE, my esteemed colleague, dedicated this park last month. The community was most pleased, partly because this was the first park with picnic facilities in the county. In the county seat, as in most other Green Thumb counties, flowers have been planted in the town square. In Pike County, even the county sheriff helps by watering the flowers every night.

In Fulton County, Green Thumbers have gone out and cleaned up truck loads of trash from along the highway which allowed the State Highway mowers to cut the grass and weeds for the first time in years. Then the Green Thumbers followed up by planting trees and shrubs for many miles. They are also building a roadside park near the county seat which will be that community's first park. The garden club and home demonstration club are helping in this project. The State has acquired a hillside of wild azaleas in this county which Green Thumbers will be making into one of the beauty spots of northern Arkansas.

These men work hard because they have worked hard all their lives. While they are given about 25 days of training, they already have more skill and knowledge for working with plants and soil than many prize winning gardeners. No wonder that a number of the State highway supervisory personnel want to hire these men when they complete the program. Other Green Thumbers will go into the nursery business. In the other States in which Farmers Union sponsors Green Thumb, namely New Jersey, Oregon, Minnesota, and Indiana, Green Thumb worker-trainees are being trained to be self-employed gardeners for suburban homes.

In my State, everyone is pleased with Green Thumb: the State highway department, the county judges, local officials, community leaders, businessmen, families, and especially the Green Thumb workers themselves. They are proud of

being able to hold down a job and especially a job which improves their community.

The bill presented by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee would encourage more employment programs such as Green Thumb and encourage organizations to join in the war on poverty. This is creative use of talent of low income people in exchange for a job and more food on the table. These men do a good job; and as the president of our State garden clubs said:

You can tell the counties where Green Thumbers are working just as soon as you cross the line.

If title II can provide more programs like Green Thumb, I support it, and I hope the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity will continue to direct his personal attention to the success of Green Thumb in view of the value it has been to Arkansas and the other States.

"CHAMPS" IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, politically motivated critics of the war on poverty seem quick to express their disapproval of any little detail of the anti-poverty effort which falls short of its goal. Unfortunately overlooked frequently are the smashing successes the poverty program has achieved in its short, 2-year existence.

One such rousing success is Operation Champ, the summer recreation, physical fitness, and athletic program inspired by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY and sponsored in 10 major cities this summer for youths from 6 to 18 by the Office of Economic Opportunity in cooperation with local officials and organizations. The 10 cities in which Project Champ operated this summer were Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, St. Louis, and San Antonio.

What happened in Baltimore this summer illustrates the importance Operation Champ has for young Americans and America. Through a \$76,000 OEO grant for Project Champ, Baltimore was able to conduct a summerlong youth recreation program at five permanent recreation centers and in addition, in streets across the city by means of a mobile recreation unit—a truck bearing gym equipment and recreation supervisors. The Baltimore program not only provided healthy recreation programs for thousands of youths who would otherwise have been left idle to roam the streets, but also provided summer employment for 200 high-school-age members of the Neighborhood Youth Corps who aided the program supervisors.

Particular credit for the success of Baltimore's Operation Champ belongs to Baltimore's Western Police Youth League, which conducted the program for OEO. The league has conducted youth recreation programs in Baltimore for the last 6 years on a voluntary basis, but heretofore has not had the funds for such a comprehensive program. Typical, in fact, of the grassroots approach to the Project Champ program was its excellent direction this summer by Allen H. Burke, a Baltimore Police Department patrolman on leave for the summer.

Mr. President, Operation Champ successfully reached more than 180,000 American boys and girls this summer, some of whom had never before known what physical fitness and good recreation is, and engaged them in a well-rounded program of healthy organized recreation, athletic and physical fitness activities. In addition, the program created job opportunities for thousands of teenagers who might have otherwise wasted their summers in idleness and hopelessness.

Thousands of the participating youngsters and their parents in Baltimore alone have asked that Operation Champ be continued on an all-year-round, after-school basis. Whether or not a year-round program can be established, a clear and compelling case has been made for its continuation and expansion of Project Champ next summer and every year.

Project Champ is a key program in our efforts to show the way to a better, healthier, responsible life for disadvantaged youngsters all across America.

PROJECT GREEN THUMB

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the most widely praised parts of the poverty program is the one resulting from a joint effort by Lady Bird Johnson and representatives of the Farmers Union. This is called Project Green Thumb, a program in which retired farmers over 55 years of age work 3 or 4 days a week using their talents to help carry out roadside beautification projects. This project has provided work and increased income for our elderly rural citizens. I am hopeful that retired farmers in Utah will be included in the program next year.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Washington Evening Star describing this program be printed in the RECORD.

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

YEARS TO ENJOY: GREEN THUMB PROJECT CATCHES ON

(By Oscar A. Doob)

One of the most picturesque and possibly one of the most successful experimental projects in the "war on poverty" is called "Operation Green Thumb." Eventually, it is hoped, this activity will provide part-time jobs for thousands of needy retired farmers.

The only criticism one hears about this project is that it is not expanding rapidly enough. Everybody seems to like the idea, including the retired, low-income farmers who are itching to make a little money by putting their green thumbs to work.

Last spring, "Operation Green Thumb" was launched in the rural areas of Arkansas, New Jersey, Oregon and Minnesota. It got off to a fine start. Recently, it was extended into 10 counties of southern Indiana. Wisconsin may be next. Many other states are expected to come into the plan in 1967 because of the success of the pilot demonstration projects.

If you happen to be motoring in any of the test states and you see a small, happy group of hard-working oldsters, busy planting trees, trimming shrubs, and otherwise beautifying the highways and roadside parks, you will probably be seeing "Operation Green Thumb" in action. The ex-farmers are being paid the prevailing local wages—\$1.25 to \$1.50 an hour.

The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity gave \$768,000 to Green Thumb, Inc., a subsidiary of the National Farmers Union. The state governments and local groups involved

in the pilot projects are putting up another \$683,000, making a first-year budget of \$1,451,000. The most recent grant was for \$172,000 for the Indiana project, with the state underwriting about \$50,000 of that.

The pace at which "Operation Green Thumb" will grow depends on the cooperation of the various states and appropriation of additional federal funds for 1967. According to Henry E. Wilcox, national director of Green Thumb, Inc., the response from retired farmers and state highway departments has been most enthusiastic. There are often more applicants than jobs. About 400 farmers have been employed so far, a drop in the bucket. "There probably are a million old people of the type we would like to reach," explains Wilcox. "We have a long way to go to make a real dent in this situation. Next spring, I hope we will have thousands at work in many states."

While the green thumb jobs are more or less seasonal, efforts are being made to place these experienced farmers in regular work as gardeners, nursery workers, and highway maintenance men. "These rugged old fellows are hard, capable workers who love their jobs," said a state highway supervisor who plans to employ them regularly.

If you want to encourage your own state to set up a Green Thumb project, it could help a little if you wrote to your state highway commission or to the regional office of the National Farmers Union in your area. Every state and county has some of those displaced patriarchs of the soil who can still do a good job if their green thumbs are given a chance.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 19, line 3, strike "\$1,344,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,314,000,000."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, this amendment would reduce the authorization for title II of the bill by \$30 million. That is the amount originally allocated in the authorization for the operation of the adult basic education program, formerly contained in part B of title II of the economic opportunity law.

The Education Subcommittee, on which I served, proposed that adult basic education should be included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and should be removed from the poverty program. Although the Poverty Subcommittee, on which I also serve, seemed in agreement with that proposal, the parliamentary situation, with both bills progressing almost simultaneously to the full committee, required that timing for this change of programs be important.

Finally, the adult basic education program was moved to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as Senators will see if they refer to the middle of page 22 of the committee report.

However, Mr. President, although the program was deleted from this bill, the funds allocated for its operation were not removed from the amounts authorized for title II.

I, therefore, offer this amendment. Again, it would simply reduce the authorization for title II by \$30 million, which is the amount intended for adult basic education, but which is now unnecessary since that program is properly authorized in the elementary and secondary education bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be necessary.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has correctly stated the problem. By a vote of 9 to 6 in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it was decided to shift the adult basic education program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare insofar as the funding and the authorization for the program was concerned.

In the bill, as it was reported to the Senate, we had allowed \$30 million for this program under title II.

In the Primary-Secondary Education Act, however, which was marked up in the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, after the poverty bill had been brought to the floor, and after the decision had been made by the same Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to transfer the program to the Office of Education, adequate funding of this program was provided. That is to say, the education bill which will come to the floor after this bill is disposed of, does adequately fund the adult basic education program.

Accordingly, I am in accord with the amendment. We agreed in committee that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] should propose this reduction in the total amount of the authorization under title II.

Mr. President, I am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am happy that we have resolved this matter in this way.

In fairness to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] it should be said that in the committee, in the earlier stage, the matter was not as clear as it is now, but the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] pursued it knowing that it would eventuate in this way.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the manager has stated that he will accept the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 50, after line 16, add the following new section: "SEC. 26".

"**TRANSFER OF JOB CORPS TO DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

"**SEC. 26.** (a) The Job Corps of the Office of Economic Opportunity, together with the functions thereof, is transferred to the Department of Labor to be administered in coordination with programs carried out under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, on such date within six months after the date of enactment of this Act as the President may fix. The functions of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity with respect to the Job Corps are transferred to the Secretary of Labor. The functions transferred by this section shall be performed by the Secretary of Labor or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers, agencies, and employees of the Department of Labor as he shall designate.

"(b) There are transferred to the Department of Labor, for use in connection with the functions transferred by subsection (a), the personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) of the Job Corps, together with so much as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine of other personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and funds (available or to be made available) of the Office of Economic Opportunity which relate to functions transferred by this section."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Arizona yield to himself?

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] has prepared some remarks on the amendment, which he has asked me to make for him. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY READ BY SENATOR FANNIN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, this amendment is a relatively simple, but an important one. It would transfer to the Department of Labor the Job Corps program. It would provide for the coordination of the Job Corps program under

the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The Labor and Public Welfare Committee voted to transfer the adult basic education program to the Office of Education. I strongly supported the transfer. It makes sense. It will help to avoid needless and costly duplication and at the same time the adult basic education program will be administered by the agency having the experience and expertise in the field—the Office of Education.

Just as the Office of Education is the most qualified in the educational area, it is the Labor Department that has the experience and expertise in the manpower development and training field.

As my colleagues may know, the Manpower Development and Training Act has two parts. The responsibility for administering the so-called institute training, as distinguished from on-the-job training, rests with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the vocational education people. This concept is preserved in my amendment so that the vocational education people would guide the various camps.

Also it should be pointed out that the actual screening of the enrollees is handled by the State employment offices, which work closely with the Labor Department. Transfer of the Job Corps program to the Labor Department I am convinced would improve the screening operations for we would have one agency in charge of all the manpower programs. I feel certain that some of the youngsters that have been sent to the Job Corps camps could have been better served by the manpower development training programs or the vocational education programs.

Sending youngsters to these Job Corps camps is a costly operation. Before they are sent, we must first examine prospective enrollees' interest and abilities and see if one of the manpower programs will meet their needs.

Mr. President, the indictments against the Job Corps are many; all can be traced to its administration. The Job Corps is in serious trouble because it has serious administration troubles. Some of the many deficiencies of the Job Corps are:

First. The Job Corps has been harmed because of lack of discipline. The record shows that discipline problems at Job Corps camps became so serious that the majority leader of the Senate, Senator MANSFIELD, was forced to take the Senate floor and deliver a speech on this subject.

It is a telling indictment of the administration of the Job Corps program:

The basic idea of the Job Corps is fine, but I have become somewhat concerned about its implementation, the screening process used in filling the camps and overall inadequacies in the administration of the program. First of all, it seems to me that everyone was in too big a hurry to get the first camps operating, too little time was given to the screening of Job Corps applicants. There is a need to be more selective. There are many who can be helped and who are willing to be helped. These camps should be limited to those who have given some in-

dication that they want to be helped and are willing to try. It was not my intention to support the establishment of three reformatories in my State.

I am well aware that there can be bad apples in every program, but it seems to me that there is something wrong. Perhaps it is a matter of lack of know-how and inefficiency on the part of the administrative Job Corps personnel involved. They and those enrolled in the program should have been more selective in the very beginning. Certainly a man with a criminal charge against him should be kept under very close surveillance.

I do not like speaking in this vein, but I cannot stress too strongly the need for a more careful selection of Job Corps men and an insistence upon efficient and capable administrative and guidance personnel.

Second. The cost of the Job Corps program has been exorbitant. Cost per enrollee has been estimated as between \$9,000 and \$13,000 yearly. Mail that I receive indicates that the American people are not going to tolerate this kind of expense for too long. Unless we want to place the Job Corps program in jeopardy, we must take steps to reduce the cost of the Job Corps program. In order to reduce the costs, salaries must be kept in line, the dropout rate must be reduced, enrollees must be assigned to the nearest Job Corps center, and not flown across the country, and the staff-enrollee ratio must be made more reasonable.

Third. Inadequate followup procedures are available to enable the Congress and the American people to objectively evaluate the Job Corps program. To the committee's credit, they adopted an amendment I offered to improve this situation.

Fourth. The dropout rate has been too high. It is my understanding that the dropout rate overall is about 25 percent. During executive sessions, I have heard Senators express disappointment over our educators for their failure to prevent dropouts. While I do not question that improvements can be made in our school system, I would point out that neither the per pupil costs nor the teacher-pupil ratio comes near approaching that of the Job Corps. One wonders how many of these dropouts would have left school if the school system enjoyed the staff-enrollee and per enrollee expenditures of the Job Corps.

Many say we should not make major changes in the program this year, and that we should give the program one last chance to prove itself. The committee's actions in transferring adult education evidence, in my judgment, a decision by the committee members that the poverty program will not be permitted to drift along for another year, evidenced a determination by the committee that administration by the next best agency will not suffice.

In my judgment, the various indictments leveled against the administration of the Job Corps by the Office of Economic Opportunity are unanswerable. As Vice President HUMPHREY stated:

We must change or discard those programs which are not making headway, and we must expand those that are.

While I fully understand the normal bureaucratic opposition to the transfer of the program to another department, I believe that we have the duty both to the youngsters enrolled in the program and to the taxpayers who are footing the bill to make certain that the program is both effective and efficient.

Transfer of the Job Corps to the Labor Department will greatly improve the program's administration, reduce its costs, and make it far more effective.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I strongly support adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, most of the problems with which we have dealt in the committee had thorough and detailed consideration.

When I first went into the matter of marking up the bill this year, I regarded these questions as being rather neatly "put where they belonged" in an administrative sense in terms of Government departments, as regards the various activities carried on by the Office of Economic Opportunity. That would include education. It would include various phases of manpower training. It would include even Operation Headstart. It certainly would include the Job Corps.

The more I studied the problem, the more testimony I heard, the less I felt that we were justified in doing it at this time—and I emphasize the words "at this time."

Let us remember that in 1966 the program became 2 years old. The rate of increase of utilization of the various aspects of the program have enormously increased only within the past year. When we did what we did with the program, we sought a coordinated war on poverty by a high level Federal official through whom the job could be done, tying in all the departments rather than throwing the poverty program, in its initial stages, upon the shoulders of already overburdened departments to whom it would be another added activity.

In deep conscience, I say to my friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and also to the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]—and I think it is so gracious of the Senator from Arizona to have undertaken this for the Senator from California, for reasons with which we are well acquainted—that one cannot say that this is not an amendment of serious purpose and of serious importance which lends itself to a reasonable view of the situation, until one understands the strong and the coordinated war on poverty which has been created by a unitary administration, the fact that the programs are just getting off the ground, and the fact that they are not lost, as they would be in the departments—and I do not say that invidiously—in an already overburdened bureaucracy without the zeal and enthusiasm which I think, in all fairness, whatever

may have been my disagreements with him, and whatever they are now, Sargent Shriver has succeeded in fusing into the office, at least up to this time.

Those of us who know the score know that this does not last forever. Thus, what is being sought through this amendment will face us, without question, in a year or two. I am therefore finally persuaded—and I really have sweated this out myself because I rather had the same view that my colleagues had, before I really did think it through and stew over it, to use a colloquialism—that for another year, at least, we should continue the present kind of program with the drive and morale, and the specialization which results from this office with a special, as it were, crusade frame of reference, as these camps are being built up.

If Senators will look at the initial words of the committee report, they will find such an enormous increase which has gone into the Job Corps camps in the very short period of time in which they have been in operation that the Job Corps camps in 1966 will have doubled as compared to what they were at the close of fiscal year 1965.

I respectfully submit that this is the kind of crash activity which we expected in the war on poverty. We should therefore give it another year, in my judgment, and that will be the optimum period in which to absorb and in which to refine it, and in which to have the kind of treatment which it will obtain, and has obtained, in the war on poverty administration, rather than throwing it on the shoulders of an already heavily overburdened Labor Department where there will be yet less activity and will not have the kind of evangelism and the kind of detailed, personal treatment which I think this needs in order, really, to solidly establish it.

Therefore, I think the amendment, while entirely appropriate to test the question, is a year ahead of itself.

It is for these reasons that I most reluctantly feel as I do, that I shall not be able to support the amendment.

I wish to add it is undoubtedly "down the road," but I think it is still "down the road a piece," and that there is at this writing next year more to be gained for the program by leaving it within the framework in which it is now located than in making the change proposed.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I do not think we can afford to gamble with the taxpayers' money for another year. I should like to quote from a statement made in the other body on this subject. I read from page 24134 of the RECORD for September 28, 1966:

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the questions were raised as to whether the Department of Labor could effectively handle this program. I raised this question with Secretary of Labor Wirtz at the hearings.

He indicated very emphatically that he could handle the program. I might also point out when this proposal of a Job Corps was first brought before us it was proposed that the Department of Labor should ad-

minister it. At that time I raised many questions, wondering whether they should or not, realizing that this had not been the case in the old CCC camps. I realized later that the administration was right when they proposed it be handled by the Department of Labor, and I have been convinced of it since. Watching the OEO operating the Job Corps camps over a period of 2 years convinces me that it should be handled by the Department of Labor. Only in this way can these training programs be properly coordinated with those entering the OEO and those programs that are outside of the OEO. If we would do this, I am convinced we will have a coordinated job training program for the young people who have dropped out or who need this type of training in school or else who have to have an environmental change in order to learn skills that are necessary for employment. Therefore I would say the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], has offered an amendment which really must be adopted if this program will be working well. If we do not do it this year, it will only be a short time before it will have to be done, anyway.

Mr. President, let me again state that I believe this amendment should be adopted and I urge the Senate to do so.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes in opposing the amendment.

Mr. President, as I had occasion to point out last Friday when I made my opening remarks on this bill, the Job Corps is one of the most controversial programs in the war against poverty. Many mistakes have been made in connection with the administration of the Job Corps. Instances of maladministration have been pointed out by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and others, including, in one instance, an incident raised on the floor of the Senate by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The authorization for the Job Corps for the current fiscal year has been cut back from \$310 million for fiscal 1966 to \$228 million. This is possible because the initial programs of the Job Corps included the construction or the renovation of Job Corps centers, which was very expensive. That work has now been done.

It should be pointed out that the Job Corps, like many new programs, has suffered from growing pains. It is almost inevitable that we should expect administrative mistakes.

I should point out that there were 47 Job Corps centers at the end of fiscal year 1965; while at the end of fiscal 1966 there were 106.

These Job Corps centers are of three kinds.

First, there are the conservation centers, many of which are located in national forests and national parks under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Labor has no particular competence in dealing with enterprises of this sort.

The second type Job Corps center is the urban training center, largely near large cities. There again the Department of Labor, with an infinite variety of tasks at present, which it is accomplishing with great skill and ability, has

plenty to do with its present responsibilities.

The third kind of Job Corps centers are residential camps for women. Here again the Department of Labor has no particular competence in this area.

In addition, the Department of Labor has not asked for the responsibility for the centers. OEO is just beginning to build up experience as to how to administer the centers. To shift it to another department now, when we are just beginning to stabilize the program, would, to my way of thinking, be a serious mistake. Because we do not like some of the administrative errors which have received great publicity, it is suggested that by turning the program over to the Department of Labor, we will cure such mistakes. This is specious reasoning. There is no reason to believe that the Department of Labor which at present has no experience with such a program would do any better with it than would the Office of Economic Opportunity, which now has 2 years of experience in the operation of centers.

Let me summarize my objections to the proposed amendment under three heads.

First. The Job Corps is a program which seeks to deal with the total problems of disadvantaged youths in a residential setting. It aims not only to increase their employability, but, in the words of the statute, to prepare them for the "responsibilities of citizenship." Conceptually, such a residential program does not fit well within the traditional areas of responsibility of the Department of Labor.

This is not to say that the Department of Labor could not administer the program, or that it would not do so in a manner sympathetic to its purposes. But the fact of the matter is that this is not an area where it has any particular competence.

Second. The Job Corps, as I have said, is a new and developing program. In the process of starting, not only the immediate staff of the Job Corps, but the Office of Economic Opportunity officials who work with it, have learned a good deal about the daily problems with which they must deal, the constraints within which it must operate, and the changes and new directions which are needed. This represents an asset in terms of continuity on matters of administration and policy which is most important to any program, and which is particularly difficult for a major new program to acquire.

The cost of relearning and of rethinking countless questions, just at a time when the program is really getting into what might be termed its "production" stage, would be a heavy one. For a complex program which is already bearing the weight of past startup problems, could well be critical.

Finally, in the residential setting, with its full range of services, Job Corps seeks to deal with the special and total problems caused by hard-core poverty. In this respect, Job Corps and Community Action, are probably the most complex

and difficult of the Economic Opportunity Act programs.

So long as there is a director principally responsible for the war on poverty, I believe it is desirable that responsibility for this program remain with him. The director should be expected to assume a special responsibility for those programs which involve the most complex assignments and should draw upon all possible resources to achieve success.

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

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I am interested in the Senator's remarks on the Job Corps, because I believe we have one so-called residential center in my State which, after great difficulty, has acquired 29—students, would they be called?

Mr. CLARK. Enrollees.

Mr. AIKEN. Enrollees. I wonder why enrollees are not recruited from nearby locations, and why they are all required to come from distant parts of the country to one of these centers. What is the reason for it?

Mr. CLARK. That was a problem which gave the committee a good deal of trouble, and we have inserted in the bill an amendment which will require that in the future enrollees should be sent to camps or centers within the general area or region in which they reside.

When the program was new and had only 47 centers it was often difficult to send enrollees to centers near their home. Now with 106 centers spread across the country, the Office of Economic Opportunity administration has been more and more able to put the young people into centers close to their own homes. Under the committee amendment, this will be done more and more in the future.

The thought has been expressed, and I think the Senator might agree that it has some validity. When we are dealing with these conservation camps dealing largely with national forests and national parks—it might be a good thing to get a young person out of New York City and up to the heady and pure air of Vermont. I think that remains as a good reason for sending some of the youngsters a good way from home.

Even with this, the committee has required that the Director, wherever possible, send an enrollee to a camp close to his home.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not too familiar with the work at the center to which I refer. We have heard for some time that it was not progressing very well. The fact that they only have 29 enrollees, according to the latest figures I have seen, would indicate, perhaps, that it is not too attractive, although it is in a beautiful setting in the Green Mountains National Forest.

Mr. CLARK. That may well be true. I admitted, before the Senator came in, that there had been a lot of headaches connected with the program. It is certainly far from perfect. There are some areas where it has not worked well.

But our review convinced the majority of the committee that we ought to give them another year, to see where they go. We think they are making progress, and it did not seem to us it would be useful to transfer the program to the Department of Labor.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that the Department of Labor, with all its experience in this field, would be able to take this work up and go ahead without all of the bother and the mishaps which seem to attend establishing the Job Corps centers.

Mr. CLARK. I tried to point out, I think before the Senator entered the Chamber, that the Department of Labor really has no experience with residential centers.

Mr. AIKEN. A brandnew organization has not had any experience, either, has it?

Mr. CLARK. It has now had 2 years. It has learned a great deal.

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, it is? How long does the Senator think it will take before it is fully qualified to operate these centers?

Mr. CLARK. I am very hopeful that things should fully stabilize during the next year.

Mr. AIKEN. I see.

Mr. CLARK. I think we will see a vast improvement in administration when we come back with a bill next year.

The philosophy of the committee—with which the Senator from Vermont may not agree—was that we could not, in the time available, engage in sufficient oversight to effect vast legislative changes in the program this year. The subcommittee, which I have the honor to serve as chairman, intends to undertake next year what I hope will be an extensive study as to what changes legislatively, if any, should be made.

With respect to this particular amendment, the Labor Department has not requested transfer of the program and has not supported any such effort.

Mr. AIKEN. I might say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I have been considerably disturbed lest the operations of the Job Corps up to this time tend to discredit other parts of the Office of Economic Opportunity program which are contributing a considerable measure of success in the direction in which they are going.

Mr. CLARK. There is no doubt that the Job Corps has been a most controversial part of the poverty program. We do not think it would help to transfer it to the Labor Department, nor do we believe we ought to abandon the program.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not speaking of helping the Job Corps program. I am speaking of doing harm to other phases of the poverty program. As the Senator knows, the criticism directed toward the whole program is largely on account of the Job Corps. It seems to me that if you have gangrene in one finger, you had better cut it off to save the hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I quite agree with the Senator from Vermont that the program is controversial, but we feel it is doing good work preparing and a great many people. We do not want to see the program killed.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not want to hurt other parts of the program that are working by trying to maintain one that is not working.

Mr. CLARK. Well, as the Senator knows, this amendment is not to eliminate the Job Corps, but merely to transfer it to the Department of Labor.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. FANNIN. I commend the Senator from Vermont, because he has brought out a very important feature of what is involved in the amendment.

I want the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania to know that the Members on this side of the aisle are certainly not opposed to the objectives of the Job Corps. We support its objectives, and feel that more can be done. That is why this recommendation is being made.

I call attention to what happened in the State of Arizona. There is a Job Corps camp on the perimeter of the Navaho reservation. I do not know what exists there today, but I know that when this program was getting underway, and for months after it had been established, there was not a single Indian in that Job Corps camp.

Arizona has more Indians than does any other State in the Union. The Indians are in abject poverty. They are in greater need of this service than is any other group in our Nation.

The Indians are native Americans and they are perhaps more deserving of consideration than is any other ethnic group.

I feel that this is an indication of a mistake. I do not see that corrections have been made in the program as time has passed.

We still have serious problems which exist. As the Senator from Pennsylvania has expressed it, this is the most criticized program of the OEO programs. Consequently, I think we can justify the making of this change.

The Secretary of the Department of Labor has stated that they can handle the program, and the Department must feel that it has the people qualified to do so or the Secretary would never have made the statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, whether he can handle the program or not, the Secretary has not sought such a transfer nor has he supported any effort to transfer it.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, this is a troublesome program, but it is one of great responsibility. We have the obligation to try to see that the program is handled to the best advantage of the youths that are involved.

I feel consequently that it would be extremely helpful if this program could

be transferred to the Department of Labor.

I am sure that if we consider the tremendous cost involved we will realize that we could send a youth through Harvard or perhaps through Oxford for \$9,000 to \$13,000.

I think that we should take into consideration whether the same or a lesser amount of money could be expended, under proper supervision, with far more productive results.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this must be a question of judgment. The overwhelming majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare felt that it would be a mistake to transfer this responsibility from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Labor Department.

Our dear friends in the minority are standing alone on this proposition. They urge the transfer without any justification or rationale as to why the Department of Labor can do a better job.

Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] has correctly pointed out to me that there was no roll-call vote in the committee on this transfer. The suggestion as to the transfer was made by a member of the committee but it was never brought before the committee for a vote.

I think we should reject the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. 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 Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator

from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH].

If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 274 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Aiken	Hill	Russell, Ga.
Boggs	Hruska	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cotton	Miller	Smith
Dirksen	Morton	Talmadge
Ervin	Mundt	Thurmond
Fannin	Murphy	Tower
Gore	Pearson	Williams, Del.
Hickenlooper	Prouty	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—38

Bartlett	Brewster	Byrd, Va.
Bible	Burdick	Byrd, W. Va.

Cannon	Long, La.	Pastore
Case	Mansfield	Pell
Clark	McCarthy	Proxmire
Dodd	McGee	Randolph
Ellender	McGovern	Ribicoff
Fulbright	Monroney	Russell, S.C.
Harris	Montoya	Symington
Holland	Morse	Tydings
Jackson	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Kennedy, N.Y.	Muskie	Young, Ohio
Long, Mo.	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—35

Allott	Griffin	McClellan
Anderson	Gruening	McIntyre
Bass	Hart	Metcalf
Bayh	Hartke	Mondale
Bennett	Hayden	Neuberger
Church	Inouye	Robertson
Cooper	Javits	Scott
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Smathers
Dominick	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Douglas	Kuchel	Stennis
Eastland	Lausche	Yarborough
	Magnuson	

So Mr. MURPHY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated and made the pending business.

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 29, immediately after line 17, insert the following new subsection:

"(1) The Director shall, out of the funds authorized for this Title, set aside \$527,000,000 for making grants for carrying out programs eligible for assistance under such sections which assist young people in areas having concentrations of children from low income families who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance and which include (A) the furnishing of such comprehensive health, nutritional, social, educational and mental health services as the Director finds will aid such children to undertake successfully the regular elementary school program, (B) the provision of appropriate activities to encourage the participation of parents of such children and the effective use of their services, and (C) such other training, technical assistance, evaluation and follow-through activities as may be necessary or appropriate."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this amendment would earmark in the basic legislation \$527 million for the Head-start program. This is the same amount which the committee indicated in its report it desired to have the OEO spend on this program under title II—the community action title.

It was the committee's feeling, shared by OEO, that it is wise to give maximum flexibility in the administration of these community action programs to the local

community action agency in line with meeting the needs of that particular community.

Of course, we will debate this issue quite fully tomorrow, however, I want the RECORD to show my opposition, as manager of the bill, to the amendment and the basic reason why I oppose it.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute merely to say that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has just explained my amendment very accurately.

I believe that the Headstart program is the most valuable and the most acceptable one of all the programs in this so-called war on poverty.

It seems to me that we should have the funds which the committee has recommended for that purpose. That is all my amendment would do.

We can, of course, discuss this at some length tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter directed to me by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Economic Opportunity Act, with offices at 2027 Massachusetts Avenue NW., in Washington, D.C., under date of October 3, 1966, which deals with support for the pending measure as it came out of the committee on behalf of a number of civic agencies.

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

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: We believe that the most important achievement of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is the awareness on the part of the nation that there exists in the United States great numbers of poor people amidst unparalleled affluence. It is also clear that, despite the urgent need to help these millions of people move out of poverty, only a small proportion of the total receive direct assistance under the current anti-poverty legislation. The anti-poverty measure reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee (S. 3164) offers a positive means of advancing the national commitment to eliminate poverty. The Senate Committee's action, in view of the modest request by the Administration, signifies a will to deal forcefully with a difficult problem.

The undersigned organizations urge strong support for the Senate Bill. Further, we hope you will oppose all amendments which would lessen the effectiveness of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

American Jewish Committee.
National Association of American Social Workers.

National Student Association.
Appalachian Volunteers, Inc.
American Federation of Teachers.

National Council of Catholic Women.
Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO.

National Council of Churches.
American Veterans Committee.
Executive Committee, Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty.

Synagogue Council of America.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Cooperative League of the United States of America.

National Sharecroppers Fund.

National Council of Senior Citizens.
Division of Human Relations and Economic Affairs, General Board of Social Concerns, the Methodist Church.

Anti Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
Americans for Democratic Action.

Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
Community Relations Division, American Friends Service Committee.

The Negro American Labor Council.
National Association for Community Development.

United Steel Workers of America, AFL-CIO.
National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

National Council of Jewish Women.
Department of Social Responsibility, Unitarian Universalist Association.

United Automobile, Aerospace, Agricultural and Implement Workers of America.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move to recommit S. 3164 with instructions that the committee report the bill back with total authorizations provided for therein not in excess of the total authorizations provided for in the House-passed bill, H.R. 15111; and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be made the order of business at an hour tomorrow that perhaps the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I can work out—an hour agreeable to the two of us; but I would like to call it up sometime tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that while the Senator from Virginia is filing his motion to recommit now, it will not be the next order of business to be disposed of by the Senate because the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has an amendment he wishes to present. But I assure the Senator from Virginia that sometime tomorrow he will have his motion called up and disposed of before the Senate adjourns.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, could we fix an hour tomorrow; perhaps 2 or 3 o'clock?

Mr. CLARK. I do not see how we can. We do not know what will happen. I agree with the Senator from Virginia that we could call it up tomorrow. There are a number of amendments which Senators on both sides of the aisle would like to have disposed of before we vote on a motion to recommit.

I realize the Senator's motion has some priority under the rules, but I hope he will let us do a little spadework, which I think is the ordinary procedure.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I can assure the Senator that I want to cooperate but I would like to have some reasonable hour designated.

Mr. CLARK. Would 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon be satisfactory?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Four o'clock tomorrow afternoon would be satisfactory, with a half hour for each side.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit, filed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] may be voted on at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, after the one-half hour on each side provided for by the unanimous-consent agreement has been used up.

Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is that unanimous-consent request in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent is in order.

Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

S. 3046, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that permission be granted the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have until midnight tonight to file the report on S. 3046, the Elementary and Secondary Education amendments of 1966.

I further ask unanimous consent that the report be printed with supplemental and individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1356. An act to amend the Judicial Code to permit Indian tribes to maintain civil actions in Federal district courts without regard to the \$10,000 limitation, and for other purposes;

S. 2070. An act to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of South Dakota at Rapid City;

S. 2463. An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments, and for other purposes;

S. 3080. An act to amend section 8 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority, and for other purposes;

S. 3096. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes;

S. 3715. An act to improve the aids to navigation services of the Coast Guard; and

S. 3830. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant

to such act, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FALLON, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. KUNKEL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2947) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve and make more effective certain programs pursuant to such Act, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

TITLE II—CLEAN RIVERS RESTORATION PROGRAM

Statement of purpose

SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to accelerate pollution control and abatement programs through the preparation and development of basin pollution control and abatement plans and through the establishment of additional incentives to encourage waste treatment consistent with water quality standards.

Submission of plan

SEC. 202. In the case of intrastate waters, whenever the Governor of the State wherein such waters are located develops a basin pollution control and abatement plan, he is authorized to submit such plan for approval by the Secretary and Congress in accordance with this title. In the case of interstate waters, whenever not less than 50 per centum of the Governors of the States wherein such waters are located develop a basin pollution control and abatement plan, they are authorized to submit such plan for approval by the Secretary and Congress in accordance with this title. In the case of interstate waters, whenever an interstate agency develops a basin pollution control and abatement plan for waters under its jurisdiction, such agency is authorized to submit such plan for approval by the Secretary and Congress in accordance with this title. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in the event that the Upper Colorado River Basin is involved, the Governors of at least three of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming or, in the event the Columbia River Basin is involved, the Governors of at least three of the four States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington or, in the event the Hudson River Basin is involved, a majority of the Governors including the Governors of New York and New Jersey must develop, or concur in the development of, a basin pollution control and abatement

plan, including any such basin plan developed by an interstate agency.

Review of plan

“SEC. 203. (a) Upon submission of a proposed basin pollution control and abatement plan to the Secretary, he shall transmit such plan to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Water Resources Council, and, when appropriate, the Secretary of State for review. Within sixty days of transmission of such plan, such officers and the Council shall notify the Secretary of their views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan.

“(b) The Secretary shall review the proposed basin pollution control and abatement plan together with the views, comments, and recommendations received pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and, if he determines that the plan will adequately and effectively maintain the waters covered by the plan at the level of quality established by the applicable water quality standards for those waters, he shall approve the plan.

Congressional approval

“SEC. 204. After the Secretary approves a basin pollution control and abatement plan in accordance with section 203 of this title, he shall transmit such plan together with all views, comments, and recommendations received from any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government to Congress for approval of such plan by Congress by a specific statute of approval.

Grant program for treatment works

“SEC. 205. Whenever a basin pollution control and abatement plan is approved by Congress in accordance with this title, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to States, municipalities, and interstate agencies from funds appropriated and allocated under authority of section 8 of this Act to assist in financing the construction of treatment works within such basin subject to the following limitations:

“(1) the amount of any grant approved by the Secretary shall not exceed 40 per centum of the estimated reasonable construction costs of such treatment works, except that the percentage limitation of 40 per centum imposed by this clause shall be increased to 50 per centum in the case of grants made under this section from funds allocated for a fiscal year to a State under section 8(c) of this Act if the State agrees to pay not less than 25 per centum of the estimated reasonable costs (as determined by the Secretary) of all projects for which Federal grants are to be made under this section from such allocation;

“(2) no grant shall be made to assist in financing any such works which are receiving a Federal grant under any other provision of law, and no Federal grant shall be made under any other provision of law to assist in financing any treatment works for which a grant has been made under this title, except a supplementary grant under section 214 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 or a supplementary grant under section 101 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965;

“(3) no grant shall be made unless such works have been approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and have been certified by such agency or agencies as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs.

Approval of grants from other agencies

“SEC. 206. After Congress approves a basin pollution control and abatement plan, application for a grant to assist in financing

the construction of treatment works in such basin made under any other provisions of law shall not be approved by the head of any other Federal agency, by the Appalachian Regional Commission, or any other regional commission established under authority of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, such works substantially conform to such basin plan.

Administrative expenses

“SEC. 207. The Secretary is authorized to make a grant to pay not to exceed 50 per centum of the administrative expenses of a designated planning agency in preparing a basin pollution control and abatement plan for submission for approval under this title. Only a planning agency designated as follows shall be eligible for such a grant:

“(1) in the case of intrastate waters, the Governor may designate an agency of State government as the planning agency;

“(2) in the case of interstate waters, not less than 50 per centum of the Governors of the States in which such waters are located may designate either agencies of the governments of such States, or an interstate agency.

Use of Federal employees

“SEC. 208. The head of each department, agency, and instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized to detail employees of such department, agency, or instrumentality to assist any State or interstate agency in the preparation of a basin pollution control and abatement plan for submission and approval under this title, upon a request from such State or interstate agency for such assistance.

Specific designations and approvals

“SEC. 209. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Tennessee Valley Authority is designated as the planning agency for the Tennessee River Basin, and the Delaware River Basin Commission created by the Delaware River Basin compact is designated as the planning agency for the Delaware River Basin as defined for the purposes of such compact. Upon development of a basin pollution control and abatement plan (1) by such Authority and approval of such plan by the Board of Directors of such Authority or (2) by such Commission and approval by such Commission, such plan shall be a basin pollution control and abatement plan which shall be transmitted directly by such Authority or such Commission to Congress for approval in accordance with this title.

Labor standards

“SEC. 210. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects for which grants are made under section 205 shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing for the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

“SEC. 211. For the purposes of this title—“(1) the term ‘basin’ includes, but is not limited to, rivers and their tributaries,

streams, coastal waters, sounds, estuaries, bays, lakes, and portions thereof, as well as the lands drained thereby.

(2) the term 'construction' shall have the same meaning as it has in section 8 of this Act."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by inserting immediately above the heading preceding section 1 of such Act the following:

"TITLE I—WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAM"

SEC. 202. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "including, but not limited to, pollution resulting from the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and the temporary use of new or improved chemical additives which provide substantial immediate improvement to existing treatment processes."

(b) Section 5 of such Act is further amended by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsection (e), (f), and (g), respectively, and by inserting immediately after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

(d) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to persons for research and demonstration projects for prevention of pollution of waters by industry, including, but not limited to, the treatment of industrial waste. No grant shall be made under this subsection in an amount in excess of \$1,000,000, no grant shall be made for more than 70 per centum of the cost of the project, and no grant shall be made for any project unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve a useful purpose in the development or demonstration of a new or improved method of treating industrial wastes or otherwise preventing pollution of waters by industry, which method shall have industry-wide application."

(c) Subsection (e) of section 5 of such Act, as redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "(1)" and by striking out all of paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(d) Section 5 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

(h) (1) The Secretary shall, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Water Resources Council, and with other appropriate Federal, State, interstate, or local public bodies and private organizations, institutions, and individuals, conduct and promote, and encourage contributions to, a comprehensive study of the effects of pollution, including sedimentation, in the estuaries and estuarine zones of the United States on fish and wildlife, on sport and commercial fishing, on recreation, on water supply and water power, and on other beneficial purposes. Such study shall also consider the effect of demographic trends, the exploitation of mineral resources and fossil fuels, land and industrial development, navigation, flood and erosion control, and other uses of estuaries and estuarine zones upon the pollution of the waters therein.

(2) In conducting the above study, the Secretary shall assemble, coordinate, and organize all existing pertinent information on the Nation's estuaries and estuarine zones; carry out a program of investigations and surveys to supplement existing information in representative estuaries and estuarine zones; and identify the problems and areas where further research and study are required.

(3) The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a final report of the study authorized by this subsection not later than three years after the date of enactment of this subsection. Copies of the report shall be made available to all interested parties, public and private. The report shall include, but not be limited to—

(A) an analysis of the importance of estuaries to the economic and social well-being of the people of the United States and of the effects of pollution upon the use and enjoyment of such estuaries;

(B) a discussion of the major economic, social, and ecological trends occurring in the estuarine zones of the Nation;

(C) recommendations for a comprehensive national program for the preservation, study, use, and development of estuaries of the Nation, and the respective responsibilities which should be assumed by Federal, State, and local governments and by public and private interests.

(4) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1967, June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969, to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

(5) For the purpose of this subsection, the term 'estuarine zones' means an environmental system consisting of an estuary and those transitional areas which are consistently influenced or affected by water from an estuary such as, but not limited to, salt marshes, coastal and intertidal areas, bays, harbors, lagoons, inshore waters, and channels, and the terms 'estuary' means all or part of the mouth of a navigable or interstate river or stream or other body of water having unimpaired natural connection with open sea and within which the sea water is measurably diluted with fresh water derived from land drainage.

(i) There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, other than subsection (h), not to exceed \$75,000,000 per fiscal year for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1967, June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1969. Not less than 25 per centum of any amounts appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year shall be expended during such fiscal year in carrying out subsection (d) of this section."

SEC. 203. Section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"Cost estimate and study"

SEC. 6. (a) In order to provide the basis for evaluating programs authorized by this Act, the development of new programs, and to furnish the Congress with the information necessary for authorization of appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1967, the Secretary, in cooperation with State water pollution control agencies and other water pollution control planning agencies, shall make a detailed estimate of the cost of carrying out the provisions of this Act; a comprehensive study of the economic impact on affected units of government of the cost of installation of treatment facilities; and a comprehensive analysis of the national requirements for and cost of treating municipal, industrial, and other effluent to attain such water quality standards as established pursuant to this Act or applicable State law. The Secretary shall submit such detailed estimate and such comprehensive study of such cost for the three-year period beginning July 1, 1968, to the Congress no later than January 10, 1968, such study to be updated each year thereafter.

(b) The Secretary shall also make a complete investigation and study to determine (1) the need for additional trained State and local personnel to carry out programs assisted pursuant to this Act and

other programs for the same purpose as this Act, and (2) means of using existing Federal training programs to train such personnel. He shall report the results of such investigation and study to the President and the Congress not later than July 1, 1967."

SEC. 204. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out "and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$5,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$5,000,000, and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$10,000,000."

SEC. 205. (a) Subsection (b) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$1,200,000," and "\$4,800,000," in clause (2) of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,400,000," and "\$9,600,000," respectively.

(2) by striking out "(A)" in clause (2) of such subsection.

(3) by striking out "project, and (B) for the purpose of the limitation in the last sentence of subsection (d), the share of each municipality so determined shall be regarded as a grant for the construction of treatment works;" in clause (2) of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "project;".

(4) by amending the last sentence of such subsection to read as follows: "The percentage limitation of 30 per centum imposed by clause (2) of this subsection shall be increased to 40 per centum, and the dollar limitations imposed by such clause shall not apply, in the case of grants made under this section from funds allocated for a fiscal year to a State under subsection (c) of this section if the State agrees to pay not less than 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost (as determined by the Secretary) of all projects for which Federal grants are to be made under this section from such allocation."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall take effect July 1, 1966.

SEC. 206. Subsection (d) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out all beginning with "and \$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967" through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "\$150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1968, \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, \$650,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$950,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

SEC. 207. (a) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(h) If, prior to commencement of construction of any treatment works in advance of the availability of funds for a grant under this section, the Secretary approves such project, and the State, municipality, intermunicipal, or interstate agency thereafter constructs such project and submits an application to the Secretary approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies for a grant for such project, the Secretary, upon his approval of such application, is authorized to make a grant under this section for such project to be paid from future appropriations. No such grant shall be made (1) unless all of the provisions of this Act have been complied with to the same extent and with the same effect as though the grant were to be made for future construction of the project, (2) in an amount exceeding a grant which would

otherwise be made under this section for the future construction of such project. Neither an approval of the project by the Secretary prior to construction, nor the making of a grant by the Secretary for a project to be paid from a future appropriation, nor any other provision of this subsection, shall be construed to constitute a commitment or obligation of the United States to provide funds to make or pay any grant for a project."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to any project on which construction is initiated after June 30, 1966, except that in the case of any project on which construction was initiated after June 30, 1966, and before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary may approve such project for the purposes of section 8(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act subsequent to the commencement of construction.

SEC. 208. Subsection (f) of section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended (1) by striking out "(f)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(f)(1)", (2) by inserting immediately after the third sentence thereof the following: "It shall be the responsibility of the Hearing Board to give every person contributing to the alleged pollution or affected by it an opportunity to make a full statement of his views to the Hearing Board.", and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) In connection with any hearing called under this section the Secretary is authorized to require any person whose alleged activities result in discharges causing or contributing to water pollution to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report based on existing data, furnishing such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of such discharges and the use of facilities or other means to prevent or reduce such discharges by the person filing such a report. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. No person shall be required in such report to divulge trade secrets or secret processes, and all information reported shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(3) If any person required to file any report under paragraph (2) of this subsection shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of \$100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business. The Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this paragraph and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(4) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures."

SEC. 209. Paragraph (f) of section 13 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and an Indian tribe or an authorized Indian tribal organization."

SEC. 210. (a) Section 2(d) of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924 (33 U.S.C. 432(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

(b) Section 7 of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924 (33 U.S.C. 436) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. In the administration of this Act, the Secretary may make use of the organization, equipment, and agencies, including engineering, clerical, and other personnel employed by him or the Secretary of the Army for the preservation and protection of navigable waters. For the better enforcement of the provisions of this Act, the offices and agencies of the United States in charge of river and harbor improvements and the assistant engineers and inspectors employed under them by authority of the Secretary of the Army, and persons employed by the Secretary, and officers of the Customs and Coast Guard of the United States, shall have power and authority and it shall be their duty to swear out process and to arrest and take into custody, with or without process, any person who may violate any of such provisions, except that no person shall be arrested without process for a violation not committed in the presence of some one of the aforesaid officials. Whenever any arrest is made under the provisions of the said sections the person so arrested shall be brought forthwith before a commissioner, judge, or court of the United States for examination of the offenses alleged against him; and such commissioner, judge, or court shall proceed in respect thereto as authorized by law in cases of crimes against the United States."

SEC. 211. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of methods for providing incentives designed to assist in the construction of facilities and works by industry designed to reduce or abate water pollution. Such study shall include, but not be limited to, the possible use of tax incentives as well as other methods of financial assistance. In carrying out this study the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of the Treasury as well as the head of any other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government. The Secretary shall report the results of such investigation and study, together with his recommendation, to the Congress not later than January 30, 1968.

SEC. 212. The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the extent of the pollution of all navigable waters of the United States from litter and sewage discharged, dumped, or otherwise deposited into such waters from water craft using such waters, and methods of abating either in whole or in part such pollution. The Secretary shall submit a report of such investigation to Congress, together with his recommendations for any necessary legislation, not later than July 1, 1967.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

REGULATION OF FIREARMS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, for more than 30 years James V. Bennett, as

Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, was the confidant, keeper, confessor, and jailer of every person convicted of a crime against the people of the United States.

Thousands of those convicts were behind bars because, with or without malice aforethought, they used firearms in the commission of a crime.

Now retired, but still actively engaged in criminal rehabilitation as a consultant to the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Mr. Bennett analyzed the criminal misuse of firearms in an article for the New York Times Magazine, published September 25, 1966.

Legislation to control the interstate commerce in mail-order guns will soon be considered by the Senate, and I should like Senators to have the benefit of my friend Mr. Bennett's more than 30 years of experience with the gun-slinging criminal when they are called to vote upon the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bennett's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times magazine, Sept. 25, 1966]

THE GUN AND HOW TO CONTROL IT (By James V. Bennett)

Around the dome of the nation's Capitol is a railed walkway used occasionally by painters and roofers. Should you be able to sweet-talk your way past the guards onto it, equipped with the kind of four-power Japanese scopesight used by marksmen Charles J. Whitman and Lee Harvey Oswald, you might, any Tuesday morning, be able to zero in on Senator THOMAS J. DODD some 300 yards below as he walks across the street from his office to the Senate Judiciary Committee meeting room.

His stride, you would observe, has a bit of jauntiness. This is because, after five years of investigations, hearings, reports, bills, amended bills and extended floor debates, there is some slight hope that, with the prodding of President Johnson, he may be able to get the Judiciary Committee to vote his firearms-control bill up or down. So far the committee has refused to come to grips with the issue raised by states, like New York, which demand the right to regulate who among their citizens may purchase pistols, revolvers, shotguns and other lethal weapons without having the states' efforts thwarted by out-of-state and mail-order sales. Though the Senator presumably has been disheartened by the committee's filibustering, he is now cheered by the belief that enough votes can be mustered with the help of an aroused public to pass the bill at the next session. Thus, after three decades of effort by nearly all law-enforcement groups—buttressed by the widespread but unorganized support of a public increasingly concerned over crime and violence—the blind and misleading opposition of a relatively small, highly organized gun lobby may be overcome.

Pending Federal proposals to curb unrestricted gun sales are simple and straightforward. The most recent Dodd bill requires anyone who wishes to buy a pistol or revolver to do so through a licensed dealer. It would no longer be possible under such a law to buy a handgun through the mails as do so many juveniles, Lee Harvey Oswalds, ex-convicts, emotionally disturbed persons or others who for one reason or another want

to hide their purchases. The bill would ban over-the-counter sales of handguns to non-residents of the dealer's state, to persons under 18, to a convicted felon or to anyone not conforming to state laws governing the purchase or ownership of guns.

The provisions with respect to buying a rifle or shotgun are less restrictive. The guns could still be bought by mail but the purchaser would need to accompany his order with an affidavit setting forth that (1) he was not a convicted felon; (2) he was 18 or older; and (3) he was not in violation of any state law regarding such a purchase. The affidavit would be forwarded by registered mail to the highest-ranking law-enforcement official of the purchaser's place of residence, identifying the firearm to be shipped on return of the receipt. It would also limit the importation of military firearms such as the Italian Mannlicher Carcano rifle bought by Lee Harvey Oswald for \$12.78 to assassinate President Kennedy.

What could be simpler or more straightforward or more essential to the enforcement of state laws? And yet many people have been led to believe the bill is some kind of Federal gun registration law. Others have been hoodwinked into thinking that the right of law-abiding citizens to keep a firearm for home protection or for hunting would be forbidden. Some have been purposely misinformed that the bill controls the purchase of ammunition. Some have been alarmed by statements of gun lobbyists that it places a sales or stamp tax on guns, and that the bill would create some kind of gun monopoly that would put honest dealers, manufacturers or gun servicemen out of business.

There is not the slightest basis for any of these beliefs but it serves well the purposes of those who wish to defeat the bill thus to confuse, obscure, misquote.

The bill, in truth, is a beginning toward preventing guns from coming so easily into the hands of the wrong people. It is a first practical step toward seeing that the almost one million guns sold each year by mail do not go directly into the hands of those who plan to use them for bank robberies, hold-ups, murders or for sniper killings by the mentally disturbed or hatemongers.

Let me mention two or three cases as examples.

Victor H. Feguer wrote to me while he was waiting to be executed that he wanted to die. He protested vigorously efforts to appeal his case. In the course of an investigation, I found that the records of the Federal Prison Bureau showed that Feguer, within a month of the date he was discharged from the state penitentiary, had bought a .380-caliber automatic revolver over the counter of a Milwaukee gun store. No questions were asked, no identification sought. A casual inquiry probably would have developed the fact that there was something wrong with him because he was paranoid and threatening. A somewhat deeper inquiry would have revealed that he was an ex-convict, had been diagnosed by the prison as a borderline schizophrenic and had a record of crime and juvenile delinquency dating back to his 11th birthday.

Thus armed, Feguer kidnapped a greatly admired and conscientious Iowa doctor and shot and killed him for no reason anyone has been able to learn. That murder could have been prevented under the Dodd bill, because no licensed dealer could have sold Feguer, an ex-prisoner, a revolver.

There are dozens of such cases in Prison Bureau files, including that of a prisoner we reluctantly had to discharge from the Leavenworth penitentiary as the law required. We knew he was extremely dangerous. While

en route to Los Angeles, he bought a gun in Flagstaff, Ariz. He had the money, so no questions were asked. When he was later questioned about a check he was trying to cash in a Sears, Roebuck store in California, he whipped out his gun and shot two police-men dead.

Albert Lee Nussbaum, like Charles J. Whitman, has been a "gunnut" since he was 18. One exhibit prized by Senator Dodd's committee is a high-powered antitank machine gun that Nussbaum simply bought over the counter.

In 1957 he was sent to prison for five years for transporting a machine gun across the state lines. Within a few months after sentence expired, Nussbaum led eight bank robberies, netting his gang a total of \$248,541. During one robbery, of the Lafayette National Bank in Brooklyn, a bank guard was ruthlessly machine-gunned to death and another police officer missed death only because the bullet intended for him lodged in his shield pin. An arsenal belonging to Nussbaum contained 17 revolvers, an automatic carbine rifle, four bullet-proof vests and several thousand rounds of ammunition. When these weapons were traced, it was found most of them had come from so-called "legitimate" sources.

Nussbaum now matter-of-factly says from his cell in a Federal prison, where he is serving a life term, that he is opposed to any firearms controls. He doubts they will work. Perhaps he reached this conclusion from reading the literature of the National Rifle Association—to which he was once admitted without the necessity of disclosing his prison record or much of anything else. Being a member of the N.R.A., he had the incidental advantage of buying a war surplus .45-caliber automatic pistol for \$17.50 and an M-1 carbine for \$20. He also got free ammunition from supplies made available to the N.R.A. and affiliated gun clubs by the Government.

Incidentally, these "surplus" carbines, pistols and Springfield '03 rifles are available only to N.R.A. members. They may be "surplus" but they certainly are not museum pieces. In 1965 a total of 848 successful bank holdups involved losses of \$3,899,465, according to the American Bankers Association, as bandits armed with handguns, shot-guns or rifles more than doubled their attacks and their annual take between 1961 and 1965. No wonder bank insurance rates increase regularly.

One of the time-worn arguments against attempting to control the sale of firearms is that it will not stop crime. Opponents of regulation ask: Why try, and in the process perhaps inconvenience law-abiding people? In this spirit Senator RUSSELL LONG of Louisiana, the Assistant Majority Leader, recently said: "These bills might make it more difficult for the murderers to get guns, but the man who intends to kill can always get a gun, no matter what we do."

If the majority of our lawmakers followed such a philosophy there would be no laws against the distribution of narcotics, fraud or check forgery, rape, arson or other crimes. By the unwillingness of some legislators to face up to facts about guns, murder, bank robbery and violence are made easy.

Take Watts, for instance. There, in the most elemental sort of guerrilla warfare, policemen, firemen and innocent bystanders were riddled down from rooftops, moving cars, the ruins of gutted buildings. Fear of snipers' bullets halted efforts to rescue the wounded, stop the looting or douse the fires. Gov. Edmund Brown's tour of the area and his plans to confer with the leaders of the community came to naught because of widespread rifle fire.

During the rioting more than 2,000 guns were seized; one-third were later submitted as evidence of criminal activity. Of those snipers who could be found and arrested, 76 had pistols in their possession and 39 others had shotguns or rifles. Fifty of the 76 persons arrested for having handguns had either a misdemeanor or felony record. Of the 39 arrested with long guns, 28 had previous criminal records.

Furthermore, Justices of the Supreme Court who were far more conservative than the majority of the present Court have upheld time and time again the right of the Federal Government, in the exercise of its power to regulate commerce, to pass laws restricting the interstate transportation of goods that are in violation of state statutes.

Mr. Orth's effort to use the Second Amendment argument before the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association was resoundingly rejected by an almost unanimous vote. The Bar Association not only found the Dodd bill constitutional but overwhelmingly approved it as sound public policy.

The mumbo jumbo about the right to bear arms is only one part of the smokescreen thrown up by the National Rifle Association to block any gun-control legislation. The association plausibly declares it favors legislation that would keep firearms out of the hands of criminals, juveniles and incompetents, but has no effective bill of its own. Instead, the N.R.A. protests its concern for proper use of firearms in full-page ads beneath a large photograph of Franklin D. Roosevelt holding a rifle as a young man ("America Needs More Straight Shooters"). In fact, as President, Roosevelt approved the Federal Firearms Act and the National Firearms Act, which control the interstate transportation of machine guns and sawed-off shotguns.

The long-standing efforts of the National Rifle Association to thwart any Federal control of firearms where possible, or to water down bills such as the National Firearms Act, which they could not defeat entirely, is interestingly and exhaustively detailed in Carl Bakal's recent book, "The Right to Bear Arms."

As a substitute for the Dodd bill, the N.R.A. urges one by Congressman ROBERT CASEY of Texas, which the association claims is directed at the criminal and not the gun. Under the Casey proposal the Federal Government would be given jurisdiction over any crime committed by a person armed with a gun that had been transported in interstate commerce. Thus, 99 per cent of handguns, rifles and shotguns would be covered.

By this legislative legerdemain tens of thousands of local crimes now dealt with under the police powers of the states would become a Federal responsibility. (Incidentally, the original Casey bill prescribed a mandatory minimum penalty of 25 years but this was later reduced to 10 years.)

Apart from the serious constitutional problems involved here, the whole idea is at odds with the universally held principle of local responsibility for crime control. Moreover, the long and dreary history of man's efforts to control crime by torture, banishment, cruel and inhuman punishment shows the futility of long prison terms. For example, armed robbery everywhere now carries severe penalties, and in some states it is punishable by death, yet armed robberies continue to escalate.

The wonder is that the National Rifle Association, an organization of 750,000 sensible men and women, would underwrite, at an annual cost of \$2-million, publicity programs based on deceptive reasoning. Perhaps the

answer is: Anything goes that will confuse or obscure the basic issues.

For this reason, perhaps, the N.R.A. argues that the Dodd bill would disarm the citizenry, leaving us helpless pawns of Communists in case of a war in which our missile capability was destroyed, our naval and air power demolished and our armies defeated. Time and again, it has been shown that the Dodd bill in no way restricts the purchase or ownership of a firearm by responsible adults. But fears that the bill would facilitate a Communist takeover nevertheless are soberly advanced in opposition to the bill. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara has testified that "no function of the Department of Defense will be in any way impaired by the enactment of this [Dodd] legislation." And he added his "deep personal conviction about the desirability" of the bill.

Putting aside the sophistry of the gun lobby for the moment, the vital question is: What kind of state law is reasonable and fair?

Only a few advocates of the strictest kind of firearms control believe that the registration and identification of the estimated 100 million pistols, revolvers, rifles, shotguns, pellet guns, bazookas, zip guns and so on is feasible at this time. The development of electronic data processing and information retrieval indicates it may some day become feasible but whether any such Federal law is worth discussing now is doubtful.

Not only should the sale of guns to felons or fugitives or drug addicts be banned but their possession by such persons ought to be subject to punishment. The enactment of such local legislation would mean that everyone who owned a handgun, and possibly also those who owned high-powered rifles, would be required to obtain a certificate of eligibility. Thus, we would be able to seize the guns now in the hands of criminally dangerous persons.

Finally, to implement this most valuable crime deterrent, a state law should be passed restricting the sale of ammunition to those who displayed a certificate of eligibility to own the gun for which ammunition is sought. The legitimate gun owner would have a registration card similar to those issued to automobile owners attesting his rightful ownership of a particular gun and his eligibility to purchase ammunition for it.

These are simple, reasonable proposals which would not handicap the honest sportsman or gun enthusiast. They are a small price to pay to reduce the nearly 6,000 fatal shootings that occur each year and the 35,000 assaults made with firearms. As certain as night follows day, they would have some effect on avoidable bloodshed caused by guns that have brought death to more Americans—750,000—since the turn of the century than all our wars combined. The annual total of 45,000 armed robberies would also decline instead of increasing, as at present, if no ammunition were available to the illegitimate possessors of handguns. But states that pass laws of this type will enact mere pieces of paper unless they are backed by a Federal statute forbidding circumvention through mail-order sales from states without such legislation.

We are quick enough to blame the courts for a rising crime wave because they insist that the police comply with the Constitution in their treatment of suspects. We have bumper stickers urging "Support Your Police." We appoint crime commissions to philosophize about basic causes of crime. We wring our hands vainly about the shocking killing of 14 innocent Texans and the wounding of more than 30 others by a demented gun nut. We view with alarm the slaughter of five people in Connecticut and the wound-

ing of six others by two gun-slingers. These tragedies happened this year. And on each remaining day of 1966, 15 people will be murdered with guns.

This carnage will go on and will increase unless the seven out of ten people who, according to a Gallup poll, believe in firearms control make known their views to their Senators and Congressmen.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the past 20 years the administration leaders have been agreeing that the agriculture program should be designed to help the bona fide family type of farming operation; however, on numerous occasions I have pointed out that the program as it has been administered, particularly in the more recent years, is not designed to help the small farmer but rather to subsidize the expansion of the corporate type of farming operation.

To a certain extent this expansion is inevitable as the farmers become more mechanized, thereby creating a need for larger acreage.

There can be no justification, however, for the using of taxpayers' dollars to subsidize the acceleration of the trend toward these large corporate type of operations. Yet that is exactly what has been happening, particularly during the past few years since the inauguration of a program to pay the farmers large subsidies not to cultivate a certain percentage of their acreage.

The small farmer could not take advantage of the soil bank payments for retired acreage. With a single tractor, one combine, a cornpicker, it is almost as expensive to keep this machinery idle in the barn or use it only half the time as it would be for full utilization.

Full and efficient utilization of his equipment and his own time would require that he cultivate practically all of his acreage; otherwise, his machinery would lie idle and he would be out of work.

On the other hand, the very large operations, using several tractors, combines, and numerous other items of equipment, could very readily curtail operations, reducing both equipment needs and payroll, with the result that their subsidy payments for idle acreage represents to a substantial degree clear profits.

On numerous occasions I have unsuccessfully attempted to place a limitation of \$10,000 on the maximum amount of direct Government subsidies that could be paid to any one farming operation in any calendar year. This proposal would have protected the small farmers and at the same time would have saved millions for the taxpayers, but it was rejected by the administration and the Congress.

Without this ceiling on payments, certain farming operations are now collecting as high as a half million dollars annually in direct Government payments not to cultivate a portion of their acre-

age. Several farming operations are collecting over \$100,000 per year in Government subsidies as payment to leave their lands idle.

This program of paying farmers not to produce agricultural products is one of the reasons for the shortage of adequate food supplies and the resulting high cost of living.

Today I am incorporating in the Record a list of all direct Government payments in excess of \$25,000 which have been made under these programs during the calendar year 1965. This report does not include the names of those farming operations which received in excess of \$25,000 when the payments consisted of a series of checks of less than that amount. The figures for this report, as furnished by the Department of Agriculture, include only those payments in which each individual payment was in excess of \$25,000.

As I call attention to these payments, it should be pointed out that my criticism is directed against the program which makes these payments possible rather than against the recipients of the subsidies. Once Congress enacts these laws, the acceptance of the payments is legal, and the only way to eliminate these excessive payments is for Congress and the administration to amend the law.

As can be seen from this report, several companies are listed as having received a series of payments. For example, the Youngker Farms, Box 398, Buckeye, Ariz., received:

Feed grain diversion program	\$92,374
Feed grain price support program	40,084
Cotton price support program	68,657

Total	201,115
-------	---------

The J. G. Boswell Co., Box 1447, Bakersfield, Calif., received:

Wheat program	\$28,282
Feed grain diversion program	55,012
Feed grain certificate program	47,611

Total	130,905
-------	---------

The J. G. Boswell Co., a corporation, Post Office Box 377, Corcoran, Calif., received:

Feed grain price support program	\$249,603
----------------------------------	-----------

The same company with Box No. 877, Corcoran, Calif., received:

Feed grain diversion program	\$285,958
------------------------------	-----------

Total	535,561
-------	---------

Westlake Farms, Inc., 23311 Newton Avenue, Stratford, Calif., received:

Feed grain price support program	\$120,879
Feed grain diversion program	163,132

Total	284,011
-------	---------

Tom J. Moore, Navasota, Tex., received two checks:

Cotton domestic allotments	\$54,872
Feed grain diversion	43,664

Total	98,536
-------	--------

Louisiana State Penitentiary, Angola, La., under the sugar program received \$61,471 subsidy.

Campbell farming, Hardin, Mont., received payment of \$133,821 under the wheat certificates program.

In Puerto Rico, C. Brewer Puerto Rico, Inc., Post Office Box 507, Fajardo, received \$489,862 subsidy payment under the sugar program.

Antonio Roig, Sucrs., S. en C., Post Office Box 487, Humacao, received a \$368,046 payment under the sugar program.

Two operations received in excess of \$1 million each in cash of subsidy pay-

ments under the sugar program with \$1,217,990 being paid to the United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., while Baldwin, Inc., Post Office Box 3440, Honolulu, Hawaii, received \$1,177,070.

In Hawaii 27 sugar plantations received Government subsidy payments totaling \$10,035,628.

In Florida 45 companies operating under the sugar program received \$4,564,745 with over one-half of this amount going to just four companies. In fact, one-fourth of these payments

went to just one operation, which received \$1,217,990.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete report as furnished by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, giving the names and addresses of all payees who received payments of \$25,000 or more for any program and the amount of such payment for the calendar year 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Name and address of payees who received payments of \$25,000 or more for any program and the amount of such payment, calendar year 1965

Program	Name and address	Amount	Program	Name and address	Amount
ARIZONA					
Feed grain diversion	Kinard Bros., Route 3, Box 7, Wilcox, Ariz.	\$28,527	CALIFORNIA—continued		
Do	Eaton Fruit Co., Route 3, Wilcox, Ariz.	28,602	Sugar program	Popejoy & Bohlander, Post Office Box 119, El Centro, Calif.	\$26,972
Do	Youngker Farms, Box 398, Buckeye, Ariz.	92,374	Do	Jack Bros. & McBurney, Post Office 116, Brawley, Calif.	30,060
Do	Gila River Ranch, Box C, Gila Bend, Ariz.	153,298	Do	Johnson & Drysdale Land & Cattle Co., Route 2, Box 9, Brawley, Calif.	28,602
Do	G. R. Rogers, Route 5, Box 1180, Phoenix, Ariz.	40,284	Do	Foster & Sperber, Route 2, Box 50, Brawley, Calif.	40,663
Do	Chatham & Chatham, 5853 West Vista Ave., Phoenix, Ariz.	43,422	Do	Jack Harelson, Route 1, Box 101, Calexico, Calif.	30,675
Do	John Kal, Box 488, Marana, Ariz.	34,700	Do	John J. Elmore, Post Office Box 119, Brawley, Calif.	28,982
Do	C. & V. Sheep & Cattle Co., Inc., Box 368, Maricopa, Ariz.	29,961	Do	Adamek & Dessert, Inc., Post Office Box 787, Seelye, Calif.	29,321
Do	Pima Community Farms, Sacaton, Ariz.	47,947	Do	Bonanza Farms, Inc., 1404 Ross, El Centro, Calif.	33,030
Do	Colorado River Trading Co., Box T, Parker, Ariz.	30,931	Wheat program	J. G. Boswell Co., Box 1447, Bakersfield, Calif.	28,282
Feed grain price support	Youngker Farms, Box 398, Buckeye, Ariz.	40,084	Do	Robert T. Johnson, 1902 Niles St., Bakersfield, Calif.	25,166
Cotton price support	do	68,657	Feed grain diversion	J. G. Boswell Co., Box 1447, Bakersfield, Calif.	55,012
Do	Pima Community Farms, Sacaton, Ariz.	47,083	Feed grain certificate	do	47,611
Do	Coury Bros., Route 1, Box 87, Queen Creek	70,896	Feed grain diversion	Buena Vista Associates and Miller & Lux Inc., 550 Kearney St., San Francisco, Calif.	55,012
Do	Arizona Farming Co., care of Producers Cotton Oil Co., Box 907, Eloy, Ariz.	64,466	Do	D. M. Bryant, Jr., Box 540, Pond, Calif.	37,412
Do	McCarthy & Hildebrand Farms, Route 1, Box 246-A, Eloy, Ariz.	32,228	Do	Robert T. Johnson, 1902 Niles St., Bakersfield, Calif.	40,666
Do	Rancho Tierra Prieta, Box 938, Eloy, Ariz.	29,930	Do	Sagues & Montero, Box 316, Lost Hills, Calif.	28,695
Do	Eloie Farms Co., Box 374, Marana, Ariz.	31,091	Do	Skyline Farms, Inc., Post Office Box 668, Wasco, Calif.	26,060
Do	Isom & Isom, 110-C East Florence Blvd., Casa Grande, Ariz.	37,525	Do	S. K. Farms, Route 1, Box 24, Burronwillow, Calif.	25,473
Do	Milton P. Smith, Jr., Route 1, Maricopa, Ariz.	31,126	Do	Henry Miller Trust, 550 Kearney St., San Francisco, Calif.	25,473
Do	Ak-Chin Farms, Route 1, Box 12, Maricopa, Ariz.	39,093	Sugarbeet program	Kern County Land Co., Post Office Box 380, Bakersfield, Calif.	88,120
Do	W. C. Brown, Route 1, Box 104, Maricopa, Ariz.	26,129	Sugar program	Palm Farms, Inc., 4016 Stockdale Highway, Bakersfield, Calif.	27,720
	State total (number of payees, 22)	1,048,354	Do	Kern County Land Co., Post Office Box 380, Bakersfield, Calif.	117,684
ARKANSAS					
Cotton domestic allotments	Wesson Farms, Inc., Victoria, Ark.	31,908	Feed grain price support	J. G. Boswell Co., a corporation, Post Office Box 377, Corcoran, Calif.	249,603
Wheat certificates	do	26,703	Do	Salyer Land Co., a corporation, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.	167,858
Cotton domestic allotments	J. G. Adams & Son; Charles Adams, Partner, Hughes, Ark.	37,450	Do	South Lake Farms, a corporation, Post Office Box 848, Corcoran, Calif.	97,320
	State total (number of payees, 3)	96,061	Do	West Haven Farming Co., 24487 Road 140, Tulare, Calif.	37,956
CALIFORNIA					
Feed grain diversion	H. & A. Andreotti, Grimes, Calif.	26,093	Feed grain diversion	Westlake Farms, Inc., 23311 Newton Ave., Stratford, Calif.	120,879
Sugarbeet program	J. J. Gross, Post Office Box 46, Grimes, Calif.	27,738	Do	Borba Bros., a partnership, 5521 22d Ave., Riverdale, Calif.	41,686
Feed grain diversion	Western Farms Co., Post Office Box 235, Byron, Calif.	34,637	Do	J. G. Boswell Co., a corporation, Post Office Box 877, Corcoran, Calif.	285,958
Sugar program	Five Points Ranch Inc., Post Office Box 247, Five Points, Calif.	27,677	Do	Boycott Farming Co., a corporation, Post Office Box 386, Corcoran, Calif.	32,943
Do	Giusti Farms, Inc., 2220 Tulare, Fresno, Calif.	29,611	Do	Inco Farms, Inc., Post Office Box 135, Bonsall, Calif.	28,362
Feed grain diversion	Airway Farms, Inc., 1221 Fulton, room 614, Fresno, Calif.	71,329	Do	George W. Nickel, Jr., doing business as Kern River Delta Farms, Post Office Drawer B, Wasco, Calif.	43,977
Do	Calfax Co., Post Office Box 307, Five Points, Calif.	122,537	Do	Lone Oak Ranch, a partnership, Box 586, Corcoran, Calif.	36,329
Do	Five Points Ranch, Post Office Box 247, Five Points, Calif.	155,058	Do	Salyer Land Co., a corporation, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.	239,574
Do	Goodman Traction Ranch, Post Office Box 225, Tranquillity, Calif.	39,464	Do	South Lake Farms, a corporation, Post Office Box 848, Corcoran, Calif.	335,378
Do	Noble, Wm. H., Post Office Box 641, Kerman, Calif.	115,628	Do	J. G. Stone Land Co., Post Office Box 146, Stratford, Calif.	75,566
Do	Ryan Bros., Post Office Box 268, Mendota, Calif.	26,714	Do	Vernon L. Thomas, Inc., Post Office Box 8, Huron, Calif.	53,594
Do	Sullivan & Gragnani, Post Office Box 128-A, Tranquillity, Calif.	69,785	Do	Wedderburn Bros., a partnership, 210 Fox St., Lemore, Calif.	45,525
Feed grain price support	Airway Farms, Inc., 1221 Fulton, room 614, Fresno, Calif.	41,698	Do	West Haven Farming Co., 24487 Road 140, Tulare, Calif.	109,014
Do	Calfax Co., Post Office Box 307, Five Points, Calif.	54,264	Do	Westlake Farms, Inc., 23311 Newton Ave., Stratford, Calif.	163,132
Do	Five Points Ranch, Post Office Box 247, Five Points, Calif.	67,167	Do	John Fuson, Post Office Box 875, Lebec, Calif.	25,963
Feed grain diversion	Hugh Hudson Ranches, Inc., Post Office Box 201, Calipatria, Calif.	51,334	Do	Bright's Nursery, Inc., 5246 South Plainsburg, Le Grand, Calif.	25,186
Do	H. B. Murphy Co., Post Office Box 75, Brawley, Calif.	57,320	Sugar program	Wolfsen Land & Cattle Co., Post Office Box 311, Los Banos, Calif.	32,619
Sugar program	River Farms Co., Post Office Box 1260, Brawley, Calif.	37,017	Do	Miller & Lux, Inc., 830 6th St., Los Banos, Calif.	67,115
Do	Arthur H. Saikhon, Post Office Box 1196, El Centro, Calif.	25,937	Do	Mesa Farms, Inc., Post Office Box 535, King City, Calif.	48,435
Do	Peter J. Sanchez, 1205 Aurora, El Centro, Calif.	30,342			
Do	Harvey S. Sidhu, Post Office Box 217, Brawley, Calif.	34,909			
Do	H. B. Murphy Co., Post Office Box 74, Brawley, Calif.	56,586			

Name and address of payees who received payments of \$25,000 or more for any program and the amount of such payment, calendar year 1965—Continued

Program	Name and address	Amount	Program	Name and address	Amount		
CALIFORNIA—CON.							
Feed grain diversion	Rey Bros., Paicines, Calif.	\$25,958	FLORIDA—con.	Fritz Stein, Jr., 1124 NW. 16th St., Belle Glade, Fla.	\$26,170		
Do.	Daley Enterprise, a partnership, North Park Station, Post Office Box 4067, San Diego, Calif.	34,594	Do.	South Bay Growers, Inc., Box 68, South Bay, Fla.	48,637		
Sugar program	John Bogetti & Robert Bogetti, 341 Hollywood, Tracy, Calif.	25,443	Do.	Miami Sod Co., 1001 NW. 42d Ave., Miami, Fla.	30,177		
Do.	Calcagno Farms, Route 1, Box 460, French Camp, Calif.	37,334	Do.	Sam Senter Farms, Inc., Box 185, Belle Glade, Fla.	78,088		
Wheat diversion	Jackson & Reinhert, Box 787, Paso Robles, Calif.	25,264	Do.	Vandegrift-Williams Farms, Inc., Post Office Box 619, Pahokee, Fla.	50,968		
Sugar program	Jack Fukumoto, Post Office Box 66, Dixon, Calif.	28,994	Do.	F. & W. Farms, Inc., Box 513, Belle Glade, Fla.	39,758		
Do.	Arnold Collier, Post Office Box 175, Dixon, Calif.	26,405	Do.	Hayes-Quackenbush, Inc., Post Office Box 746, Belle Glade, Fla.	33,246		
Do.	Lum & Young, Route 2, Box 1890, Vacaville, Calif.	29,034	Do.	New Hope Sugar Co., 314 Royal Poinciana Bldg., Palm Beach, Fla.	44,038		
Do.	Solano Farms Corp., Post Office Box 426, Dixon, Calif.	27,648	Do.	Wedgworth Farms, Inc., Post Office Box 206, Belle Glade, Fla.	78,458		
Do.	George M. Struve, Jr., Post Office Box 7, Liberty Farms, Calif.	29,006	Do.	J. T. Boynton Farms, Inc., 1649 East Main St., Pahokee, Fla.	45,148		
Sugarbeet program	Newhall Land & Farming Co., 5002 West El Nido Rd., El Nido, Calif.	73,669	Do.	S. N. Knight & Sons, Inc., Post Office Box 730, Belle Glade, Fla.	62,371		
Do.	Oji Bros., 8547 Sawtelle Ave., Yuba City, Calif.	29,766	Do.	J. Allen Baker Farms, Box 611, Belle Glade, Fla.	47,473		
Sugar program	E. W. Merritt Farms, 11188 Road 192, Porterville, Calif.	40,673	Do.	J. E. & J. W. Beardisley, Post Office Box 149, Clewiston, Fla.	28,772		
Do.	Chew Bros., 6256 Fordham Way, Sacramento, Calif.	53,327	Do.	Talismann Sugar Corp., Box 814, Belle Glade, Fla.	293,624		
Do.	Lloyd M. Eveland, Post Office Box 27, Woodland, Calif.	33,081	Do.	New Ranch Corp., care of A. R. Diebold, 375 Park Ave., New York, N.Y.	79,840		
Do.	Heidrick Bros., Route 1, Box 1215, Woodland, Calif.	71,671	Do.	A. H. Hechler, Highlands Springs, Va.	29,598		
Do.	Meek & LeMaire, 200 Cedar Lane, Woodland, Calif.	42,957	Do.	Hatton Bros., Inc., Drawer 558, Pahokee, Fla.	61,555		
Feed grain diversion	Layton Knaggs, Box 970, Woodland, Calif.	71,266	Do.	Harley Watson, care of W. E. Bolton, Box 366, Lake Harbor, Fla.	38,317		
Do.	C. Bruce Mace Ranch, Inc., Box 190 Davis, Calif.	80,325	Do.	Tokaliga Farms Co., 314A Royal Poinciana Plaza, Palm Beach, Fla.	63,603		
Sugar program	Tony A. Sanchez, 1409 South Hunter St., Stockton, Calif.	25,830	Do.	Florida Sugar Corp., Box 1001, Belle Glade, Fla.	161,047		
	State total (number of payees, 87).	2,554,853	Do.	Camayen Farms, Co., Post Office Box 6216, West Palm Beach, Fla.	30,065		
			Do.	R. W. Bishop, Clewiston, Fla.	30,853		
			Do.	Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., Post Office Box 86, South Bay, Fla.	651,938		
COLORADO							
Wheat certificates	Monaghan Farms, Box 358, Commerce City, Colo.	40,617	State total (number of payees, 45)		4,564,745		
Do.	Box Elder Farms, Equitable Bldg., Denver, Colo.	28,680					
Do.	Kalcevic Farms, Inc., 19 Del Mar Circle, Aurora, Calif.	26,203					
Do.	Willard Hubbs, Byers, Colo.	26,359					
Do.	Baughman Farms, Inc., Liberal, Kans.	47,134					
Do.	Baughman Farms, Inc., care of T. Jerry Blakemore, Haswell, Colo.	36,843					
Do.	James S. Garvey, care of Garvey Farms Management Co., Colby, Kans.	25,959					
Do.	Olive W. Garvey, care of Garvey Farms Management Co., Colby, Kans.	38,738					
Feed grain diversion	Penny Ranch, Burlington, Colo.	25,408					
Wheat certificates	Baughman Farms, Inc., Liberal, Kans.	51,260					
Do.	do.	28,940					
Do.	C. A. Barth and Robert Barth, Holly, Colo.	25,058					
Do.	Wm. Stretesky, Julesburg, Colo.	25,185					
State total (number of payees, 13)							
426,384							
FLORIDA							
Sugar program	Click Farms, Inc., Post Office Box 1326, Clewiston, Fla.	48,101	HAWAII				
Do.	J. E. Frierson, Route 2, Clewiston, Fla.	25,727	Sugar program	Hawaiian Agricultural Co., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	375,174		
Do.	Floridagold Citrus Corp., Post Office Box 1690, Tampa, Fla.	25,201	Do.	Mauna Kea Sugar Co., Ltd., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	406,069		
Do.	Hiepoochee Farm, Route 2, Box 177, Clewiston, Fla.	29,186	Do.	Pasihau Sugar Co., Ltd., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	201,745		
Do.	John Tiedtke, Clewiston, Fla.	80,871	Do.	Pepeekeo Sugar Co., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	382,027		
Do.	Ray D. Yoder, Moore Haven, Fla.	30,554	Do.	Kilauea Sugar Co., Ltd., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	308,348		
Do.	Arbark Farms, Inc., 4217 Ponce DeLeon Blvd., Coral Gables, Fla.	43,376	Do.	Olokele Sugar Co., Ltd., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	308,603		
Do.	United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.	1,217,990	Do.	Wailuku Sugar Co., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	308,348		
Do.	O. V. Land Co., Inc., Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Room 1211, Miami, Fla.	32,477	Do.	Gay and Robinson, Makaweli, Hawaii.	191,401		
Do.	Bueno Farms Corp., Post Office Box D, Pahokee, Fla.	31,204	Do.	Kekaha Sugar Co., Ltd., care of American Factors, Ltd., Post Office Box 3230, Honolulu, Hawaii.	417,240		
Do.	Flying Cow Sugar Farm, Inc., Post Office Box 611, Belle Glade, Fla.	27,962	Do.	Grove Farm Co., Puhu Rural Station, Lihue, Hawaii.	359,664		
Do.	A. Duda & Sons, Inc., Box 257, Oviedo, Fla.	142,197	Do.	Lihue Plantation Co., care of American Factors, Ltd., Post Office Box 3230, Honolulu, Hawaii.	566,843		
Do.	Eastgate Farms, Inc., 100 East Robinson St., Orlando, Fla.	63,198	Do.	McBryde Sugar Co., Ltd., care of Alexander & Baldwin Inc., Post Office Box 3440, Honolulu, Hawaii.	294,352		
Do.	Closter Farms, Inc., Box 933, Belle Glade, Fla.	136,268	Do.	Waimea Sugar Mill Co., Ltd., care of American Factors, Ltd., Post Office Box 3230, Honolulu, Hawaii.	54,146		
Do.	Billy Rogers Farms, Post Office Box 68, South Bay, Fla.	74,661	Do.	Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co., Division of Alexander & Baldwin, Inc., Post Office Box 3440, Honolulu, Hawaii.	1,177,070		
Do.	C. A. Thomas, Post Office Box 8, Lake Harbor, Fla.	62,730	Do.	Pioneer Mill Co., Ltd., care of American Factors, Ltd., Post Office Box 3230, Honolulu, Hawaii.	469,536		
Do.	South Florida Sugar Co., Inc., 530 Pan American Bank Bldg., 150 SE. 3d Ave., Miami, Fla.	140,639	Do.	EWA Plantation Co., care of Castle & Cooke, Inc., Post Office Box 2990, Honolulu, Hawaii.	447,066		
Do.	715 Farms, LTD, Post Office Box D, Pahokee, Fla.	123,438	Do.	Kahuku Plantation Co., care of Alexander & Baldwin Inc., Post Office Box 3440, Honolulu, Hawaii.	207,463		
Do.	Sugarcane Farms Co., 318 A Royal Poinciana Plaza, Palm Beach, Fla.	78,553	Do.	Oahu Sugar Co., Ltd., care of Alexander & Baldwin Inc., Post Office Box 3440, Honolulu, Hawaii.	561,070		
Do.	Chanticleer Farms Co., 318 A Royal Poinciana Plaza, Palm Beach, Fla.	28,936	Do.	Waialua Agricultural Co., Ltd., care of Castle & Cooke, Inc., Post Office Box 2990, Honolulu, Hawaii.	558,671		
Do.	S. N. Knight, Inc., Post Office Box 7, Belle Glade, Fla.	30,043	Do.	Pepeekeo Sugar Co., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	363,775		
Do.	Vinegar Bend Farms, Inc., Box R, Belle Glade, Fla.	37,689	Do.	Puna Sugar Co., Ltd., care of C. Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	316,378		
			Do.	Charles Akamai, Jr., Naalehu, Hawaii.	96,722		
			Do.	Hamakua Mill Co., care of Theo. H. Davies & Co., Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii.	279,255		

Name and address of payees who received payments of \$25,000 or more for any program and the amount of such payment, calendar year 1965—Continued

Program	Name and address	Amount	Program	Name and address	Amount	
HAWAII—continued						
Sugar program	Honokaa Sugar Co., care of Theo. H. Davies & Co., Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii.	\$276,748	LOUISIANA—continued	Caire & Graugnard, Post Office Box 7, Edgard, La.	\$50,318	
Do.	Kohala Sugar Co., care of Castle & Cooke, Inc., Post Office Box 2990, Honolulu, Hawaii.	375,161	Do.	T. Lanaux Son, Lucy, La.	27,107	
Do.	Laupahoehoe Sugar Co., care of Theo. H. Davies & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3020, Honolulu, Hawaii.	368,978	Do.	Terre Haute Plantation, Inc., Reserve, La.	32,394	
Do.	Onomea Sugar Co., care of Brewer & Co., Ltd., Post Office Box 3470, Honolulu, Hawaii.	363,775	Do.	Levert St. John, Inc., Route 1, Box 10, St. Martinville, La.	49,143	
	State total (number of payees, 27)	10,035,628	Do.	Cypremort Farms, Inc., Louisa, La.	30,670	
IDAHO						
Wheat certificates	William Rehn, 2020 Overland Ave., Burley, Idaho.	27,669	Do.	Sunrise Planting Corp., State Route B, Box 392, Franklin, La.	30,968	
Do.	Clinton Ranch, Route 3, Rupert, Idaho.	37,722	Do.	Sterling Sugars, Inc., Post Office Box 572, Franklin, La.	97,612	
Do.	Meacham Land & Cattle Co., Lapwai, Idaho.	27,081	Do.	A. V. Allain & Sons, Inc., Route 2, Box 211, Jeanerette, La.	28,254	
Do.	Ira McIntosh & Sons, 2034 14th St., Lewiston, Idaho.	35,423	Do.	Katy Plantation, Post Office Box 344, Franklin, La.	27,683	
Do.	Wagner Bros., 1126 3d St., Lewiston, Idaho.	36,204	Do.	Southdown, Inc., Post Office Box 52378, New Orleans, La.	172,226	
Do.	Willmore Bros., Rexburg, Idaho.	99,336	Do.	The South Coast Corp., 1420 Carondelet Bldg., Milliken & Farwell, Inc., Route 1, Box 157, Port Allen, La.	302,384	
	State total (number of payees, 6)	263,435	Do.	Westover Planting Co., Ltd., Route 2, Box 214, Port Allen, La.	45,040	
ILLINOIS						
Feed grain diversion	Edward C. Sumner, Jr., Jessie Sumner, and John Sumner, care of Edward C. Sumner, Jr., Milford, Ill.	27,575	Do.	Harry L. Laws & Co., Inc., Route 2, Box 299, Port Allen, La.	60,398	
Do.	Cote Farms, Inc., St. Anne, Ill.	51,674	Do.	Poplar Grove Planting & Refining Co., Inc., Route 2, Box 69, Port Allen, La.	43,722	
Do.	Tallmadge Ranch, Inc., Momence, Ill.	45,745	Do.	Margaret Plantation, care of Frank Carruth III, agent, Route 2, Box 195, Port Allen, La.	34,408	
Do.	A. H. Nichols, 724 3d St., Dixon, Ill.	37,084	Do.	Louisiana State Penitentiary, Angola, La.	61,471	
	State total (number of payees, 4)	162,078		State total (number of payees, 32)	1,737,432	
INDIANA						
Feed grain diversion	Dr. Lee Maris, 606 South Brady St., Attica, Ind.	32,948	MINNESOTA		E. G. Melo, Box 205, Stephen, Minn.	25,460
Do.	John Blood, 206 East 5th St., Mount Carmel, Ill.	35,880	Wheat certificates		State total (number of payees, 1)	25,460
Do.	Wm. Gehring, Inc., Rural Route 6, Rensselaer, Ind.	79,788				
Do.	James D. Green, care of Northern Trust Co., Box N, Chicago, Ill.	26,593	MISSISSIPPI		H. R. Wetson & Sons, Tunice, Miss.	25,447
Do.	Savich Farms, Rural Route 6, Rensselaer, Ind.	43,595	Cotton domestic allotments		State total (number of payees, 1)	25,447
Do.	Everett Madison, Momence, Ill.	29,022				
Do.	New Harmony Realty Co., care of Melvin Fisher Farm Manager, Route 2, New Harmony, Ind.	34,848	MISSOURI			
Do.	Overmyer Farms, Inc., Francesville, Ind.	111,494	MISSOURI		Scamman & Co., Rock Port, Mo.	25,980
Do.	Arthur P. Gunz, North Judson, Ind.	66,711	Feed grain diversion		Donald E. Morris, Fortescue, Mo.	25,278
Do.	Richard & Jerome Gunz, North Judson, Ind.	42,575	Do.		G. D. Patterson, O. J. Patterson, Mount City, Mo.	67,492
Do.	Wm. Gehring, Inc., Rural Route 6, Rensselaer, Ind.	25,265	Feed grain price support		do	25,552
	State total (number of payees, 11)	528,719	Feed grain diversion		Roy J. Davis, Boonville, Mo.	27,964
IOWA						
Feed grain diversion	Garst Co., care of Stephen Garst, Coon Rapids, Iowa.	33,180	Do.		G. Leslie DeLapp, care of Don Elefson (RLDS Church), RLDS Auditorium, Independence, Mo.	38,763
Do.	J. F. Huxol, 701 North Iowa, Charles City, Iowa.	31,189	Do.		James Washburn, LaBelle, Mo.	26,660
Do.	Lawrence Hamilton, Rural Route 1, Hampton, Iowa.	25,816	Do.		Maxwell Bros., Route 1, East Prairie, Mo.	29,466
Do.	Payne Valley Farms, Inc., by M. M. Payne III, Hamburg, Iowa.	29,025	Do.		Arressas Ranch, Inc., Wm. Milne, mgr., Burlington Jet, Mo.	27,069
Do.	Amana Society, care of Wm. Hahn, farm manager, Middle Amana, Iowa.	161,601	State total (number of payees, 9)			
Do.	Lakin Ranch, Roy Selley, agent, Odebolt, Iowa.	74,064				
Do.	do	38,101	MISSOURI			
Feed grain price support	Lakin Ranch, Odebolt, Iowa.	29,677	Wheat certificates		Campbell Farming, Hardin, Mont.	133,821
Feed grain diversion	Amana Society, care of Wm. Hahn, farm manager, Middle Amana, Iowa.	57,395	Do.		Floyd Warren, Inc., Hardin, Mont.	30,269
Feed grain price support	State total (number of payees, 9)	435,048	Do.		V. R. Cazier & Sons, Toston, Mont.	27,539
LOUISIANA						
Sugar program	Churchill & Thibaut, Inc., Post Office Box 431, Donaldsonville, La.	46,864	Do.		Lee A. Booth, 1742 Alder Dr., Great Falls, Mont.	28,906
Do.	C. F. Daigle, Jr., trader, Labadieville, La.	37,844	Do.		Juedeman Grain Co., Geraldine, Mont.	36,451
Do.	B. D. Thibaut, partners, Route 2, Napoleonville, La.	26,316	Do.		Leo M. Kraft, Box 909, Havre, Mont.	34,062
Do.	Saviole Industries, partners, Belle Rose, La.	51,248	Do.		Marlin Spicher, Hingham, Mont.	26,166
Do.	Duhe Bros. Planting Co., Post Office Box 241, New Iberia, La.	26,512	Do.		Allen Kolstad, Ledger, Mont.	27,970
Do.	W. C. Lanie & Sons, Inc., Route 1, Box 265, Jeanerette, La.	25,019	Do.		Schnitzler Corp., Froid, Mont.	31,619
Do.	M. A. Patout & Sons, Ltd., Route 1, Box 288, Jeanerette, La.	32,973	Do.		Nash Bros., Redstone, Mont.	26,248
Do.	A. Wilbert's Sons L & S Co., Post Office Box 540, Plaquemine, La.	65,899	Do.		Bill McCarter, 215 11th Ave., Shelby, Mont.	26,724
Do.	Catherine Sugar Co., Inc., Route 2, Box 104, Port Allen, La.	28,224	State total (number of payees, 11)			
Do.	Young's Industries, Inc., Youngsville, La.	39,940				
Do.	J. B. Leverett Land Co., Post Office Box 351, Thibodaux, La.	26,341	KANSAS			
Do.	Caldwell Sugars Co-op., Inc., Post Office Box 226, Thibodaux, La.	27,521	Wheat certificates		Andrew Larson, Route 1, Garden City, Kans.	31,709
Do.	Valentine Sugars, Inc., Post Office Box 340, Lockport, La.	50,413	Do.		W. D. Brady, 205 La Mesa Dr., Dodge City, Kans.	28,596
Do.	Alma Plantation, Ltd., Lakeland, La.	35,647	Do.		Dale Steele & Sons, care of Larry Steele, Tribune, Kans.	28,774
Do.	Graugnard Farm, St. James, La.	36,046	Feed grain diversion		Aaron Sell, 1470 Emporia, Aurora, Colo.	40,123
			Wheat certificates		Clyde F. Mercer, 901 Center, Garden City, Kans.	29,236
			Do.		Raymond Dienst, Sr., Lakin, Kans.	26,217
			Do.		Ray Rohlman, Syracuse, Kans.	29,168
			Do.		J. Ernest Bertrand, 315 Maple, Oakley, Kans.	32,927
			Do.		R. B. Christy Estate, Donald Christy, administrator, Box 278, Scott City, Kans.	25,450
			Feed grain diversion		G. H. J. Farms, Ltd., Johnson, Kans.	39,772
			Do.		Walter Herrick Johnson, Kans.	25,415
			Do.		Olen Warner, Syracuse, Kans.	44,809
			Wheat certificates		Faye Collingwood, Hutchinson, Kans.	26,414
			Sugar program		K. Akagi Farms, Johnson, Kans.	25,051
			Feed grain diversion		Carl Brolier, Moscow, Kans.	26,177
			Wheat certificates		Marshall Farms, care of Don E. Crumbaker, Brewster, Kans.	29,953
			Do.		Sam Medford, Levant, Kans.	27,952

Name and address of payees who received payments of \$25,000 or more for any program and the amount of such payment, calendar year 1965—Continued

Program	Name and address	Amount	Program	Name and address	Amount
KANSAS—continued			SOUTH DAKOTA		
Wheat certificate	O. C. K. Farms, care of Gary E. Cooper, Colby, Kans.	\$34,630	Wheat certificates	Robert O'Day, Fort Pierre, S. Dak.	\$27,993
	State total (number of payees, 18)	552,373	Feed grain diversion	Bones Hereford Ranch, Parker, S. Dak.	34,341
NEBRASKA				State total (number of payees, 2)	62,334
Feed grain diversion	Frank J. Higgins, Schuyler, Nebr.	25,346	TEXAS		
Do.	Leo C. Anderson, Dakota City, Nebr.	31,507	Feed grain diversion	Carl Easterwood, 1002 Maple St., Dimmitt, Tex.	30,194
Do.	Central Alfalfa, Inc., by George Pfister, Lexington, Nebr.	34,804	Do.	George Heck, Route D, Nazareth, Tex.	32,468
Do.	Noel Cover, S. Meridian, Cozad, Nebr.	27,257	Do.	Homer Hill, Box 382, Hart, Tex.	28,432
Do.	Platte Valley Products, Lexington, Nebr.	26,315	Do.	Ware Farms, Co., Box 865, Dimmitt, Tex.	52,999
Do.	Harland Milligan, Hooper, Nebr.	29,587	Do.	G. L. Willis, Box 453, Dimmitt, Tex.	34,959
Do.	Dale Lovegrove, Geneva, Nebr.	33,187	Do.	J. K. Griffith, Route 2, Morton, Tex.	32,850
Do.	Johnson Bros. & Jones, partners, Cambridge Nebr.	29,724	Do.	E. L. Polvado 304 East Grant, Morton, Tex.	27,620
Do.	Tyson Farms, Inc., Blair, Nebr.	32,285	Do.	T. Cattle Co., in care of B. B. Wegenhoff, Route 1, Eagle Lake, Tex.	28,717
Do.	Thomas W. Harrington, Bradshaw, Nebr.	32,798	Do.	Elmer Haiskell, Route 2, Box 212, Balhart, Tex.	33,623
Feed grain price support	Hundahl Farms, care of Ernest Hundahl, Tekamah, Nebr.	33,632	Do.	O. D. Bingham, Box 944, Friona, Tex.	38,173
	State total (number of payees, 11)	336,442	Do.	Herbert E. Bippus, 401 25-Mile Ave., Hereford, Tex.	36,491
NEVADA			Do.	Vernon Denson, Route 5, Hereford, Tex.	25,706
Cotton domestic allotments	W. J. Williams, 1223 Park Circle, Las Vegas, Nev.	27,528	Do.	J. T. Gilbreath, Jr., 303 East 5th, Hereford, Tex.	25,983
	State total (number of payees, 1)	27,528	Do.	R. C. Godwin, Box 1026, Hereford, Tex.	51,827
NEW MEXICO			Do.	A. C. Hays, Jr., Box 668, Dimmitt, Tex.	31,965
Wool program	Herbert Corn, Route 2, Box 196-C, Roswell, N. Mex.	25,024	Do.	E. M. Jack, Route 2, Friona, Tex.	26,055
Feed grain diversion	Dale Elliott, Route 1, Clovis, N. Mex.	25,506	Do.	Virgil F. Marsh, Route 5, Hereford, Tex.	31,242
Do.	L. R. Talley, Route 1, Texico, N. Mex.	43,817	Do.	Taft McGee, Box 69, Hereford, Tex.	38,380
Do.	John Garrett & Sons, Box 271, Clovis, N. Mex.	27,188	Do.	J. C. Mills, Drawer G., Abernathy, Tex.	57,086
Do.	W. V. Lawrence, 2214 Breckon Dr., Hobbs, N. Mex.	48,347	Do.	Billy Wayne Sisson, Route 5, Hereford, Tex.	29,870
Do.	H. & G. Ranch, Bill Hilburn, operator, Post Office Box 276, Columbus, N. Mex.	36,510	Do.	Robert Veigel, Box 511 Roosevelt, Hereford, Tex.	26,541
	State total (number of payees, 6)	206,293	Wheat certificates	Taft McGee, Box 69, Hereford, Tex.	25,016
Feed grain diversion	A. D. Swindell, Pantego, N.C.	43,394	Do.	Perrin Bros., Box 12, Hereford, Tex.	94,687
Do.	John F. McNair, Inc., Laurinburg, N.C.	25,019	Feed grain diversion	Alamo Angus Ranches, Route 2, Box 52, Carrizo Springs, Tex.	29,587
Do.	J. B. Bell, Route, Pantego, N.C.	26,729	Cotton domestic allotments	H. H. Moore & Sons, Navasota, Tex.	62,798
	State total (number of payees, 3)	95,142	Do.	Tom J. Moore, Navasota, Tex.	54,872
NORTH DAKOTA			Feed grain diversion	Frank Robinson, Panhandle, Tex.	43,664
Wheat certificates	Swindler Bros., Mott, N. Dak.	26,142	Do.	Verlon Hilburn, East Star Route, Lovington, N. Mex.	25,425
Do.	Arvel Glinz, Pingree, N. Dak.	29,192	Do.	E. T. O'Daniel Estate, 1704 Harvard, Big Spring, Tex.	31,011
	State total (number of payees, 2)	55,334	Do.	K. K. Whitaker, Sand Rural Station, Lamesa, Tex.	37,025
OHIO			Do.	W. S. Wimberly, 605 S.W. 2d, Seminole, Tex.	42,101
Feed grain diversion	Harry Booher, Route 4, Urbana, Ohio	26,744	Do.	R. L. Porter Estate, Box 1055, Spearman, Tex.	29,832
Do.	Ward Walton & Associates, Inc., Route 4, Upper Sandusky, Ohio.	61,757	Wheat certificates	Thomas L. Moran, Dumas Route, Hartley, Tex.	34,256
	do.	28,210	Do.	Harold H. Hogue, 1415 Denrock Ave., Dalhart, Tex.	32,051
	State total (number of payees, 3)	116,711	Feed grain diversion	Spade Farms Inc., 1107½ Ave. K, Lubbock, Tex.	48,729
OREGON			Cotton domestic allotments	Joe Hoover, Fabens, Tex.	28,556
Wheat certificates	Wilcox Investment, care of Pohn P. Weidert, Box 323, Arlington, Oreg.	30,745	Do.	C. L. Ranch, Dell City, Tex.	28,120
Do.	Chase Land & Cattle Co., Haycreek Ranch, Madras, Oreg.	29,984	Feed grain diversion	Halsell Cattle Co., Earth, Tex.	57,341
Feed grain diversion	Tulana Farms, Ashland Star Route, Klamath Falls, Oreg.	49,079	Wheat certificates	Marshall Cator, Box 442, Sunray, Tex.	39,215
Sugar program	Shigeno Farms, Inc., care of Tadao Shigeno, Route 1, Ontario, Oreg.	29,528	Feed grain diversion	Fortson Farms, Box 1321, Corsicana, Tex.	28,228
Wheat certificates	Nelson Bros., Lexington, Oreg.	31,499	Do.	Herman Grusing, 32 Oldham Circle, Amarillo, Tex.	35,775
Do.	Ralph Crum, Ione, Oreg.	34,911	Do.	Martin Bros., Route 2, Friona, Tex.	37,204
Do.	Tucker Echo Ranch, Inc., Echo, Oreg.	39,012	Cotton domestic allotments	Albert J. Hoelscher, 1902 Jackson, Pecos, Tex.	26,651
Do.	Charles A. Tom, 2015 West Scenic Dr., The Dalles, Oreg.	28,688	Do.	Clark & Roberts, Route 4, Clarksville, Tex.	38,201
Do.	B. L. Davis Ranch, Inc., Adams, Oreg.	25,597	Do.	Jonescutt Farms, Inc., Box 1210, Pecos, Tex.	36,983
Do.	Richard Hampton, 215 NW. 12th, Pendleton, Oreg.	25,080	Do.	Kesey Bros., Box 1368, Pecos, Tex.	29,613
Do.	Pendleton Ranches, Box 1186, Pendleton, Oreg.	42,253	Do.	Kenneth Lindemann, Box 1947, Pecos, Tex.	28,201
Do.	Thompson Ranches, Route 1, Box 199, Pendleton, Oreg.	26,851	Do.	Western Farms, Box 68, Verhalen, Tex.	25,057
Do.	Glenn, Thorne, Holdman Route, Pendleton, Oreg.	27,371	Wheat certificates	Worsham Bros., Box 1411, Pecos, Tex.	43,942
	State total (number of payees, 13)	420,598	Feed grain diversion	V. H. and J. M. Tatton, Salt Creek Ranch, Drawer D, Refugio, Tex.	49,970
PENNSYLVANIA			Do.	Esra F. Fisk, Texhoma, Okla.	26,942
Feed grain diversion	George V. Seiple & Son, Mounted Route 40 and William Penn Highway, Easton, Pa.	37,337	Do.	Miller Farms Co., Box 390, Tula, Tex.	29,232
	State total (number of payees, 1)	37,337	Do.	Fowler McDaniel, Box 6, Tula, Tex.	78,677
			Do.	Warner Reid, Box 259, Tula, Tex.	46,248
			Do.	Fowler McDaniel, Box 6, Tula, Tex.	25,562
			Do.	W. T. Waggoner trust estate, Drawer 2130, Vernon, Tex.	90,877
			Wool program	Otto Maser, De Kalb, Tex.	45,327
			Wheat certificates	R. T. Hoover, Post Office Box 816, Fabens, Tex.	25,776
				Lee Moor Farms, Clint, Tex.	26,622
				State total (number of payees, 60)	2,271,564
UTAH					
			VIRGINIA		
			Feed grain diversion	Deseret Livestock Co., 531 South State St., Salt Lake City, Utah.	25,049
			Wool program	E. J. Graff, Hurricane, Utah.	29,868
			Wheat certificates	State total (number of payees, 2)	54,917
			Feed grain diversion	W. R. Malbon, 875 Old Dam Neck Rd., Virginia Beach, Va.	25,109
				State total (number of payees, 1)	25,109

Name and address of payees who received payments of \$25,000 or more for any program and the amount of such payment, calendar year 1965—Continued

Program	Name and address	Amount	Program	Name and address	Amount
WASHINGTON					
Wheat loan program	Robert Franz, Ritzville, Wash.	\$28,633	PUERTO RICO—con.	Sugar program	
Do	Ralph Gering, 108 W. 11th, Ritzville, Wash.	41,891		Carlos Fajardo Quiles, trustee for Antonia Cabassa Vda. Fajardo, Teodoro Fajardo Cabassa, Carmen Roger Suau, Wilda Fajardo Roger, Hector Fajardo Roger, Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez, Rosalinda Fajardo Davila, Maria L. Fajardo Davila, Andres Guillemand Fajardo, Ana Ruth Guillemand Fajardo, Carlos Fajardo Quiles, Heyda Fajardo de Carlo and Melania Quiles Vda. Fajardo, joint operators, Post Office Box 67, Hormigueros, P.R.	\$78,542
Do	Leonard-Henry Franz, Lind, Wash.	35,658		Illeana Garcia Ramirez de Arellano, Post Office Box 599, Mayaguez, P.R.	25,238
Do	Hutterian Brethren, Route 1, Espanola, Wash.	26,675		Ernesto Quinones Sambolin, Post Office Box, 125 San Gorman, P.R.	54,334
Do	R. H. Phillips, Lind, Wash.	28,661		Do. Jose C. Rodriguez Favale, Post Office Box 657, Sabana Grande, P.R.	26,994
Do	Robert Phillips, Lind, Wash.	29,585		Aurelio Tio Mazario, testamentary executor of the estate of Juan Angel Tio, deceased, Galle Wilson No. 1398, Santurce, P.R.	45,369
Do	Don Damon, Cunningham, Wash.	40,266		Miguel A. Garcia Mendez, Post Office Box 599, Mayaguez, P.R.	40,354
Wheat certificates	Vollmer & Bayne, Box 129, Prosser, Wash.	37,485		Carlos F. Calimano, Post Office Box 433, Guayama, P.R.	25,253
Do	Bi County Farms, Box 550, Prosser, Wash.	47,911		Do. Enrique R. Calimano, Post Office Box 515, Guayama, P.R.	48,902
Do	Horrigan Farms, Box 550, Prosser, Wash.	28,531		Luis Vila Santana, Ponce de Leon No. 501, Hato Rey, P.R.	30,707
Do	Broughton Land Co., Box 27, Dayton, Wash.	65,038		Soller Sugar Co., Inc., Post Office Box 1085, Arecibo, P.R.	32,675
Do	The Sheffels Co., Govan, Wash.	27,355		Hacienda Dolores Farms, Inc., Post Office Box 1144, Ponce, P.R.	26,782
Do	Timm, Duane & Robert, Harrington, Wash.	26,235		Fernando Rovira Calimao, trustee for Fernando Rovira Calimao and Aida Fausta Abaca Iturrondo, joint operators, Post Office Box 2352, San Juan, P.R.	30,518
Do	Twain Bodmer, 1437 Sturm Ave., Walla Walla, Wash.	25,447		Waldemar Bravo, Post Office Box 58, Mayaguez, P.R.	78,015
Do	Lenneker Farms, Inc., care of Robert Lenneker, Star Route, Prescott, Wash.	64,840		Antonio Roig, Sucrs. S. en C., Post Office Box 487, Humacao, P.R.	368,046
Do	John H. Rea, Route 1, Box 77, Touchet, Wash.	33,842		Mario Mercado e Hijos (a Pts.), Guayanilla, P.R.	73,691
Do	Robison Land & Livestock Co., c/o Jim S. Robison, Post Office Box 1018, Walla Walla, Wash.	28,606		Do. Hector Stella, trustee for the heirs of Arturo Lluberas, deceased; Rosa Elena Lluberas, Graciela Lluberas de Valenti, Raquel Lluberas, Celia Lluberas de Blasins, Antonia Lluberas Vda Armstrong, Geonimo Lluberas Kells, Rosa Antonia Lluberas Kells, Maria Christina Lluberas Kells and Terry Muniz Lluberas, joint operators, Post Office Box 5, Yauco, P.R.	36,017
Do	Tucker Farms, Inc., c/o Conrad Tucker, 641 Bryant Ave., Walla Walla, Wash.	26,130		Basilio del Pilar, Rural Box 30, Arecibo, P.R.	25,877
Do	McGregor Land & Livestock Co., Hooper, Wash.	52,591		Francisco Mendez Roig, trustee, in bankruptcy for Jorge Gonzales Hernandez, Central Agricultural Co., Inc., Compania Agricola Mendez, Inc., and Northern Estates, Inc., joint operators, San Vicente, P.R.	31,536
Do	E. C. Hay & Sons, Inc., Tekoa, Wash.	25,496		Do. Proportional Profit Farm La Julia, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	25,695
Do	Grote Farms, Inc., c/o Ben Grote, Prescott, Wash.	54,105		Do. Proportional Profit Farm Monte Grande, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	27,177
	State total (number of payees, 22)	804,714		Do. Proportional Profit Farm La Luisa, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	32,116
WYOMING					
Wool program	Warren Livestock Co., Box 848, Cheyenne, Wyo.	25,965		Do. Hector L. Bruno, Calle Vicente Pales No. 4, Guayama, P.R.	62,459
	State total (number of payees, 1)	25,965		Felix J. Serralles Nevares, Box A, Mercedita, P.R.	39,035
PUERTO RICO				Ramon Gonzalez Rodriguez, Post Office Box 287, Aguirre, P.R.	26,372
Sugar program	Francisco Mendez Roig, trustee in bankruptcy for Jorge Gonzales Hernandez, San Vicente, P.R.	50,011		Do. Proportional Profit Farms, San Pedro, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	25,604
Do	Francisco Mendez Roig, trustee in bankruptcy for Jorge Gonzales Hernandez, Central Agricultural Co., Inc., Compania Agricola Mendez, Inc., and Northern Estates, Inc., joint operators, San Vicente, P.R.	45,178		Ramon Gonzalez Hernandez, Post Office Box 287, Aguirre, P.R.	81,514
Do	Carlos Fajardo Quiles, trustee for Antonia Cabassa Vda. Fajardo, Teodoro Fajardo Cabassa, Carmen Roger Suau, Wilda Fajardo Roger, Hector Fajardo Roger, Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez, Rosalinda Fajardo Davila, Maria L. Fajardo Davila, Andres Guillemand, Ana Ruth Guillemand Fajardo, Carlos Fajardo Quiles, Heyda Fajardo de Carlo, and Melania Quiles Vda. Fajardo, joint operators, P.O. Box 419, Mayaguez, P.R.	92,589		Do. Proportional Profit Farm, Fortuna, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	35,152
Do	Francisco Mendez Roig, trustee in bankruptcy for Jorge Gonzalez Hernandez, Central Agricultural Co., Inc., Compania Agricola Mendez, Inc., and Northern Estates, Inc., joint operators, San Vicente, P.R.	44,260		Do. Proportional Profit Farm, Luciana, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	27,281
Do	Lucas & Co., S. en C., Post Office Box 1972, Aguirre, P.R.	497,450		Do. Proportional Profit Farm, Maria Antonia, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	32,403
Do	Suen, J. Serralles, Box A, Mercedita, P.R.	239,928		Do. Proportional Profit Farm, Providencia, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	33,836
Do	Wirshing & Co., S. en C., Box A, Mercedita, P.R.	65,875		Do. Proportional Profit Farm, Santa Rita, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	37,184
Do	Arsenio Martinez, Jr., trustee for the heirs of Gabriel Pia, deceased; heirs of Miguel Esteves Blanes, deceased; Rafael Martinez Dominguez; heirs of Arsenio Martinez, deceased; Frank Bianchi Green; Dr. Francisco J. Casaldu; Jose Enrique Bianchi Green; Juan Hernandez Batalha; heirs of Guillermo Cabrera Cuesta, deceased; and heirs of Jose Maria del Valle, deceased, joint operators, Post Office Box 215, Aguadilla, P.R.	137,766		Do. Peter Michalakis, Carretera No. 2, Casa No. 106, Mayaguez, P.R.	37,254
Do	Eduardo Esteves Marques, Post Office Box 187, Aguadilla, P.R.	25,580		Do. Proportional Profit Farm, Mini Mini, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	28,112
Do	Juan Juarbe Alfar, Buzon R-3-221, Isabela, P.R.	28,788		Do. Proportional Profit Farm, Higuerito, Post Office Box 9745, Santurce, P.R.	30,488
Do	Horacio Frau Subira, trustee for Providencia Subira Echevarria Viuda de Perello and Concepcion Subira Echevarria Viuda de Frau; and heirs of Maria Subira Echevarris, deceased, joint operators, Post Office Box 1783, Ponce, P.R.	41,119		Do. Ubaldino Ramirez de Arellano Poventud, Post Office Box 3445, Mayaguez, P.R.	26,986
Do	C. Brewer Puerto Rico, Inc., Post Office Box 507, Fajardo, P.R.	489,862		Armando Julio Wirshing Conesa, Box A, Mercedita, P.R.	27,853
	State total (number of payees, 48)	3,473,867			

PROPER DEVELOPMENT OF RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, several months ago Mr. Harry T. Thorson, president of the Wyoming Land and Water Commission, made an excellent speech on "What the Land and Water Conservation Act Will Mean to Outdoor Recreation in Wyoming." In the speech, Mr. Thorson described with wit and wisdom the frontier heritage that is so important to the people of Wyoming, and he outlined a sound program for the proper development of our recreational resources.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHAT THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION ACT WILL MEAN TO OUTDOOR RECREATION IN WYOMING

(By Harry T. Thorson)

Were you to visit high, wide and windy . . . you would see a gamut of nature's most beautiful, strange, but most often spectacular scenes in America.

A mere 340,000 souls live in this almost 100,000 square miles that can hold twelve States the size of Massachusetts, and yet Boston alone has twice the population.

I have come to speak about this land . . . which bursts with the bright buds of abundance and the placid flowers of relaxation and the cool pools, rushing streams, snow capped peaks of sportman paradise. I have come to speak of Wyoming . . . as it is and as it might become . . . as it is now and as it might become . . . with intelligent direction, and with cooperation.

It was wise national leadership that created the first national monument from Devil's Tower some six decades ago . . . which gave us our first national park in the fabulous Yellowstone, and then in succession gave us the Grand Tetons, the Big Horn Mountains and other scenic wonders for the delight of millions of fellow Americans and for the constant admiration of those of us fortunate enough to live there.

It has been said, and with just justification, that "if you stay in Wyoming for a year . . . you'll never be satisfied with any place else." Where else can one see springs break loose their icy locks in rushing rivulets to bare the purple flower, the bear emerge from his winter sleep, the wild elk and deer meander up the greening slopes to the wild, forest-covered high country.

Here are some slides to help illustrate. Devil's Tower . . . the Indians' legend says it was formed by a giant bear attempting to clear his way to maidens who took refuge on the plateau. The following slides depict some of the grandeur of Yellowstone. Words are too inadequate to describe its colors and forms. Look at them . . . It has to be seen to be fully appreciated. Some 3 million persons visited Yellowstone in 1965, viewing these and other exciting scenes.

Wildlife live in this country much as they did centuries ago . . . The majestic elk, graceful deer, the lumbering moose, the nimble, sure-footed sheep, and the suspicious and dangerous bear live with the lesser forest predator, the bobcat, the lynx, the wolf. These spread into the nearby grand Teton National Park where the Wyoming game and fish commission have supervision.

In most all Wyoming winter sports are in their infancy. As highways are opened up for winter travel, multitudes of Americans, and foreigner too, will come to enjoy winter in the State's parks and other recreation areas. Jackson Hole and Pinedale area are

already becoming known to avid skiers and the new ski slopes at Jackson promise to become world famous. Yet there are many State parks which have need to be developed to their potential. Keyhole Dam with excellent possibility for boating, fishing, camping lies in the eastern part of the State, and nearby is Sand Creek, an outstanding trout stream, with camping facilities. High in the Bear Lodge Mountains sits Cook Lake, still nearby, and this complex can become a great summer and winter playground.

Hot Springs State Park at Thermopolis is being developed. Close to the town of Shoshone is Boysen Dam, a huge lake where one can boat and fish all seasons. Near Buffalo at the edge of the snow-capped Big Horns Lake De Smet teems with fish and has adequate space for boating and camping. A short drive from Casper along the upper platte are Alcove, Pathfinder, Seminoe and Grey Reef Dams, and Casper Mountain offers skiing as one of its facilities. Guernsey State Park with the Glendo Dam will have much to offer when it is developed.

Outdoor recreation is for people, and the demand for such will increase with the expanding population. According to projections, the population will be double in the next 35 years and the demand for recreation will triple. The blue collar worker alone—in the last 100 years—has about 32 hours more per week; vacation weeks in industry has grown from 20 to 140 million; the older folks are living longer—the average is now nine years after retirement; young people have more free time. Prolonged schooling and late entry into work force adds free time to the young adult. Each of these factors adds to the importance of acquiring and developing properly located areas of suitable size to serve functions for recreation. Thus the problem in our society is to prepare for a smooth transition from work values to leisure values. Our society has, by tradition, been one where work was the core of values. It is difficult to adjust, for some of us, to a leisure centered role, where still meaningful activities can be introduced. Every indication tells us that he should prepare for efficient use of leisure time. Recreation is a partial answer. Additional areas must be found . . . present areas expanded.

In Wyoming the 38th legislature declared it . . . "desirable that Wyoming citizens of the present and future generations be assured adequate outdoor recreation resources; that it is desirable for all levels of government and private interests to take prompt and coordinated action to the extent practicable . . ."

The thirty-eighth legislature enacted the law authorizing participation by the State of Wyoming and its political subdivisions in programs of Federal assistance relating to the planning and development of outdoor recreation resources and facilities, including the acquisition of lands and waters and interests therein; creating a commission known as the State Land and Water Conservation Commission; providing for the establishment of a State land and water conservation fund; enumerating certain powers of the Commission; and appropriating \$40,000.

Primary responsibilities of the Commission are to prepare, maintain, and keep up to date a comprehensive plan for the development of outdoor recreation resources of the State.

Basic objective of this plan is to provide a balanced program for the use, management, development and preservation of the natural and cultural resources of the State of Wyoming which will best serve the largest number of people in Wyoming and the Nation over the longest period of time with the least amount of damage to the resource involved.

This plan is intended to serve as a guide for action at all levels of government as well as for private property owners. It is important

that the people of the State take advantage of every opportunity to develop and extend to the fullest the total outdoor recreation potential. The plan will take cognizance of, and give consideration to, the full range of outdoor recreation activities and resources within and affecting the State, and to the roles of all levels of government and of the private sector having responsibilities in outdoor recreation, or allied to outdoor recreation activities.

The principal agencies involved in recreation in Wyoming are the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, the Wyoming State Parks Commission, Wyoming Charities and Reform, and the Wyoming State Land and Water Conservation Commission. Other agencies are also involved: the Wyoming Highway Department, the Wyoming Natural Resources Board, the State Board of Land Commissioners, the Wyoming State Agriculture Department, the Wyoming Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the Soil and Water Conservation State Committee, the University of Wyoming, the State engineer, the Wyoming Health Department, the Wyoming State Department of Education and the Wyoming Travel Commission. As you can see, many of these State agencies are represented on our Land and Water Conservation Commission which is most helpful in discussing and planning a balanced program. The University of Wyoming is preparing a demand study of recreation which is expected to be completed in 1969.

Wyoming has twenty-three counties. We feel we have been most fortunate in being able to work directly with our county commissioners. As a result, eleven of these counties have formed recreation boards to coordinate outdoor recreation programs within their counties. More are organizing at the present time and it is our objective to have such a board in each county.

It's most important that our future pressures on our outdoor recreation areas and facilities be projected. County outdoor recreation planning boards will reduce the workload and will help immeasurably to keep abreast of these demands.

Wyoming is not presently plagued with over size communities. Most of our population is found in the smaller and rural communities. Our State has two cities over 40,000: Cheyenne—48,000; and Casper 47,000. In fact, it all depends on who you are talking to should you ask which is the larger.

Our communities, too, are becoming more and more aware of their responsibilities to provide adequate parks and recreation areas. They too are forming departments under their city governments which will be directly responsible for planning outdoor recreation programs. In fact, through the land and water conservation fund program, which our commission administers, no less than 54 of our 88 communities, have filed applications with us for development of outdoor recreation projects.

Herein lies the problem for Wyoming. Most of the prime land available for expansion lies under the administration of the Federal Government. More than half the land of the State, including its most outstanding natural wonders is under the ownership of the Federal Government. The Bureau of Land Management administers nearly twenty-seven percent of the total land in the State alone. Add this to the seven national forests, the two national parks, the Wind River Reservation, two national recreation areas, and other Federal holdings, it leaves very few natural areas available for expansion by the State government.

We have always maintained wonderful working relations with the Federal agencies, and well we should, as we have many common concerns.

It is most important though, for the Federal Government to recognize that there is a tremendous need for refinement of meth-

ods and procedures. The new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation appears to be following old and antiquated methods already and they are but an infant on the Federal scene.

We in Wyoming strongly recommend that this group share with us our concern about the need for streamlining methods employed by the Federal Government. We suggest that there first of all be a decentralization of authority to the regional offices of the B.O.R. Our State is ready to roll with recreation, but too many channels and hurdles blocking the path of progress will only tend to discourage outdoor recreation, not encourage as was stated so specifically in the land and water conservation fund act.

Other Federal agencies can be pointed to that have felt this need and have done something about it. The pollution control program, the Pittman-Robinson—Dingell-Johnson programs and others have decentralized to such a degree that action programs can be started almost immediately.

Then too, there are other problems that need attention. The fee system will not carry the load unless support is given to it by all America. National parks and national recreation areas must maintain high standards for the visiting public, they cannot be allowed to minimize the health and sanitation standards. Disposal stations need to be provided to take care of the sewage units now sold as standard equipment on campers, trailers, and boats. There are others that the traveling public must help solve and I'm sure this type of a national organization can do much to help guide and direct the thinking of those who have the administrative capability to solve these problems.

We in the high, wide, and windy prefer cooperative individualism. We, in the still rugged frontier, feel that we can plan for the needs of our State. We . . . in the Equality State, believe that individual, but cooperative action can lead us to a more gratifying pursuit of expansion and preparation for the future.

So believing—isn't it our responsibility?

TEXAS OIL CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it was my privilege last Friday to participate in a celebration at Nacogdoches, Tex., commemorating the 100th anniversary of the drilling of the first oil well west of the Mississippi River.

The ceremonies were held in honor of Lyne T. Barret, who in 1866 struck oil at a spot now called Oil Springs, a few miles from Nacogdoches, and thereby set in motion the growth of the Texas oil industry. Our celebration on Friday took the form of dedicating a memorial to Tol Barret on the campus of the Stephen F. Austin State College.

Our celebration at Nacogdoches was one aspect of several commemorative activities undertaken throughout the State in honor of Barret and his historic accomplishment. Television stations participated by showing of a 30-minute documentary film; books relating the accomplishment of Tol Barret were distributed to libraries in the State.

In conjunction with the 100th birthday of the Texas oil industry, members of the industry are publishing a volume entitled "Texas Oil Centennial Anthology." The book chronicles the growth of the Texas oil industry and the Texas Railroad Commission, which is now celebrating its 75th year.

It was my privilege to be asked to become a guest editor of this important

volume, which is a historic collection of the best writings dealing with the development of the petroleum industry in Texas. The editor of the volume is the able Mr. James A. Clark, of Houston, an authority in this field.

The foreword was written by Gov. John Connally, and other guest editors include Senator YARBOROUGH, Lt. Gov. Preston Smith, House Speaker Ben Barnes, Railroad Commission Chairman Ben Ramsey and Commissioners Jim C. Langdon and Byron Tunnell, Comptroller Robert S. Calvert, and former Governors Allan Shivers and Price Daniel.

The distinguished panel of contributing editors includes Chairman John Ben Shepperd, of the Texas Historical Commission; Gen. James E. Taylor, of the Texas Motor Transportation Association; Walter Caven, general counsel of Texas Railroad Association; Weldon Hart, executive vice president of Texas Good Roads Association; Charles E. Simons, executive vice president of Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association; Walter Koch, president Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association; Harry P. Whitworth, Austin counsel of Texas Chemical Council; Lowry M. Carpenter, general manager Texas Butane Dealers Association; Nelson Jones, vice president Humble Oil & Refining Co.; Dr. Richard J. Gonzalez, chairman of the study panel of the National Petroleum Council; Red Adair, the famous oil firefighter, and industry leaders John Mecom, Jr., and Michael T. Halbouly.

The publishers of the anthology have issued an attractive commemorative coin, one side of which depicts the advance of the Texas petroleum industry and the other side of which pays tribute to the Texas Railroad Commission as the "guiding hands of the industry" on its 75th anniversary.

Consequently, Mr. President, recognizing the tremendous importance of the petroleum industry to the people of Texas, and of its vast contributions to the Nation and to the American people, I ask that part of the proceedings of the celebration at Nacogdoches be included in the RECORD today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Chairman Ben Ramsey of the Railroad Commission of Texas, and the remarks of the president of the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Mr. W. A. Landreth, of Fort Worth.

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

REMARKS OF BEN RAMSEY, CHAIRMAN, RAILROAD COMMISSION OF TEXAS, MEMORIAL TO L. T. BARRET, NACOGDOCHES, TEX., SEPTEMBER 30, 1966

It is a genuine pleasure and honor for me—as an East Texan and Chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas—to join in this tribute to an East Texan and oil industry pioneer. Lyne Taliaferro Barret's name belongs in the first rank when we talk about accomplishments for Texas.

From my boyhood at San Augustine, I have heard stories of early-day oil development in this area. We are grateful that scholars like Charley Warner—and those who came after him—have stabilized the facts in

connection with this event. It affords us the opportunity to lift Mr. Barret from the obscurity of legend and give him the recognition he deserves in the annals of Texas history.

I want to congratulate the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association . . . Stephen F. Austin College . . . and the Nacogdoches Chamber of Commerce . . . for sense of history they have shown in honoring this man, in this significant year. I am sure this tribute is shared in spirit by many independents and oil field workers, from tool pusher to top executive.

Almost three hundred years ago, missions established near here marked the outpost of white man's civilization in the New World. It is appropriate that one of the most significant outposts in the advancement of our own petroleum-fed civilization was also established here one hundred years ago, when Tol Barret drilled that first Texas oil well. Fortunately for his memory, he left writings which showed his accomplishment to be the first step in an effort to realize a dream—to develop a great natural resource for a young state.

Tol Barret had imagination, courage, and determination. His correspondence reveals him as a man of great vision, with the ability to inspire others.

The original lease—dated October 9, 1865—between the heirs of Isaac C. Skellern and L. T. Barret, et al., granted "the exclusive privilege of mining operations" upon a tract of land upon which the Springs known as Petroleum or Oil Springs are situated, containing 279 acres . . . situated on the east side of Mast's Creek, about 250 yards below the mouth of Conny Branch, and a few yards below the old Spanish or Indian trail crosses.

The royalty was 1/12th part "of all products of said lands in the way of minerals or oils."

The parties, even at that early date, were aware of conservation practices. The lessees agreed "not to destroy any timber unnecessarily & not to injure the land otherwise than such mining operations may necessarily require." The language "not to injure the land" surely covered damage by salt water.

For a full measure of Tol Barret, I would commend to you the excellent story of him written by Frank Tolbert of the Dallas Morning News, which the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association has published.

As we reflect on the consequences of Barret's well, we must keep in mind that he did not discover oil. The Indians, for uncounted centuries, knew of oil seeps in this region. Historians speculate that oil gathered from streams around here was used to lubricate vehicles which traveled El Camino Real—the link between frontier settlements here and Santo Antonio.

Like his predecessors in the oil fields of Pennsylvania, Barret sought to convert an unused gift of nature to a useful servant of mankind. Like so many inventors and explorers, his timing was unfortunate for his personal welfare. Money was hard to come by. He was trying to develop a supply of oil when there was a glut in another part of the country nearer the market. Texas was still under the governmental confusion of the Reconstruction when officials were appointed by the federal government, rather than elected by Texans.

As far as we know, Mr. Barret was the original wildcatter in a state world-famous for oil hunters. Though his personal success may have been limited, there are few achievements in the history of our state which marked the beginning of something so vast and so vital as the Texas petroleum industry today.

In the past one hundred years, thousands have walked in Mr. Barret's footsteps—some to fortune—some to failure. But the legacy

left by such men is a modern, prosperous, industrialized state. Through its oil and gas production, Texas makes a mighty contribution to the strength and vitality of the whole nation.

Indeed, it is hard to imagine Texas without the benefits of a thriving oil and gas economy—the jobs it affords and the millions of dollars it provides for education and the well-being of our state. In fact, nearly every Texas community shares in the industry's direct payroll of more than \$1.3 billion a year.

Yes, Mr. Barret's enterprise started something in which every Texas citizen has an interest today. Another remarkable element has been the productive partnership between this private business and the people of Texas through their state government. As your elected public official, I feel a special pride in the way the people, acting through their Legislature, have responded to changing conditions in this great natural resource industry. And the industry statesmen, through the years, have always taken the long look in support of the regulation that is necessary for such a far-reaching and complex enterprise. This ability to adapt to changing conditions—this mutual trust between the public and the oil man—has given us public policies that foster growth, rather than penalize development. The policies have been rooted in common sense and equity, rather than in bureaucratic power-grabbing.

Simultaneous with the 100th anniversary of the event we celebrate today, we are also celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Railroad Commission of Texas. Almost fifty years ago, the Commission was given its first responsibility, through the regulation of pipelines. Two years later, the Commission was given broad powers to enforce state laws to prevent waste in the production of oil and gas. From these laws, the Commission devised regulations basic to the conservation system we have today. During the East Texas boom and chaos of the 1930's, we were instructed by the Legislature to prohibit the production of oil unless there was a market for it. Through the years, the Legislature, the petroleum industry, and the Commission have been responsive to the changing conditions. We are continually overhauling our rules so that practices permissible yesterday do not stifle industry development today.

As a result of the widespread interest and concern that Texans have in their oil and gas industry, this partnership has produced remarkable results. Nowhere on earth have so many wells been drilled, in the search for oil . . . nowhere are there as many individual farmers, ranchers, and other landowners sharing in the royalty generated by petroleum production.

As we enter the second century of petroleum development in Texas, we realize we are heirs to billions of barrels of oil reserves, and to the wealth of technology developed by the oil and gas industry. Beginning with Barret's enterprise, oil has stimulated the imagination of many Texans as few other things. This spirit of adventure and inquiry promises us a continuation of these benefits well into the next century.

Therefore on behalf of the state government of Texas, it is with pride that I unveil this memorial to Lyne Taliaferro Barret:

"In 1866 Barret drilled the first Texas oil well about 12 miles southeast of Nacogdoches. It was 106 feet deep and produced 10 barrels a day. Lack of capital prevented further development. Twenty years later, others developed a commercial field near Barret's well site.

"In the century after Barret's well, Texans developed an economy in which oil and gas were major factors: More than 540,000 wells were drilled, 29 billion barrels of oil were produced and sold for more than 63 billion dollars. By the 100th year, a third of Texas'

manufacturing was devoted to processing oil and gas, a fourth of the state revenues came from taxes on petroleum operations. Texas oil and gas production was valued at more than four billion dollars annually.

"To honor the man who opened a prosperous century for this state, Texas oilmen, through Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, join Stephen F. Austin State College, and the Nacogdoches Chamber of Commerce, in this memorial dedicated here September 30, 1966."

REMARKS OF W. A. LANDRETH, FORT WORTH, PRESIDENT, TEXAS MID-CONTINENT OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION AT DEDICATION OF MEMORIAL TO L. T. BARRET, NACOGDOCHES, TEX., SEPTEMBER 30, 1966

Mayor Campbell, Dr. Steen, Mr. Rudisill, Distinguished Guests:

Mayor Campbell, we are so fortunate that the scene for this historic occasion should be in your delightful city. The hospitality of your fellow citizens has already made good the warm spirit of welcome which you just voiced.

On behalf of the thousands of Texans engaged in the oil and gas industry, the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association is pleased to present to Stephen F. Austin State College and the citizens of Nacogdoches County this memorial to Lyne Taliaferro Barret.

According to historians, it was some time in the later part of 1866 that Tol Barret drilled the first oil well in Texas.

About a year ago some thoughtful people in our industry agreed it was high time that some recognition be given the contribution that Tol Barret had made to the development of our state. On this campus and in this community they found enthusiastic and dedicated associates for their project.

I would like to express our appreciation for the leadership of men like Mr. John Rudisill, Dr. Ralph Steen, Mr. A. L. Mangham, Mr. Travis King and Fire Chief Delbert Teutsch and their fellow citizens who made this day possible.

We are particularly honored to have so many descendants of Mr. Barret here for this ceremony. We know you are indeed proud of the contribution made by your illustrious ancestor and we hope this day will enhance public appreciation of the Barret name for years to come.

You may also be interested to know that this ceremony here today is only one of numerous events throughout the state which have been sparked by the anniversary of Tol Barret's well. TV stations are showing a 30-minute documentary picture devoted to the past and future of this industry. Hundreds of posters proclaim his deed. Thousands of students will be writing essays about Barret and his well. Every library in the state now has the story of Barret on its shelves. This should put him in the history books and it should enlarge the spot that Nacogdoches has on the map of Texas. We shall continue this observance the rest of the year.

As far as we know, we have here today the first memorial of a permanent nature ever erected to commemorate this young man's pioneering venture 100 years ago. It is our hope that long after this brick and bronze are gone, there will live in the minds of men the story of Tol Barret's enterprise.

We honor him as our No. 1 Wildcatter. Like thousands who have come after him, he was fascinated by the mysteries of petroleum and sought to make it a useful servant of mankind. Like other pioneers, inventors and discoverers, he broke the barrier between a dream and reality.

The progress that has been made in the economy and culture of Texas as a result of petroleum development during the past century had its start with Tol Barret.

Now in the gateway of a new century of petroleum development, we pause to honor his memory. We hope that our civilization will continue to be blessed by an abundance of men with the spirit of a wildcatter—not only in the search for oil and the perfection of its technologies, but in all fields of endeavor where there is need for more knowledge and where ideas can be transformed into beneficial deeds.

WATERSHED PROGRESS AND COOPERATION

MR. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Watershed Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a matter having to do with the watershed protection and flood prevention program, which is administered efficiently and effectively by the Soil Conservation Service.

Last week, in Washington, Donald A. Williams, the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, held his week-long annual conference with the 50 State conservationists of the Soil Conservation Service. They are the men who administer the program of the Soil Conservation Service in each of the 50 States.

In opening the conference, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, set forth a measure of progress in the upstream watershed program. He said:

Watershed projects have breathed life back into struggling rural areas. Some 786 have been authorized for operations. Of these, 498, or 62 percent, have been authorized since 1960.

Later in the week the conference was addressed by Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Mr. Godfrey stressed the importance of cooperation in resource programs. He told the State conservationists:

Your agency is one of the great instruments for action. And the district program brings to the conservation movement a real genius for cooperation. Cooperation among individuals. Cooperation among the many public agencies that have a resource role.

Mr. President, I feel certain that all Senators will want to read these two addresses. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have both printed in full in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN AT ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF STATE CONSERVATIONISTS OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, USDA, AT THE ANAPOLIS-MANGER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., AT 9 A.M., SEPTEMBER 26, 1966

I'm happy to be with you as you start your annual conference.

If Don Williams had not asked me to speak to you, I would have wanted to come here anyhow . . . if only to thank you . . .

To thank each of you for the valuable contributions you have made to the Department's programs during the past year. . . .

To especially thank those of you who have done so much to make my recent trips to your States pleasant and memorable. Believe you me, I know that local program arrangements take a "heap of doin'" and that behind the scenes is leadership of the "can do" variety.

I have still another reason for being here that isn't connected with your Administrator's invitation.

It is my pleasure to announce authorization of planning assistance to six new Resource Conservation and Development Projects.

They aggregate about 20 million acres.

They are in the States of Illinois, Louisiana, New York, South Carolina, Texas, and Utah. I am directing the Soil Conservation Service to give planning assistance to the local sponsors of these six RC&D Projects.

The details are being made available today to the news media.

This brings to 26 the number of RC&D Projects approved for planning or operations. Eighteen have been approved for operations. Two more will be approved very shortly.

We launched the RC&D Program, as you know, early, in 1964. It is quite remarkable, I think, that so many projects have been initiated in so short a time. Much of the credit belongs to the "can do" variety of behind-the-scenes leadership typified by the State Conservationists of the Soil Conservation Service.

RC&D Projects are a part of the new look that, working together, we have given to conservation and rural development.

This "new look" has many faces.

It is broadening our programs of assistance to soil and water conservation districts.

It is accelerating the small watershed program and emphasizing multipurpose development watershed projects.

It is assisting in recreational developments on private lands.

It is emphasizing beautification of the countryside, in all our work, and by those with whom we work.

It is creating better rural facilities, such as ample water supplies, so that industry will be attracted away from the alarming density of our spreading cities.

It is doing everything within our power to make rural America a place where millions more of our citizens can live, and work, and play.

It is eliminating the causes of rural poverty.

It is strengthening the family farm pattern of agriculture.

It is establishing a reservoir of experience which the developing Nations of the world—largely rural and agrarian—can adapt.

These are some of the many faces of the "new look" we have given to conservation and rural development.

They show that our concept of conservation has been growing and taking new form as was so ably expressed by President Johnson in his Message on Natural Beauty in February 1965 when he said:

"Our conservation must not be just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a *creative* conservation of restoration and renovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit."

In developing this new concept we have done well. I think . . . so far.

Three-fourths of the Nation's 3,000 conservation districts have accepted my offer to broaden their programs. They have keyed their programs to economic development. They now give special attention to recreation, fish and wildlife, beautification, forestry, watershed projects, water supply, and land use changes in rapidly developing rural fringe areas.

More than 34,700 land owners and operators have established one or more income-producing recreational undertakings. More than 3,200 have changed their total operations to include recreation as a primary source of income.

Watershed projects have breathed life back into struggling rural areas. Some 786 have

been authorized for operations. Of these, 498, or 62 percent, have been authorized since 1960.

Under the broadened watershed program authority, 95 communities in 31 States will get water-based recreational developments that will be used by more than 5 million people a year. In addition, thousands of private recreation enterprises such as fishing lakes, camping and picnic areas, vacation cottages and cabins, have come into being with small water impoundments on private land as their principal attraction.

Multipurpose watershed projects have expanded rapidly. Today 358 of the watershed projects authorized for operations have dual or triple objectives including municipal water and recreation as well as flood prevention.

This compares to 78 multipurpose watershed projects in 1960.

At our recommendation the maximum size of watershed dams for flood prevention purposes was increased in 1965 from 5,000 acre-feet to 12,500 acre-feet to better meet the needs of multipurpose watershed development.

Yes, by most measurable standards we have done a pretty good job. At least we are on the right track. And we are moving ahead.

But it is later than we think.

And we are not moving fast enough.

The job we have to do in attempting to control our environment and to adapt it to human needs for tomorrow and next year and a hundred years from now is an urgent and demanding one. The need is tremendous. We can build the Great Society that our creative, hard-driving President challenges us to achieve. But in order to do so, we must conquer some grave threats.

It now seems quite likely that the increase in world population between now and the end of this century will equal or exceed the number who now inhabit the earth.

This means we must be prepared to feed one billion more people in the next 15 years.

This means the soil and water resources of the United States must be developed, protected, and geared for sustained use.

This means, over the long haul, using each acre of land in the way for which it is best suited and treating it in accordance with its needs for sustained use.

This means harnessing our basic natural resources, many of which are underdeveloped, and putting them to work for the good of all the people . . . here and throughout the world.

This means sharing our knowledge and our know-how with underdeveloped Nations where the struggle for daily bread often consumes up to 90 percent of the spendable income.

This is our world of the mid-1960's.

For us, the world begins with these wonderful United States of ours—this land of the free. If we would help make the world prosperous and peaceful, we must ourselves be strong—not only militarily, which everyone takes for granted, but perhaps more importantly—and this is less understood—our resources of land and water must be strong to produce food and fiber in adequate amounts not only to sustain life itself but to keep turning the wheels of industry and commerce . . . to assure the amenities that make life more joyful, and at the same time to provide resources with which to help less fortunate peoples around the world. Only if they have adequate resources will they sustain hope and the desire to better themselves; the alternative is despair—and that destroys rather than builds.

We have reached a point in time where momentous decisions must be made . . . and massive actions taken.

Are we as strong as we should be—this great America of ours—this land of breath-taking vistas—when 70 percent of us occupy 1 percent of the available space?

Are we as strong as we should be when we are still losing the equivalent of 400,000 acres of good land a year from erosion and other forms of soil deterioration?

Are we as strong as we should be when more than a billion dollars a year in flood damages—much of it preventable—still occur in our upstream watersheds?

Are we as strong as we should be when we still pay a bill of 87½ million dollars a year for sediment damage in upstream areas—70 percent of which could be prevented if small watershed projects were installed in all places they are needed?

Are we as strong as we should be when each year we permit 1½ million acres of our very best land—the prime land on which food and fiber can be produced most economically—to be taken out of agriculture forever and buried under the concrete of highways, airports, subdivisions, factories, and the like?

Originally, America was an agrarian Nation. Our strength was in the countryside. We were a Nation of farmers and ranchers and, in the homesteading days, of sodbusters.

Today we are an urban society. Our country people migrate into the great cities looking for opportunities that no longer exist in rural America.

We must restore those opportunities.

We must give direction, purpose and hope to rural America.

We must encourage more rapid rural industrialization and expansion of new commercial enterprises in rural areas to provide new employment and other nonfarm economic opportunities.

We must eliminate the causes of rural poverty.

We must do these things within the framework of our fundamental free enterprise principles. We must move economic opportunity into rural areas. We must use land, not idle it. We must use our resources in ways that conserve, and serve the needs of all people, rural and urban.

This we call conservation and rural development.

You have a key role in it.

Your opportunities to serve are infinite.

Each of you heads the work of an active, respected and accepted resource conservation and development agency within a State—the Soil Conservation Service—now in its 31st year as a permanent agency of government.

Collectively, you currently have under your direction some 15,000 full-time, well-trained conservationists who work closely with the people on the land.

Collectively, you and your employees work closely with and are in position to inform and influence the 15,000-odd members of governing bodies of the Nation's soil and water conservation districts and their 2 million cooperators.

Collectively, you and your staffs work closely with and are in position to influence officials of State conservation and resource and other agencies.

Collectively, you and your associates at the State level are in position to furnish information to and thereby influence the Governors and the State Legislatures on behalf of a better rural America.

Would that I, limited as I necessarily am to spreading myself across the 50 States as sort of a pleader and urger, had your opportunities for action!

Would that I had the opportunity to be the conservation leader in a State!

I envy you, your position and your opportunities.

I urge you to take full advantage of them.

I need not tell you a watershed project is more than land treatment and flood prevention and channel improvement. You know it is an economic shot in the arm that serves as a base for development of a community which may perish otherwise as an economic unit.

I need not tell you that a Resource Conservation and Development Project is more than any of its component parts—that its potential is unlimited.

And I need not tell you that the benefits of a conservation plan installed on a farm or ranch or a group of farms and ranches spread to the far corners of the community. Multiplied, they are Nationwide.

But perhaps I do need to point out that resource conservation itself, while necessary as a base on which to build, is not in itself total rural development.

And it is not your total job.

Your job doesn't end with helping to get the dam built, the terrace system installed, the water supply developed, the recreation area under way.

These are the *beginnings* of rural development, not the end.

Total rural development, to which you should address yourselves, includes highways, parks, libraries, industries, schools, hospitals, water or sewer systems—all the things people need to make country living as feasible and attractive as urban living.

Lift your sights above the humdrum of the daily job. Stand back so you can see the big picture.

And then go to work on it—the total job—with the same zeal you have always shown for soil and water conservation.

I am convinced that what we do in the next few years to rediscover and redevelop rural America—from whence sprang our strength as a Nation—can have a far more profound effect on our future well being—and that of the world—than all the explorations in space.

No other group has a greater opportunity nor a greater responsibility in this crusade for a better rural America than this group.

You are the inheritors of the mantle of Hugh Bennett, that great American who won the fight against heavy odds for national recognition of the menace of soil erosion—the fight that led to establishment of the Soil Conservation Service and soil conservation districts and watershed projects and all the other great conservation programs we have today.

Hugh Bennett's battle is far from won.

Changing times have brought new and even greater challenges.

Hugh Bennett would urge, as I do, that now is the time for you to again become the crusaders you were 30 years ago when a Nation was alerted to the dangers of soil erosion and duststorms.

The question this morning is not: Can you do it?

The question is: Will you do it?

REMARKS OF H. D. GODFREY, WASHINGTON, D.C., SCS STATE CONSERVATIONISTS, SEPTEMBER 29, 1966

1. INTRODUCTION

I am most grateful to Don Williams for including me in this program. Conservation is a long-time motivating force in my personal life as well as in my official activities. Having spent more than 30 years in ASCS and its predecessor agencies, I have been more than a little involved in the question of how this Nation makes conservation happen.

Your agency is one of the great instruments for action. And the district program brings to the conservation movement a real genius for cooperation. Cooperation among individuals. Cooperation among the many public agencies that have a resource role.

The need for this kind of cooperation is implicit in the topic we have before us today: "Opportunities for Agencies of the USDA to Cooperate with Soil Conservation Districts for Community and Resource Development."

2. COORDINATION OF ACP

A major opportunity for cooperation continues to be the Agricultural Conservation Program. The ACP is a major effort of ASCS—and it is my favorite program because it helps just about every agricultural county in the United States. More than a million farmers take part in the program each year, with cost-sharing assistance amounting to around \$220 million annually. Since these farmers must also invest their own money, time, labor, and equipment, the total investment in ACP cost-share practices amounts to double that—or close to half a billion dollars a year.

The National ACP directs the ACP Development Group in each county to meet with the Soil Conservation District Supervisors after the ACP for the year has been agreed upon by the USDA agencies. The purpose of this is to coordinate the ACP with the work plan of the Soil Conservation District.

This is an opportunity for cooperation. It is an opportunity that we can do more with. For this coordination to be really effective, each District must have a well-defined work plan for the year with enough "specifics" in it to make coordination possible. And, of course, SCS is primarily responsible for helping the District develop an annual work plan with definite goals and objectives.

3. SPECIAL ACP PROJECTS

A further opportunity for cooperation is in connection with what we call "Special ACP Projects."

These are projects used to bring together the resources of several land owners to create, with extra Government help, conservation practices that are helpful to people throughout a community. The benefits are community wide.

Special projects are extra effort projects. They are authorized by the ASC State Committees and sometimes carry a little higher Federal share of the total cost. They frequently involve the use of pooling agreements in which a group of farmers combine their resources to raise the needed money for their share of the project. Then the ASCS shares the cost of needed conservation practices.

Now, here is a chance for Soil Conservation Districts to bring to the ASC Committee's attention severe or critical problems which we can help the SCD solve. This is an opportunity because of the fact that we have directed ASC committees to bring into their planning and execution of these projects all interested local bodies and organizations.

Examples:

In Bourbon County, Kansas, many farmers had farm plans that they weren't following through on. Most farms needed practices to stabilize land. In addition, they had dry wells and streams in time of drought.

ASCS, the SCS, Soil Conservation District Supervisors, city officials and the Extension Service got together. It was decided that the best approach was for farmers to carry out the farm plans they already had.

The ASC County Committee said: Look, we'll give you first call on ACP cost-share assistance, if you'll sit down with the SCS technician and figure out a priority schedule for completing your farm plan. This is simple, and it's working.

In Northern New Mexico, ASCS County Committees and the SCS are helping farmers to update and modernize irrigation systems that have been in existence—some of them—for over 300 years. These systems were in bad condition, and the problem was mounting. The State ASC Committee looked the situation over, and agreed to adjust the cost-share sharply upward. The State of New Mexico also provided funds, and the local ditch associations raised an additional amount. The result is a terrific boost to

those farmers—mostly low-income—and to the economies of entire communities.

4. APPALACHIA LAND STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION PROGRAM

ASCS has responsibility for the special conservation cost-sharing phase of the Appalachia program. In order to reach the kind of problems and people to which this program is directed, ASCS has tried to use the knowledge and interest of all local organizations and agencies.

These usually are brought together by ASCS in an effort to determine who and where are the "needy" farmers the program could most appropriately assist. This gives Districts a chance to get something done about the critical conservation problems on lands that are least likely to get needed practices without special help.

5. CROPLAND CONVERSION PROGRAM

This is still a pilot program—being operated in 57 counties this year.

Within ASCS, we are taking a fresh look at the program, with the idea of seeing if we can make it better achieve its purposes. The solution might be to give it greater local adaptation and beam it at solving land use problems rather than using it for commodity adjustment. Any ideas you have along this line would be appreciated. Certainly, in counties where it operates the CCP should help achieve land use adjustments which are in the long-time interest of the area.

6. WILDLIFE AND BEAUTIFICATION

The acres diverted under the various ASCS commodity programs offer a fine opportunity to improve the appearance of the countryside and to enhance wildlife conservation. Although the acres diverted under the annual grain programs will be reduced in 1967, there will continue to be a sizeable diverted acreage. Cotton diversion about the same.

If a Soil Conservation District has a good work plan which identifies the beauty and wildlife needs specifically, ASCS can encourage the farmer to divert land needing this treatment (if it is otherwise eligible). Then we could give him special consideration for ACP or CAP cost-sharing.

An example is the effort made in Minnesota to get wildlife habitat plantings on diverted feed grain acres. Also along a 110-mile stretch of the Minnesota River (from Ortonville to St. Peter) ten of our county offices are being urged to assist farmers in building at least one wildlife pond in each township bordering on the River. Ponds are being built close to the River, designed to serve as duck nesting areas as well as stopover areas for migratory waterfowl on the Minnesota River flyway.

7. SCS HAS AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN ASCS-SCD RELATIONS

Many SCD supervisors are also ASC committeemen. We would like to see an increase in this kind of dual service. It makes for understanding and better cooperation all around.

Even so, you still need to use your influence on Districts to get them to make better use of their opportunities for cooperative achievement with ASCS. If our efforts are to succeed, they must lead to joint SCD-ASC committee action.

Too often—and I say this in all kindness—each one wants the credit but waits for the other to do the work. Both need to work and work well, if we are to get maximum accomplishment in conservation.

8. CONCLUSION

I realize that the Soil Conservation Districts and their national organization have been one of the strongest and most effective supporters of the conservation programs which ASCS administers. I know also that this kind of help and support would not have

been achieved without a sympathetic attitude by the SCS organization at the State and county level.

While we all may have different reasons for supporting these various programs, we can and must bring them to bear for our common good. Without continued helpful support by SCS, Districts might not have the assistance which these programs provide in achieving community and resource development.

FIRST REPORT ON HIGH SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to invite the attention of the Senate to the first report on the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, which has just been released by the Department of Commerce today.

I have a very special interest in this excellent report, because the high speed ground transportation program grew out of my own efforts, begun in 1962, to improve the quality of rail passenger transportation in the northeast megalopolis.

The report issued today on the first year of work under the bill indicates that substantial progress is being made toward that objective. Work has already begun on the construction of new ultra-modern railroad equipment which will be put in service in 1967 to test, under Federal auspices, the public response to faster, more frequent, and more comfortable service. The results of these demonstration projects should provide some valuable guidelines, indeed, regarding the future direction of transportation planning in our heavily urbanized regions.

The report further indicates, in fact, that the scope of the high speed ground transportation program is far more comprehensive than the changes I originally envisioned. It is also providing a major commitment of Federal funds for research and development in a whole new generation of high speed ground transportation equipment together with a systems analysis of the most promising transportation systems of the future. The clear intention is to arm those who must plan future transportation facilities—both in the private and public sectors of the economy—with some valid and realistic choices for future development.

All of this, plus a comprehensive transportation statistics program is being financed under an authorization for expenditures totaling \$90 million. An appropriation for \$18.2 million was made for fiscal 1966 and the amount requested for fiscal 1967 is \$24 million. The program has been slowed considerably because of the demands of the Vietnam conflict, and the report indicates that the appropriations through fiscal 1968 will be considerably less than the \$90 million total for the 3-year period. Even if the total amount is eventually expended, however, it is an extremely modest amount considering the fact that it will lead to improved transportation for millions of persons, and that the same amount of public investment will build only a mile or two of urban expressways in our largest cities.

Finally, the first year's work under this excellent program confirms an assertion I made in my book entitled "Megalopolis Unbound: The Supercity and the Transportation of Tomorrow," which was published last month:

The High Speed Ground-Transportation program—involving the systematic evaluation of alternatives leading to a regional plan for balanced transportation services—represents a model of what national transportation policy formulation could be, perhaps under the comprehensive leadership of a Cabinet-level Department of Transportation.

Since those words were written, the proposed Cabinet-level Department of Transportation has moved closer to reality, and my observation, I hope, is thus all the more pertinent. The new Department should be a mechanism for rational coordination of transportation policies. I hope that the excellent program begun under the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act will not only be kept intact within the framework of the new Department but will stand as an example of what intelligent and rational policy formulation can be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first report on the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FIRST REPORT OF THE HIGH SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1965

(Made pursuant to section 10(a) of the act approved September 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 895))

(By the Secretary of Commerce to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, September, 1966)

INTRODUCTION

This report complies with Section 10(a) of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965 (PL 89-220, 79 Stat. 893, 895) which requires the Secretary of Commerce to report to the President and the Congress, not less often than annually, with respect to activities carried out under the Act. The Act went into effect on September 30, 1965, and on October 31 an appropriation of \$18,250,000 was made available for expenditure. This report covers the nine month period through the end of the fiscal year 1966.

Three basic activities are authorized by the Act. They are:

1. Research and development of high speed ground transportation.
2. Demonstration projects to determine the contribution that high speed ground transportation could make to more efficient and economical intercity transportation systems.
3. A national program to improve the scope and availability of transportation statistics.

The Act is reproduced in the appendix.

GENERAL ORGANIZATION

The administration of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act is a responsibility of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation. To implement the Act, the Department established two new offices placed under the supervision of the Deputy Under Secretary for Transportation Research. The Office of High Speed Ground Transportation has responsibility for the research and development and demonstrations activities authorized by Sections 1 and 2 of the Act, and the Office of Transportation Data Systems is responsible for the collection, collation and dissemination of data, statistics and other information on transportation authorized by Section 4.

The organization of the two offices includes personnel in the following categories: Engineers, economists, transportation research coordinator, transportation research specialists, legal adviser, political scientist, data systems specialist, mathematical statistician, regional planner, marketing analyst, operations research analyst, mathematician, EDP programmer, secretarial, clerical.

Recruiting for these positions has been moderately successful, despite the persistent shortage of qualified and experienced personnel.

In compliance with Section 5 of the Act, a seven member Advisory Committee was appointed by the Secretary from among leading authorities in the field of transportation.

The persons named to the Committee are: Professor Raymond R. Tucker (Chairman), Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri; Donald W. Douglas, Jr., President, Douglas Aircraft Company, Inc., Long Beach, California; Milton A. Gilbert, Chairman of the Board, Gilbert Systems, Inc.; Everett Hutchinson, President, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, Washington, D.C.; Robert M. Jenney, President, Jenney Manufacturing Company, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts; William B. Johnson, President, Illinois Central Railroad, Chicago, Illinois; George E. Leighty, Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association, Washington, D. C.

The first meeting of the Committee was held on June 21, 1966. It was decided at that time that future meetings would be held quarterly.

BUDGET

In Section 11 of the Act, Congress authorized appropriations in amounts not to exceed \$20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and \$35 million each for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1967 and 1968. The appropriation made for fiscal year 1966 was \$18,250,000. For fiscal year 1967, a budget figure of \$24 million for high speed ground transportation was approved and sent to the Congress by the President.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

General

The objective of the High Speed Ground Transportation Research and Development Program is to advance the technology of high speed ground transportation.

The program is attempting both to advance rail technology as rapidly as possible and to discover new technologies which might be useful for new modes of ground transportation. In the rail research and development, the emphasis is on track structure and roadbed where progress in technology has been slower than in other elements of rail operation.

Although the research and development program is oriented to intercity transportation, important fallout is likely for application to urban transportation.

Administrative

Budget: FY 66 funds budgeted for R & D were \$8,750,000; funds requested for FY 67 are \$16,238,000. Funds obligated during FY 66 total \$3,677,742 and additional commitments were made of \$3,630,406.

Personnel: Eight professional and four secretarial-clerical positions have been assigned to the R & D program. At present five professional and three secretarial positions are filled.

Contracts: Following is a list of the R & D contracts entered into during FY 1966 and also a listing of commitments which were made prior to the end of the fiscal year. The contracts have been geographically distributed throughout the United States to the maximum extent practicable as required by Section 8(a)(2) of the Act. In its contractual arrangements the Department has also applied the directives contained in the President's Executive Order setting forth patent policy guidelines with respect to patentable

discoveries and inventions emerging from Government-financed contracts.

Contracts

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.	\$497,785
Melpar, Inc., Falls Church, Va.	300,000
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.	225,000
AIResearch Manufacturing Co. (Garrett Corp.), Torrance, Calif.	30,000
Oceanics, Inc., Plainview, N.Y.	28,590
Celestial Research Inc., South Pasadena, Calif.	26,000
The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	1,015,487
Pennsylvania RR. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	1,554,880
Total	3,677,742

Commitments

General Motors Defense Research Laboratories, Santa Barbara, Calif.	\$73,781
Hydronautics, Laurel, Md.	37,200
UCLA, Los Angeles, Calif.	30,000
National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.	10,000
Materials Research & Development, Oakland, Calif.	53,540
Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio	39,800
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.	14,545
Systems Engineering—RFP, unknown	2,000,000
Cost Analysis—RFP, unknown	60,000
Pennsylvania Railroad, Philadelphia, Pa.	250,000
Melpar, Inc., Falls Church, Va.	918,597
AIResearch Manufacturing Co. (Garrett Corp.), Torrance, Calif.	42,943
Flame Jet Tunneling—RFP, unknown	100,000
Total	3,630,406

Research and development projects

Railroad technology: A program of tests and evaluations of advanced railroad designs has been undertaken. The reactions of track and rolling stock to increased speeds will be defined in terms of roadbed, car and catenary dynamic performance. The scope of the program includes evaluation of experimental propulsion systems, improved truck and pantograph designs, new car body acoustical treatments and the mechanical and economic merits of improved track structures.

Four test cars built for the Department of Commerce by The Budd Company are currently being instrumented by Melpar, Inc. Melpar will conduct the instrumentation during the two year test program.

These cars will be used to conduct tests at speeds up to 150 miles per hour on an improved 21 mile section of Pennsylvania Railroad track between Trenton and New Brunswick, New Jersey. Additionally, the test cars will be used to monitor the condition of the Pennsylvania and New Haven rail lines for the demonstration projects. The test cars are shown in Figure 1 (not printed in the RECORD).

The more important measurements to be made with the test cars are as follows: (1) pantograph-catenary interaction at high speeds, including pantograph forces and motions, as well as operating voltages, currents and temperatures, (2) closed-circuit TV monitoring of pantograph motions and arcing, (3) track and catenary profiles, including rail alignment, gage, superelevation, level, and warp, (4) wheel loads, (5) ride quality and truck performance data, including acceleration along the three perpendicular directions, both in the passenger compartment and on the trucks, (6) vibration and noise level, and (7) air pressure effects between passing trains and between trains and way-side.

In addition to the four test cars, a wayside instrumentation package will be located on the test track to determine rail-roadbed dynamics during train passage and to measure the long term effects of repeated loadings. Roadside TV monitoring of the catenary will also be performed. The roadside package will be movable so that it may be easily relocated for observation at different track sites. Operation of the wayside instruments will be fully synchronized with those on the test cars. The information gathered in the rail test program will also be used to evaluate theoretical models of rail systems, which up to now have largely been based on experience at lower speeds.

The test section has new heavy conductor wire in the catenary, welded steel rail, new ties and fastenings, and standards of level and alignment superior to any other railroad in this country.

A major problem for railroads is the maintenance necessary to keep roadbed and track structure in good enough condition to provide good ride quality. Maintenance could be reduced if a more stable track structure could be devised. Carnegie Institute of Technology, Battelle Memorial Institute and Materials R & D Company have been selected to undertake studies of new designs of roadbeds.

In order to demonstrate the advantages in providing improved schedules and the flexibility of railroads, California, Los Angeles specifically has been selected to develop scheduling techniques using the test track as a proving ground.

Advanced technology: Directions in that portion of the R & D program devoted to a search for new technologies have not been nearly as clear as in rail. Discussions have held with nearly 200 different organizations, permitting a review of the state-of-the-art in nearly every field of technology pertinent to ground transportation.

Enclosed guideway systems: The safety and all-weather capability provided by an enclosed guideway for high speed vehicles suggests that tube and tunnel systems need serious consideration and exploration. One which appears to avoid some of the aerodynamic problems which can arise if a vehicle acts like a piston in a tube is the design by Dr. Joseph Foa at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Dr. Foa has been awarded a contract to investigate theoretically and experimentally: (1) the inherent stability and control of subsonic vehicles in tubes, (2) feasibility of propulsion by means of ejection of whirling air jets forming a vortex at the rear of the vehicle, and (3) feasibility of high frequency power transmission using the tube walls. The principle of vortex propulsion is illustrated in Figure 4, and construction of a model tube vehicle test facility can be seen in Figure 5.

The aerodynamics of vehicles traveling in tubes are relatively unknown. Therefore, in support of the Rensselaer project a six months contract has been awarded to Oceanics, Inc. to develop the subsonic aerodynamic stability characteristics of a generalized tube vehicle.

Vehicles traveling in evacuated tubes can avoid aerodynamic drag and high power consumption, but novel means of propulsion are required. A study of one possible propulsion system, that of cryo-pumping has been awarded to Celestial Research, Inc. Tunnels are certain to be important to any future ground transportation system, not only because high speeds require protected guideways as mentioned earlier, but also because the cost of surface routes through urban centers is already in some cases above the cost of tunneling. Improvements in tunneling techniques appear to be entirely possible. Therefore, the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation has joined other Federal agencies (Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers, Bureau of

Public Roads, Geologic Survey, Atomic Energy Commission and the Air Force) in an Ad Hoc Committee on Rapid Excavation. The first action was to sponsor a study by the National Academy of Sciences to review possible new techniques.

While participating with the Ad Hoc Committee, our own program has also been started by selection of Hydronautics, Inc. for an evaluation of the rock cutting capabilities of cavitation in water jets. A request for proposal has been prepared on the use of flame jet tunneling methods, including not only rock cutting but spoil removal, environmental protection and other aspects of a tunnel boring system.

Propulsion systems: Another means of propulsion which can be used for tube vehicles, air cushioned vehicles or wheeled vehicles is the linear electric motor. This motor has the advantages of less weight in the vehicle and no moving parts coupled with consequent higher reliability and lower maintenance. The AIResearch Division of Garrett Corporation has been given a contract to study various designs of linear motors.

Fundamental research: A one year contract has been awarded to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for research in areas where technological progress has been slow or where previous work indicates possibility of significant advance. These areas are: (1) soil mechanics and rock fracture, (2) linear induction motors and high power semi-conductor switching devices, (3) organization of system controls, control of spacing of vehicles and scheduling, (4) aerodynamics of vehicles entering tunnels, (5) stress and strain of rolling bodies in contact, and (6) active and fluid suspensions and lateral oscillation of vehicles.

Systems engineering: So that the R & D program may be focused on the areas of greatest potential progress and also be responsive to economic constraints, preliminary designs of the most promising transportation systems will be undertaken in a systems engineering program. A request for proposal has been issued to conduct systems engineering studies for the next two years. This will provide systems performance through preliminary engineering, forecast technologic progress and provide insight into deficiencies in the state-of-the-art in all technologies of ground transportation.

Another request for proposal to provide cost analysis to permit trade-off studies and economic feasibility evaluations of proposed new transport systems has also been issued.

Hughes Aircraft completed a literature survey calculating passenger comfort limitations on vibration, acceleration, noise, etc., to be used in evaluating new transportation systems.

Planning: The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology has formed an Ad Hoc Panel of the Commerce Technical Advisory Board for the purpose of providing recommendations on high speed ground transportation research and development. The panel consists of engineers and scientists from industry, non-profit research organizations and universities. Five subpanels have been formed on:

1. Communication and Control.
2. Guideways, Suspension and Aerodynamics.
3. Passenger and Freight Factors.
4. Propulsion, Energy and Braking.
5. Terminals and Interfaces.

The subpanels are reviewing the state-of-the-art and research and development now under way and will recommend R & D projects for inclusion in the R & D plan.

Summary

The R & D program has been started with the emphasis on railroad technology. This emphasis will shift to the new technology projects when facilities, i.e., test cars, test

track and instrumentation, are operational. The first work in new technologies has been primarily in three areas: tube vehicles, tunneling and electrical propulsion. The next area to be emphasized will be air cushion vehicle technology which has been studied in-house during the first year, in order to plan intelligently the contract research to be started during the second year.

The presence of additional personnel for the start of fiscal year 1967 will permit a faster rate of obligation of funds for R. & D. contracts. At the start of the program only two engineers were assigned.

DEMONSTRATIONS

General

Section 2 of the High Speed Ground Transportation Act authorizes the Secretary to contract for demonstrations to determine the contributions that high speed ground transportation could make to more efficient and economical intercity transportation systems. According to the Act they shall be designed to measure and evaluate such factors as the public response to new equipment, higher speeds, variations in fares, improved comfort and convenience, and more frequent service.

The law also requires the Secretary to provide for financial participation by private industry to the maximum extent practicable and to include certain labor protective arrangements (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) in all contracts with common carriers for carrying out such demonstrations.

The basic purpose of demonstrations was emphasized by President Johnson when he stated, in his letter of March 4, 1965, which proposed the High Speed Ground Transportation Program to the Congress, that "... we must learn about travel needs and preferences, in part through the use of large scale demonstration projects." Hence, the demonstrations are essentially market tests in which specific and measurable service elements are introduced in varying combinations in successive phases. In that sense the demonstrations which have been initiated since the passage of the Act, while they will utilize the best of available techniques and equipment in high speed ground transportation, are not in themselves intended to be tests of advancements in technology.

Administrative

Budget: The FY 1966 funds budgeted for the demonstrations were \$7,840,000; funds requested for fiscal year 1967 are in the amount of \$5,500,000. Funds obligated during fiscal year 1966 totaled \$7,717,566.

Personnel: Five professional and four secretarial-clerical positions have been assigned to the demonstrations. As of June 30, 1966 four professional and all of the secretarial positions were filled.

Contracts: Following is a list of demonstration contracts entered into during FY 1966:

Pennsylvania RR., Philadelphia, Pa.*	\$5,400,000
United Aircraft Corp., Farmington, Conn.	2,159,625
Kimball Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C.	112,210
Drake, Sheahan, Sweeney & Hupp, New York, N.Y.	30,944
Association of American Railroads, Chicago, Ill.	8,186
Whitten & Associates, Washington, D.C.	4,238
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Baltimore, Md.	2,363
Total	7,717,566

* This contract is for a total amount of \$9,600,000. Funds in the amount of \$4,200,000 will be obligated from fiscal year 1967 funds.

Demonstration projects

Washington, D.C.—New York City: During fiscal year 1966 the Department entered

into an agreement with the Pennsylvania Railroad under which the Railroad will offer substantially improved service between New York City and Washington to start in October 1967 and to run for a period not to exceed two years. The service to be provided is specified in a detailed operating contract covering four separate service phases over the two-year test period.

A fleet of fifty new electrically-propelled, multiple unit passenger cars will be acquired by the Pennsylvania Railroad for the demonstration service. The Railroad will upgrade its roadbed, structures, and catenary to permit speeds of 100-110 miles per hour on most of the route and will also improve stations, particularly by the construction of high level platforms. A model of a car is shown in figure 2 (not printed in the RECORD).

Frequency of service between New York and Washington (226 miles) and between New York and Philadelphia (90 miles), respectively, will be increased about 45 percent. The demonstration trains will run between Washington and New York in less than 3 hours, with at least 4 intermediate stops. This will be at least 35 minutes better than the fastest existing schedule and 50 minutes better than the average train on the route.

A different combination of service elements will be offered in each of the phases. The contract further calls for experiments, such as varying types of meal service, luggage handling, use of coach attendants, fixed or reversible seating, determination of intermediate station stops and provision of suburban stations with ample parking. Other experiments such as fare levels, on-board sound and/or visual entertainment, improved methods of ticketing passengers and processing seat reservations will also be carried on. Additionally, the contract provides for the training of public-contact railroad personnel for improved performance.

Negotiations are also being conducted with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company to provide commercial telephone service for use by passengers on demonstration trains. For the first time, passengers on moving trains will be able to receive, as well as initiate, calls over the standard commercial network.

As prescribed by Section 6 of the Act, protective arrangements for employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad involved in the New York-Washington demonstration have been included in the operating contract.

The Government's contribution to this demonstration will be \$9.6 million, which may be reduced by arrangements to share equally with the Pennsylvania Railroad in increases in revenues produced by the improved service. The complete expenditures of the Railroad on this project cannot be accurately stated at this time. The contract for the demonstration establishes the lower limit of the Railroad's commitment in terms of minimum service, equipment and roadway standards which it must provide, without specifying costs.

It is certain, however, that the Railroad's contribution to the cost of new rolling stock will reach at least \$11 million. Its management presently estimates that the cost of upgrading the roadbed and overhead catenary will exceed \$25 million.

Boston-New York City: Demonstrations planned for the Boston-New York "Shore Line" of the New Haven Railroad will provide a test of public reaction to improved service provided by two 3-car gas turbine trainsets to be leased from United Aircraft Corporate Systems Center, Farmington, Connecticut, for a two-year period starting about February 1967. This equipment will operate in regular passenger service between Boston-New York City with four intermediate stops at elapsed times no greater than 3 hours and 15 minutes.

The trainsets embody a number of significant innovations—including direct propulsion by lightweight free gas turbine engines developed originally for aircraft, extreme light weight of body and undercarriage, and a new form of suspension described as "pendulous." The latter, combined with a lowered center of gravity and guided axles is expected, according to the manufacturer, to enable the equipment to round curves at speeds up to 30 percent faster than is possible with conventional equipment. A model of the train is shown in figure 3 (not printed in the RECORD).

Early plans for the demonstration north of New York contemplated operation between Providence, Rhode Island, and Boston (44 miles) since this was the only segment of the New Haven Railroad line capable of high speed operations.

In April 1966, however, the Connecticut Transportation Authority offered to make available the sum of \$500,000 if the Department of Commerce would operate a passenger demonstration from Boston through to New York. Inasmuch as this promised to offer a more meaningful demonstration, the Department agreed to operate for one year the service proposed by the State of Connecticut. The understanding with the State is contingent on the demonstrated ability of the United Aircraft trainsets to operate between Boston and New York at an elapsed time no greater than 3 hours and 15 minutes, with at least 4 intermediate stops. It was understood also that the Department would expend up to \$500,000 in Connecticut to make road and structure improvements necessary for the 3 hour and 15 minute schedules. The Federal Government will initiate schedules and pay for the cost of necessary maintenance work on road and structures between Providence and Boston.

Since the New Haven Railroad is in bankruptcy and is unable to participate financially in the cost of the demonstration, the Department has tentatively agreed to compensate it for appropriate incremental expenses of operating the experimental trainsets on schedules the Department will prescribe. Under these conditions the Government would be entitled to additional revenues attributable to demonstration runs.

The Department will negotiate an operating contract with the Railroad specifying the schedule standards of on-time performance, cleanliness, inspections, and other elements required for a valid test of public reaction and will carry out experiments similar to those on the Washington-New York demonstration.

"Auto Ferry" Demonstration: The Department is considering the economic feasibility of a demonstration by which private automobiles and their occupants would be transported in rail cars with the automobiles serving as principal seating units. Preliminary exploration of routes for such a demonstration has indicated a high traffic potential between Washington, D.C. and Jacksonville, Florida.

In June of 1966 a test of riding performance of automobiles on fully-instrumented rail cars, conducted by the Association of American Railroads and personnel of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation, provided information as to the characteristics of equipment needed for auto-on-train service. Engineering consultants have been engaged to recommend design of equipment suitable for auto-on-train service. The management of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company is submitting proposals for schedules, ramp facilities, etc., and is cooperating with the Department in a study of operating and facility costs.

At the close of fiscal year 1966 a contract with the Florida-Atlantic University for a study of out-of-state automobile travel to Florida points was under negotiation. This

study would include origins and destinations details of car occupancy, and travel reaction to proposed auto-on-train service.

Procedures for obtaining public reaction to improved services

The main objective of the demonstration projects is to obtain reactions from the traveling public to improved service. Hence, procedures have been established to determine accurately changes in the use of the services, origins and destinations of passengers and passenger reactions to various aspects of the demonstration services.

The Department has devised, as a means of obtaining counts of passenger travel identified by stations of origin and destination and individual trains, machine-readable tags which are also used by the Pennsylvania and New Haven Railroads as passenger hat checks. These tags are collected and transmitted to the Department on a daily basis. This procedure was begun shortly after inception of the high speed ground transportation program and has been in full-scale operation since January 1966.

Starting early in fiscal year 1967, the Department plans to carry on a continuous sample survey of rail passengers on the New York-Washington and the Boston-New York lines in order to obtain in the period preceding the new demonstration service information about travel behaviour. This will be continued through the demonstration period to acquire reactions of travelers to various changes in the service.

Changing attitudes of the total population in the areas served by the demonstrations must also be measured. In March 1966 arrangements were made with the U.S. Bureau of the Census to increase the coverage in the Northeast Corridor region of the Census' 1967 National Travel Survey. This will provide information about the travel behaviour of the public as a whole in the Northeast Corridor and, particularly, how travel behaviour is affected by the demonstrations.

Summary

Three demonstration projects were initiated during fiscal year 1966: (1) An agreement was reached with the Pennsylvania Railroad for substantially improved rail service between New York and Washington, D.C.; (2) A contract was let with United Aircraft for the rental of two sets of gas turbine trains and negotiations were started with the New Haven Railroad for use of this equipment between New York and Boston; and (3) Studies were begun on a project for providing rail service to private automobiles and their passengers.

Contracts were let for the study of various aspects of rail passenger service such as baggage handling and for the collection of data on the reactions of travelers to rail passenger service.

TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS

General

The Office of Transportation Data Systems was organized to carry out the statistical data and information functions provided for in Section 4 of Public Law 89-220. Its program is intended to serve the needs of transportation executives and planners throughout the Federal Government, as well as in State and local governments and in private industry.

Work during fiscal year 1966 concentrated on the development of a long-range work program embodying the following objectives:

a. Identification of the significant transport-related policy issues, both for industry and government executives, which appear to be characterized by inadequate or insufficient information being readily available.

b. Definition of the problems within each identified problem area to determine the in-

formation needed to resolve these issues. (This task essentially involves converting the needs of policy-makers, private and public, into technical data requirements.)

c. Review and evaluation of available sources of transportation statistics, especially Federal statistics, to determine the extent they now satisfy these needs or can be improved to meet policy-makers' needs.

d. Development of plans for data collection and improvement projects which make maximum use of the resources already available within various Federal agencies.

In addition to traditionally considered data and statistical sources, the Office will conduct studies on the adequacy of documentation practices in transportation research and systems planning, the needs for more efficient access to legal materials pertaining to all levels of government transportation activity, and the extent to which international transport statistics complement or conflict with present Federal practices.

Staffing difficulties delayed the start of the long-range work program itself; but preliminary studies have identified many of its major elements and work on these was underway at the close of fiscal year 1966. The Office now has a staff of six and will soon be up to its authorized complement of nine.

Fiscal year 1966 projects

Commodity codes: A preliminary study on the state of the commodity-coding art; influences on commodity codes; and typical problems encountered by decision makers and researchers who use commodity-coded data. A major finding has been that because presently used codes are not very compatible, much commodity-coded data are not very useful either for comprehensive, multi-commodity traffic studies or for detailed, single-commodity studies of interactions among transportation production, mining, agriculture, foreign trade and national security.

Further research is required (1) to determine the feasibility of developing alternative concepts of classification; (2) to be definitive testing of inter-code compatibility; (3) to determine influence on code nomenclatures of the standardization movement and of transportation, freight classification committees; and (4) to identify the special data problems which decision makers and researchers encounter because of these coding problems.

Transportation documentation: A feasibility study regarding the establishment of a national documentation center for transportation literature. This effort includes a brief survey and assessment of existing major collections around the country, identification of major "gaps" within the spectrum of compiled transportation-related literature, consideration of alternative approaches to document classification, and a preliminary determination of the benefits that might accrue from the establishment of a transportation documentation center.

Transportation output measures: An exploratory research effort aimed at uncovering more viable measures of transportation "output". The project includes an inter-disciplinary survey of potentially new policy-sensitive measures and delineates the characteristics of the information requirements necessary to provide such measures.

Forecasting: General review of the forecasting methodologies currently employed in transportation-related government agencies and private companies.

Reporting requirements: Analysis of the Federal reporting requirements imposed upon the transportation industry to assess the uses made of reported data and the opportunities for developing better statistics without increasing the reporting requirements.

Select information concerning the relevant reporting forms maintained by the Bureau of the Budget has been tabulated. A pilot study of a sample of these reports

is underway to determine how best to pursue this project on a full-scale basis.

Transportation agency programs: Compilation and review of current statistical programs, data systems activities, and business reporting requirements of each of the principal administrative entities contemplated for inclusion in the proposed Department of Transportation.

Information has been compiled on the kinds of data gathered by these agencies and the methods of collection. Recommendations on how best to coordinate these activities are now under development.

Fiscal year 1967 projects

Geographic coding: A survey of transportation-oriented geographic coding practices within the Federal Government and private industry.

Planning data: A survey of Federal programs which either encourage or mandate a continuous planning or evaluation process that involves regularly scheduled field surveys, enumerations, inspections, interviews, or a sampling of administrative records, on a national, regional, State, or smaller area basis, the data from which are relevant to the work of transportation agencies, operators, or users.

Output measures: A study to determine the need for and undertake the development of improved and more comprehensive measures of transport activity.

Common terminology: A study to explore the need for (and possibly develop) an up-to-date Transportation Thesaurus, that can facilitate standardization of common transport terminology.

Passenger travel: A development and data collection project to provide comprehensive, continuing statistics on intercity passenger travel which can be integrated with statistics being collected on intracity travel. This work will be carried out with the Bureau of the Census as a supplement to the travel surveys now made once every five years and will be integrated with metropolitan transportation surveys sponsored by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Freight movement: A data collection and statistical coordination project to provide a continuing inventory of national freight movements. This work will be carried out with the Interstate Commerce Commission and other Federal and State agencies now collecting statistics on freight transportation.

Summary

During fiscal year 1966 initial planning was begun for the development of a National Transportation Statistics Program. Preliminary studies indicated a significant need for future efforts to be focused upon improving the quality and quantity of statistics relating to national freight and passenger movements.

A comprehensive review is being undertaken of those statistical programs and activities which may be included in the proposed Department of Transportation.

Research has been initiated to explore the possibility of creating improved measures of national transportation "output," and studies are in progress in such areas as transportation forecasting practices within the Federal Government, and Government reporting requirements imposed on transportation industry.

GENERAL COMMENT

The program generally has progressed according to plan. Cooperation from private industry has been excellent both in the demonstrations and the R & D program. Viet Nam has, however, made inroads as might be expected. The budget request to Congress for fiscal year 1967 is for \$24 million of the \$35 million authorized by the Act. Determinations on the budget for fiscal year

1968 have not yet been made, but it appears certain that appropriations through fiscal year 1968 will be substantially less than the \$90 million authorized by the Act.

Viet Nam has affected the program in other ways as well. The aerospace industry which has exhibited great interest in advanced technology in high speed ground transportation has found itself much more preoccupied with defense needs. This has affected the availability of research contractors and of qualified personnel for employment within the Department of Commerce. As a result the research and development program has taken a slower pace.

AS CHINA SEES US

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in light of the current interest in reviewing our China policy, I invite attention to an editorial published in the June 10 issue of the Catholic Review, of Baltimore, Md.

The article makes a valuable contribution to the discussion because it attempts to view the United States through Chinese eyes. If for the purpose of analysis we can put ourselves in their shoes, we can gain a better insight into some of the problems that stand in the path of better relations between our two countries. As the editorial points out, there are valid historical, as well as ideological, reasons for the Chinese "hate America" campaign. There are incidents in our relations with China which have contributed to adopt a hostile attitude toward the United States. These incidents do not excuse Chinese excesses; nor should they induce us to surrender any vital interests out of guilt or self-doubt. But an understanding of the historical basis for Chinese anti-Americanism is essential to any intelligent policy toward the Chinese Communists.

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

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

[From the Catholic Review, June 10, 1966]

AS CHINA SEES US

What do you think of Li Po, Han Wu-ti, Su-ma Ch'ien, Wang An-shih? You've never even heard of these great heroes of Chinese culture? Then you're like the vast majority of Americans and other inheritors of Western culture.

For some 4,000 years, Chinese culture and Western culture have developed with practically no mutual contact. Since China became Communist in 1949 it has become one of the great world powers, and it looks upon the U.S. as the greatest foe of its 750 million people—one fourth of the world's total. Our mutual ignorance of one another can now determine the fate of the whole human race.

A few weeks ago this newspaper expressed its belief that Americans are ready and willing for their government to reconsider its Red China policy even to the extent of recognizing Red China diplomatically, dropping opposition to its admission to the U.N., and trading with it. Not a single objection to this viewpoint has been expressed to *The Catholic Review*. Our belief seems to have been vindicated.

If we Americans are to understand the viewpoint of the Red Chinese toward the West in general and the U.S. in particular, we will have to appreciate the national memory of China. For many centuries China was a

great nation with an extraordinary degree of culture. It regarded all foreign nations as inferior—and not without some justification. In the 18th century it was the most powerful country in the world. Adam Smith, the English economist, considered China the summit of economic achievement.

But the 19th century brought many disasters and calamities. In the 1840's a century of humiliating treaties with the West began. These limited China's sovereignty, forced foreign encroachment on Chinese territory, and left that nation in heavy financial debt to Western governments and bankers.

Although at the beginning of this century China stood to gain commercially by U.S. sponsorship of the Open Door Policy, other U.S. actions embittered China's attitude toward our country. These included our anti-Chinese immigration policy, already at work in the 1880's, and our disinterest in the reform movement of Sun Yat-sen in the 1920's. (As a result Sun Yat-sen turned for help to Red Russia and the newly formed Chinese Communist party). Then, after Japan's attack on China in 1931, the U.S. continued to supply the attacker with strategic material.

During World War II the U.S. eventually helped both the Nationalist and Communist Chinese to defeat Japan. Then, when civil war broke out between these two Chinese groups, the U.S. backed the loser, prolonged the conflict and contributed greatly to Chinese suffering. In 1950 the year after the Red Chinese victory and Chiang Kai-shek's dejected retreat to Formosa (Taiwan), the U.S. was preparing to recognize the new regime on the mainland.

But then North Korea invaded South Korea in June of that year. When U.S. and U.N. forces pushed the invader back into North Korea and approached the Chinese border, China acted on her warnings and sent hundreds of thousands of soldiers across her own border. In the meantime, after a period of neutrality, the U.S. committed itself to the support of the Nationalist Chinese forces on Formosa, and on the off-shore islands of Matsu and Quemoy.

Quemoy is only four miles from the mainland and is a source of active harassment which Red China cannot be expected to view calmly. Now that the U.S. has in South Vietnam a military force approaching 300,000 and is dropping bombs near the Chinese border, anti-U.S. feelings within China are understandably at fever pitch. Putting aside the question of the justice of the U.S. presence in Vietnam, we can imagine U.S. feelings if several hundred thousand Chinese troops were fighting in Mexico and dropping bombs near the Texas border.

These observations are not offered by way of assigning guilt and responsibility, but chiefly to show the complexity of U.S.-Chinese relations. The mainland Chinese see Western actions in the light of their own bitter memories and of the undeniable advantages which a Communist government has brought them. World peace and U.S. interests can only be served if Americans make the effort to see themselves as the Chinese see them, especially as Orientals see the white nation which dropped atom bombs on Asians and which is now killing, wounding and bombing thousands of Asians in Vietnam every week.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3807) to amend Public Law 89-428 to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a cooperative arrangement for a large-scale combination nuclear

power-desalting project, and appropriations therefor, in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 4, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 3, 1966

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.—Psalm 121: 1.

O God, the Eternal Father of us all, who art ever near and ever ready to help those who put their trust in Thee, clear our vision and strengthen our hearts as we wait upon Thee. Deliver us from doubt, free us from fretfulness, and save us from the spirit that promotes confusion and disunity. Help us to turn away from all movements which would stifle the liberties of free men and lead us into the fresh air of freedom, justice, and good will. By Thy grace may we and our Nation live in this high moral climate all our days—so shall we be true children of Thine and so shall we serve well the citizens of our beloved land. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 30, 1966, 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3805. An act to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966 in order to authorize the payment of educational assistance allowances under chapter 34 of title 38, United States Code, for the month of June 1966 in the case of eligible veterans who began a summer course of education before June 1, 1966, but completed such course before June 30, 1966.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CLARK W. THOMPSON

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when the 2d session of the 89th Congress draws to a close, we shall lose the