

H.R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 3466. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Bani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Antonio Penna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 3468. A bill for the relief of Surjeet Singh Dhanjal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3469. A bill for the relief of Maria Stanislaw Zagorska Prochazka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 3470. A bill for the relief of Enrique Aurelio Baca-Patlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3471. A bill for the relief of Francesco Corigliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLBORN:

H.R. 3472. A bill for the relief of Walter A. Radeloff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 3473. A bill for the relief of Calogero Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3474. A bill to require the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to determine the amount and validity of the claim of Ike Ignac Klein against the Government of Hungary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Michael Stefanakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3476. A bill for the relief of John P. Ramoglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3477. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Brancata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3478. A bill for the relief of Ancilla Zeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3479. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Rubino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3480. A bill for the relief of Antonio Raccuglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3481. A bill for the relief of Calogero Troia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3482. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Storta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3483. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Scalici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3484. A bill for the relief of George Niskopoulos and Amalia Niskopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3485. A bill for the relief of Zdravko Drazic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3486. A bill for the relief of Attilio Marra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 3487. A bill for the relief of Leonidas Gregoropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 3488. A bill for the relief of Milford W. Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 3489. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rebil Mehmet Hankan and his wife, Mesadet Seher Hankan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 3490. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reynaldo C. Soriano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 3491. A bill for the relief of Gloria de la Jara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3492. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chu Chai-ho Hay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 3493. A bill for the relief of Cita Rita

Leola Ines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3494. A bill for the relief of Herman Boxer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3495. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Ocean Delight* in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Shamool Essagh Danil and his wife, Verdian Essagh Danil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 3498. A bill for the relief of D. M. Dew and Sons, Inc., and Dewey Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Safia Talibi Naz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jae Eun Bahng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 3501. A bill for the relief of Teresita F. Legmay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 3502. A bill for the relief of Sypridon B. Adam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3503. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Dalamangas and his wife Sofia Dalamangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3504. A bill for the relief of Nick Lellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3505. A bill for the relief of Angel Oris Amado Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Pao Hsi Yeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3507. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis A. Perlingas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 3508. A bill for the relief of Gulseppe Gumina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3509. A bill for the relief of Miriam Odenia Bradshaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3510. A bill for the relief of Luigi Seminara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3511. A bill for the relief of Inger J. Ladegaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Enzo (Enzio) Perotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3513. A bill for the relief of Chin Wing Teung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 3514. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3515. A bill for the relief of Luis A. de la Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3516. A bill for the relief of Andres Mauricio Candela, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3517. A bill for the relief of Dr. Moises Mitran, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3518. A bill for the relief of Ferrum Trading Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3519. A bill for the relief of Salustiano Garcia-Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3520. A bill for the relief of World Mart, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3521. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carlos Modesto Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3522. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Chang-You Wu, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Jose H. Kates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Israel Mizrahy, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3526. A bill for the relief of Sherif Shafey, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3527. A bill for the relief of Josefina Fulgueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3528. A bill for the relief of Isaac Chervony, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3529. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Benes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 3530. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sook Ja Duffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3531. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jung Ja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laureana Bernardina Cal de Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 3533. A bill for the relief of Rev. Shoyu Hanayama and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Noble and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGLER:

H.R. 3535. A bill for the relief of Sung-Won Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

12. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Ore., relative to the American merchant marine, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 1967

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 19, 1967)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Very Reverend Constantine Berdar, rector, St. Josaphat Ukrainian Catholic Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

With the Psalmist we pray: *Behold, the Lord who has reigned from eternity, has established His throne for judgment. It is He who governs the world with justice, judges the people with equity. The Lord is a stronghold for the oppressed, a stronghold in time of trouble. Let those who cherish Your name trust in You, for you do not abandon those who care for You, O Lord.*—Psalms 9: 8-11.

Indeed, O Lord, we too raise up our voices on this day when we commemorate the 49th anniversary of the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence and turn to You as the "Stronghold for the oppressed," as He "who governs the world with justice." We pray Thee, grant to this Nation and its people, who were first to become a captive nation,

freedom and self-determination; grant that Ukraine and all other captive nations may take their rightful and lawful places in the community of nations.

"You do not abandon those who care for You, O Lord"; abandon not our country and the ideals for which it stands. Come to the aid of our beloved Government, illumine with Thy wisdom, knowledge and justice the Members of the Senate of the United States of America and of all the branches of government.

We call upon Thee: *Arise, O Lord God, lift up Your hand! Forget not the afflicted.*—Psalms 10: 12.

In confidence we proclaim: *The Lord will give His people victory, the Lord will bless His people with peace.*—Psalms 29: 11. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 19, 1967, was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on January 20, 1967, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 16) extending the dates for transmission of the Economic Report and the report of the Joint Economic Committee.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SOCIAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 40)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

America is a young nation. But each year a larger proportion of our population joins the ranks of the senior citizens. Today, over 19 million Americans are 65 or older—a number equal to the combined populations of 20 States. One out of every 10 citizens is in this age group—more than twice as many as a half century ago.

These figures represent a national triumph. The American born in 1900 could expect to reach his 47th birthday. The American born today has a life expectancy of 70 years. Tomorrow, the miracles of man's knowledge will stretch the lifespan even further.

These figures also represent a national challenge. One of the tests of a great civilization is the compassion and respect shown to its elders. Too many of our senior citizens have been left behind by the progress they worked most of their lives to create. Too often the wisdom and experience of our senior citizens is lost or ignored. Many who are able and willing to work suffer the bitter rebuff

of arbitrary and unjust job discrimination.

In this busy and productive Nation, the elderly are too frequently destined to lead empty, neglected lives:

Five and three-tenths million older Americans have yearly incomes below the poverty level.

Only one out of five has a job, often at low wages.

Over 2 million elderly citizens are on welfare.

Nearly 40 percent of our single older citizens have total assets of less than \$1,000.

Countless numbers dwell in city and rural slums, lonely and forgotten, isolated from the invigorating spirit of the American community. They suffer a disproportionate burden of bad housing, poor health facilities, inferior recreation and rehabilitation services.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

The historic Social Security Act of 1935, sponsored by that great President Franklin D. Roosevelt, first proclaimed a Federal role in the task of creating a life of dignity for the older American. By 1951, the number of our senior citizens who had earned and received social security benefits exceeded the number on public welfare. Today, more than 15 million Americans over 65 draw social security, while only 2 million remain on the welfare rolls.

We in the executive branch and you in the Congress have extended the Federal role in other ways:

The last eight housing acts contain special public housing provisions for the elderly and special assistance for them when they rent, buy, or modernize their own homes.

The Hill-Burton hospital program seeks to expand and improve nursing homes and other long-term care facilities.

Public welfare provides programs to help restore older people to self-support and self-care.

The manpower development and training programs direct special efforts at the problems of the middle-aged and older Americans.

The National Institutes of Health have established programs of research on aging.

In 1965, the Congress enacted and I signed into law two landmark measures for older Americans:

Medicare, to ease the burden of hospital and doctor bills;

The Older Americans Act, to develop community services to put more meaning into the lives of the senior citizens.

When he signed the 1935 Social Security Act, President Franklin Roosevelt said:

This law . . . represents a cornerstone in a structure which is being built but is by no means complete.

President Truman in 1950 and President Kennedy in 1961 proposed and the Congress passed legislation to improve the social security system.

The time has come to build on the solid foundations provided by the work of Congress and the executive branch over the last three decades. Last summer, I de-

clared a bill of rights for older Americans—to fix as our Nation's goal an adequate income, a decent home, and a meaningful retirement for each senior citizen.

Now we must take steps to move closer toward that goal.

Let us raise social security benefits to a level which will better meet today's needs.

Let us improve and extend the health care available to the elderly.

Let us attack the roots of unjust job discrimination.

Let us renew and expand our programs to help bring fulfillment and meaning to retirement years.

TOWARD AN ADEQUATE INCOME

Social security benefits today are grossly inadequate.

Almost 2½ million individuals receive benefits based on the minimum of \$44 a month. The average monthly benefit is only \$84.

Although social security benefits keep 5½ million aged persons above the poverty line, more than 5 million still live in poverty.

A great nation cannot tolerate these conditions. I propose social security legislation which will bring the greatest improvement in living standards for the elderly since the act was passed in 1935.

I recommend effective July 1, 1967:

1. A 20-percent overall increase in social security payments.
2. An increase of 59 percent for the 2.5 million people now receiving minimum benefits—to \$70 for an individual and \$105 for a married couple.
3. An increase of at least 15 percent for the remaining 20.5 million beneficiaries.
4. An increase to \$150 in the monthly minimum benefit for a retired couple with 25 years of coverage—to \$100 a month for an individual.
5. An increase in the special benefits paid to more than 900,000 persons 72 or over, who have made little or no social security contribution—from \$35 to \$50 monthly for an individual; from \$52.50 to \$75 for a couple.
6. Special benefits for an additional 200,000 persons 72 or over, who have never received benefits before.

During the first year, additional payments would total \$4.1 billion—almost five times greater than the major increase enacted in 1950, almost six times greater than the increase of 1961. These proposals will take 1.4 million Americans out of poverty this year—a major step toward our goal that every elderly citizen have an adequate income and a meaningful retirement.

The time has also come to make other improvements in the act.

The present social security system leaves 70,000 severely disabled widows under age 62 without protection.

The limits on the income that retired workers can earn and still receive benefits are so low that they discourage those who are able and willing to work from seeking jobs.

Some farmworkers qualify for only minimum social security benefits. Others fail to qualify at all. As a result,

many farmworkers must go on the welfare rolls in their old age.

Federal employees in the civil service and foreign service retirement systems are now excluded from social security coverage. Those having less than 5 years' service receive no benefits if they die, become disabled, or leave Federal employment. Those who leave after longer service lose survivor and disability protection.

I propose legislation to eliminate these inequities and close these loopholes.

I recommend that—

Social security benefits be extended to severely disabled widows under 62.

The earnings exemption be increased by 12 percent, from \$125 to \$140 a month, from \$1,500 to \$1,680 a year.

The amount above \$1,680 a year up to which a beneficiary can retain \$1 in payments for each \$2 in earnings be increased from \$2,700 to \$2,880.

One-half million additional farmworkers be given social security coverage.

Federal service be applied as social security credit for those employees who are not eligible for civil service benefits when they retire, become disabled, or die.

Social security financing must continue on an actuarially sound basis. This will require future adjustments both in the amount of annual earnings credited toward benefits and in the contribution rate of employers and employees.

I recommend:

A three-step increase in the amount of annual earnings credited toward benefits—to \$7,800 in 1968; to \$9,000 in 1971; and to \$10,800 in 1974.

That the scheduled rate increase to 4.4 percent in 1969 be revised to 4.5 percent; and that the increase to 4.85 percent in 1973 be revised to 5 percent.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Despite these improvements in social security, many elderly Americans will continue to depend on public assistance payments for the essentials of life. Yet, these welfare programs are far behind the times. While many States have recently improved their eligibility standards for medical assistance, their regular welfare standards are woefully inadequate.

In nine States, the average amounts paid for old-age assistance are as low as \$50 a month, or less.

Twenty-seven States do not even meet their own minimum standards for welfare payments.

The Federal Old-Age Assistance Act allows the States to provide special incentives to encourage older persons on welfare to seek employment. But almost half the States have not taken advantage of this provision.

To make vitally needed changes in public assistance laws, I recommend legislation to provide that—

State welfare agencies be required to raise cash payments to welfare recipients to the level the State itself sets as the minimum for subsistence;

State agencies be required to bring these minimum standards up to date annually;

Each State maintain its welfare subsistence standards at not less than two-thirds the level set for medical assistance;

State welfare programs be required to establish a work-incentive provision for old-age assistance recipients.

TAX REFORM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

Our Federal income tax laws today unfairly discriminate against older taxpayers with low incomes who continue to work after 65. The system of deductions, credits, and exemptions is so complex that many senior citizens are unable to understand them and thus do not receive the full benefits to which they are entitled.

I recommend that—

The tax structure for senior citizens be completely overhauled, simplified, and made fairer.

Existing tax discrimination against the older Americans who are willing and able to work be eliminated.

Under this proposal, taxes will be reduced for almost 3 million older Americans—two out of every three who now pay taxes. Nearly 500,000 of these Americans will no longer have to pay taxes. There will be some increases for those in the upper tax brackets—those best able to afford them.

THE SUCCESS AND THE FUTURE OF MEDICARE

During the long wait for medicare, many older Americans needlessly suffered and died because they could not afford proper health care. Nearly half had no health insurance protection. For most, coverage was grossly inadequate. As a result, men and women spent their later years overburdened by health care costs. Many were forced to turn to public assistance. Others had to impose financial hardship on their relatives. Still others went without necessary medical care.

Since medicare went into effect just over 6 months ago more than 2½ million older Americans have received hospital care; hospitals have received nearly \$1 billion in payments; more than 3½ million Americans have been treated by doctors under the voluntary coverage of medicare; 130,000 people have received home health services, and medicare paid the bills; 6,700 hospitals, with more than 98 percent of the general hospital beds in the Nation, have become partners in medicare.

High standards set by medicare will raise the level of health care for all citizens—not just the aged. Compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act has hastened the end of racial discrimination in hospitals and has brought good medical care to many who were previously denied it.

Medicare is an unqualified success. Nevertheless, there are improvements which can be made and shortcomings which need prompt attention.

The 1.5 million seriously disabled Americans under 65 who receive social security and railroad retirement benefits should be included under medicare. The typical member of this group is over 50. He finds himself in much the same plight as the elderly. He is dependent on social security benefits to support himself and his family. He is plagued by high medical expenses and poor insurance protection.

I recommend that medicare be extended to the 1.5 million disabled Ameri-

cans under 65 now covered by the social security and railroad retirement systems.

Certain types of podiatry services are important to the health of the elderly. Yet, these services are excluded under present law. I recommend that foot treatment, other than routine care, be covered under medicare whether performed by podiatrists or physicians.

Finally, medicare does not cover prescription drugs for a patient outside the hospital. We recognize that many practical difficulties remain unresolved concerning the cost and quality of such drugs. This matter deserves our prompt attention. I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to undertake immediately a comprehensive study of the problems of including the cost of prescription drugs under medicare.

NURSING AND HEALTH CARE

Medicare and the medical assistance program have removed major financial barriers to health services. Federally assisted programs are developing health facilities, manpower, and services—many targeted to the needs of older Americans.

We have made progress, but serious problems remain. Although the number of agencies that provide health services to individuals in their own homes has grown to more than 1,400 throughout the country, their services are often limited in scope and quality. Many communities still have no such services available.

The great majority of nursing homes are ill equipped to provide services required for medicare and medical assistance patients. Of the 20,000 nursing homes in the country, only 3,000 have qualified for medicare. Of the 850,000 beds in nursing homes, less than half—415,000—meet Hill-Burton standards for long-term care. Many do not even meet minimum fire and safety standards.

Expenditures for nursing home care have increased by 400 percent in the past decade. They now exceed \$1.2 billion annually. Federal, State, and local governments pay more than a third of these costs—and the Government share is rising rapidly.

We have learned that there is no single answer to the problem of providing the highest quality health care to the elderly. Just as their needs vary, so must the approach.

Some senior citizens can be treated in their homes, where they can be close to their families and friends. Others may need once-a-week care at a nearby outpatient clinic. When serious illness strikes, extended hospitalization may be required. When chronic disease is involved, care in a nursing home may be needed. And when postoperative care for short durations is necessary, specialized facilities may be essential.

Thus, we must pursue a wide range of community programs and services to meet the needs of the elderly—to allow them freedom to choose the right services at the right time and in the right place.

To move toward our health goal for the elderly, I propose to:

Extend the partnership for health legislation to improve State and local health planning for the elderly;

Launch special pilot projects to bring comprehensive medical and rehabilitation services to the aged;

Begin an extensive research effort to develop the best means of organizing, delivering, and financing health services needed by the aged;

Expand visiting nurses and other home health services.

I am requesting funds for more health facilities and better health care institutions for the aged, including the full authorization of \$280 million for construction under the Hill-Burton program to provide new beds and to modernize existing facilities; mortgage guarantees and loans to construct nursing homes for the aged; infirmaries and nursing units in senior citizens' housing projects; intensive research to find new approaches in design and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, extended care facilities and other health institutions.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE OLDER AMERICAN

In our Nation, there are thousands of retired teachers, lawyers, businessmen, social workers and recreation specialists, physicians, nurses, and others, who possess skills which the country badly needs.

Hundreds of thousands not yet old, not yet voluntarily retired, find themselves jobless because of arbitrary age discrimination. Despite our present low rate of unemployment, there has been a persistent average of 850,000 people age 45 and over who are unemployed.

Today, more than three-quarters of a billion dollars in unemployment insurance is paid each year to workers who are 45 or over. They comprise 27 percent of all the unemployed—and 40 percent of the long-term unemployed. In 1965, the Secretary of Labor reported to the Congress and the President that approximately half of all private job openings were barred to applicants over 55; a quarter were closed to applicants over 45.

In economic terms, this is a serious—and senseless—loss to a nation on the move. But the greater loss is the cruel sacrifice in happiness and well-being which joblessness imposes on these citizens and their families.

Opportunity must be opened to the many Americans over 45 who are qualified and willing to work. We must end arbitrary age limits on hiring. Though 23 States have already enacted laws to prohibit discriminatory practices, the problem is one of national concern and magnitude.

I recommend that—

The Congress enact a law prohibiting arbitrary and unjust discrimination in employment because of a person's age. The law cover workers 45 to 65 years old.

The law provide for conciliation and, if necessary, enforcement through cease-and-desist orders, with court review.

The law provide an exception for special situations where age is a reasonable occupational qualification, where an employee is discharged for good cause, or where the employee is separated under a regular retirement system.

Educational and research programs on age discrimination be strengthened.

Employment opportunities for older workers cannot be increased solely by measures eliminating discrimination. Today's high standards of education, training, and mobility often favor the

younger worker. Many older men and women are unemployed because they are not fitted for the jobs of modern technology; because they live where there are no longer any jobs, or because they are seeking the jobs of a bygone era.

We have already expanded training and education for all Americans. But older workers have not been able to take full advantage of these programs. In many State employment offices, there is need for additional counselors, trained to deal with the special problems of older workers.

I am directing the Secretary of Labor to establish a more comprehensive program of information, counseling, and placement service for older workers through the Federal-State System of Employment Services.

ENRICHING THE LATER YEARS

Old age is too often a time of lonely sadness, when it should be a time for service and continued self-development. For many, later life can offer a second career. It can mean new opportunities for community service. It can be a time to develop new interests, acquire new knowledge, find new ways to use leisure hours.

Our goal is not merely to prolong our citizens' lives, but to enrich them.

Congress overwhelmingly endorsed this goal, when it passed the Older Americans Act. As a result, we have launched a new partnership at all levels of government, and among voluntary and private organizations. We have established a new agency and a new impetus to promote this partnership.

Forty-one States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico—where more than 91 percent of our older persons live—are now engaged in providing special services for senior citizens. Two hundred and seventy community programs have already been started. Several hundred more will begin in the next few months.

We are helping States and communities to:

Establish central information and referral services so that our older citizens can learn about and receive all the benefits to which they are entitled;

Begin or expand services in more than 65 more senior citizen centers;

Increase volunteer-service opportunities for older people;

Offer preretirement courses and information about retirement;

Support services which help older people remain in their homes and neighborhoods.

To carry forward this partnership, I recommend that—

The Older Americans Act be extended and its funding levels be increased.

Appropriations under the Neighborhood Facilities Program be increased to construct multipurpose centers to serve senior citizens with a wide range of educational, recreational, and health services, and to provide information about housing and employment opportunities.

A pilot program be started to provide nutritional meals in senior citizen centers.

Decent housing plays an important role in promoting self-respect and dignity in the later years. In the past 3 years, the

total Federal investment in special housing programs for the elderly has doubled—to over \$2.5 billion.

Rental housing for the elderly is one of our most successful housing programs. We have made commitments for about 187,000 units to house more than 280,000 persons. Direct loan and grant programs assist many senior citizens to improve their homes in urban renewal areas, and in areas of concentrated code enforcement where blight is worst. The new rent supplement program, enacted in 1965, promises to help thousands of low income older citizens to have good housing at reasonable rents.

I recommend that these housing programs be continued and that the full amount authorized for the 1968 rent supplement program be provided. I am directing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make certain that the model cities program gives special attention to the needs of older people in poor housing and decaying neighborhoods.

The talents of elderly Americans must not lie fallow. For most Americans, the most enriching moments of life are those spent helping their fellow man. I have asked the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to initiate and expand programs to make a wider range of volunteer activities available to older citizens to enlist them in searching out isolated and incapacitated older people; to build on the success of the foster grandparent and medicare alert programs by using public-spirited older Americans as tutors and classroom aides in Headstart and other programs; to organize older citizens as VISTA volunteers in a variety of community efforts.

OUR OBLIGATION

These are my major recommendations to the first session of the 90th Congress on behalf of older Americans. But this message does not end our quest, as a nation, for a better life for these citizens.

I believe that these new measures, together with programs already enacted, will bring us closer to fulfilling the goals set forth in our bill of rights for older Americans.

We should look upon the growing number of older citizens not as a problem or a burden for our democracy, but as an opportunity to enrich their lives and, through them, the lives of all of us.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1967.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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. 376) fixing the representation

of the majority and minority membership of the Joint Economic Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

A communication from the President of the United States, proposing an extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on working capital funds of that Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1966, Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, dated January 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of procurement of foreign produced aircraft ejection-seat system, Department of Defense, dated January 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on need for more effective action to correct conditions disclosed by internal audits, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, dated January 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE NATIONAL DOMAIN

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities of the Geological Survey in areas outside the national domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE HELIUM ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on matters contained in the Helium Act, for the fiscal year 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CONCESSION CONTRACTS

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed amendments to concession contracts in Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz., and Blue Ridge Parkway, N.C. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Ralph

Boryszewski, of Rochester, N.Y., relating to the case of Boryszewski et al., against Stephen S. Chandler, as lawyer and as chief judge of the U.S. District Court, Western District of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 109 OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive A, 90th Congress, 1st session, the amendment to article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 20, 1965, and set forth in General Assembly Resolution 2101 (XX), transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the amendment, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the text of the amendment to article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 20, 1965, and set forth in General Assembly Resolution 2101 (XX).

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the amendment.

The sole effect of the amendment is to change the word "seven" to "nine" in paragraph 1 of article 109 of the charter, so that article 109 will be consistent with article 27 of the charter as amended. By an amendment to article 27, which was adopted by the General Assembly on December 17, 1963, and entered into force on August 31, 1965, the affirmative vote by which decisions of the Security Council should be taken as a consequence of its enlargement was increased from seven to nine. Article 109, which should have been amended at the same time, provides in paragraph 1 that a General Conference for the purpose of revising the charter "may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council."

I request that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the amend-

ment to article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1967.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MORTON (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

S. 556. A bill to postpone the application of daylight saving provisions of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in certain States; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 557. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, and to lower from 72 to 70 years the age after which such benefits are no longer subject to deductions on account of earnings; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 558. A bill for the relief of Donald Schultze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

(NOTE.—The first above-mentioned bill was ordered to be held at the desk until January 30, 1967, for additional cosponsors.)

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 559. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes Sung Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 560. A bill to eliminate discount windfalls on FHA insured mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

(NOTE.—The above bill was ordered to be held at the desk until January 30, 1967, for additional cosponsors.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina):

S. 561. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for Cape Hatteras National Seashore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 562. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 563. A bill for the relief of Laura Poblete Carbonell;

S. 564. A bill for the relief of Dr. Soon Duk Koh;

S. 565. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Manuel S. Lina; and

S. 566. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Alex Avestruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts:

S. 567. A bill to establish a Temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Fiscal Needs and Resources; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts when he introduced the above

bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART:

S. 568. A bill for the relief of Col. Hossein Gholi Ashrafi and his wife, Mahine Ashrafi;

S. 569. A bill for the relief of Lilly Nagy;

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Maximo A. Galvez; and

S. 571. A bill for the relief of Marian Cwalinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. PROXMIER):

S. 572. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain requirements with respect to effectuating marketing orders for cherries; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 573. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in or about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944, as amended, so as to provide benefits for certain persons not now covered by such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 574. A bill to make provisions of section 232(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 inapplicable to propane gas; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 575. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando Regino Milanes-Alvarez; and

S. 576. A bill for the relief of Magaly Jane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 577. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 578. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 579. A bill to provide for a connecting road between three units of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 580. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the importation into the United States of certain noxious aquatic plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 581. A bill to add a new title VIII to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 582. A bill to establish a program of economic analysis and evaluation in the Federal Reserve System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 583. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an incentive for industry to establish programs to educate and train individuals in needed skills and to establish on-the-job-training programs for employees by allowing a credit against income tax for the expenses of conducting such programs; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 584. A bill to provide for the development, encouragement, and operation if necessary of centers for occupational education and training, for the strengthening and improvement of the manpower sources offered by the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; and

S. 585. A bill to provide meaningful public service employment opportunities to unemployed individuals with serious competitive disadvantages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 586. A bill to provide for a census every 5 years of the Nation's urban areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 587. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a special day care services program for preschool children from families whose annual income does not exceed \$6,000; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 588. A bill to amend title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 589. A bill to require that State plans under titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act provide for the establishment and maintenance of health and safety standards for rental housing occupied by recipients of assistance under such titles; and

S. 590. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist the States in conducting State health census surveys of pre-school-age children residing in the State; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 591. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance for the control of rodents in urban areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 592. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include as charitable contributions those contributions made to nonprofit organizations formed to promote urban renewal; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 593. A bill to expand the provisions of title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 to authorize matching grants with the States in aid of programs to provide special and advanced education to young persons showing unusual promise for leadership in urban affairs, and to carry out research and demonstration projects relating to the training of persons in self-help techniques for the rebuilding of their neighborhoods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 594. A bill for the relief of Lamia Julian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTROYA:

S. 595. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Pombo Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 596. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 597. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 598. A bill to grant court leave to employees of the United States when appearing as witnesses on behalf of a State in any judicial proceeding; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. McGEE):

S. 599. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, for the purpose of computing a civil service annuity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. DODD):

S. 600. A bill to provide for the installation of an eternal flame at the site of the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 601. A bill to designate a pumping plant on the St. Francis River, Ark., as the W. G. Huxtable Pumping Plant; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DODD, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. MONTROYA, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PELL, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 602. A bill to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

(NOTE.—The above bill was ordered to be held at the desk until February 2, 1967, for additional cosponsors.)

By Mrs. SMITH:

S. 603. A bill to provide benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act for the surviving child of Henry C. Furstenwalde; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miguel Ramon Calzadilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 605. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Man Loi Chu;

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Ah Nang Yu; and

S. 608. A bill for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 609. A bill to provide for the administration of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act) by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. DODD, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENBERGER, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the voluntary admission or confession of the accused in a criminal prosecution shall be admissible against him in any court sitting anywhere in

the United States, and that the ruling of a trial judge admitting an admission or confession as voluntarily made shall not be reversed or otherwise disturbed by the Supreme Court or any inferior court established by Congress or under its authority if such ruling is supported by competent evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish a memorial museum at Las Vegas, N. Mex., to commemorate the Rough Riders and related history of the Southwest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

REPORT ENTITLED "TO PROMOTE THE PROGRESS OF USEFUL ARTS" BY THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE PATENT SYSTEM

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 52) which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 52

Resolved, That the report of the President's Commission on the Patent System, entitled "To Promote the Progress of Useful Arts", be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary.

POSTPONEMENT OF DAYLIGHT SAVING PROVISIONS OF THE UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to postpone the application of daylight saving provisions of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in certain States.

When the Congress enacted the Uniform Time Act last year, it was the intent to establish national uniformity in the dates for commencing and ending the daylight saving time in all States and jurisdictions where it is observed. The act also stipulated that each State, through action of its legislature, could exempt itself on a statewide basis from the provisions establishing daylight saving time.

It was the clear purpose of the Cotton amendment, which I supported, that each State would have a choice of determining whether to go on fast time or to remain on standard time. Unfortunately, a situation has now arisen—a situation not brought to our attention during our consideration of the legislation, but one which could have been easily and simply accommodated in the basic act.

Kentucky is one of three States—I understand the others are Virginia and Mississippi—whose State legislatures will not meet again in regular session until 1968. Kentucky, thus, is foreclosed from exercising its option provided for in the act to remain on standard time unless the legislature is called into special session.

I do not know what the Kentucky Legislature might do, but I feel very strongly that the people of the Commonwealth should have the same right as her sister States in exercising their choice

through their elected representatives. The bill I introduce would merely maintain the time status quo in Kentucky until the legislature can work its will early in 1968.

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

The bill (S. 556) to postpone the application of daylight saving provisions of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 in certain States, introduced by Mr. MORTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be listed as a cosponsor.

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

TO PERMIT OLDER CITIZENS TO EARN MORE WITHOUT BEING PENALIZED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to permit our older citizens the privilege of working more and earning enough to provide realistic supplementary income, without the necessity of being penalized by denial of benefits already earned under social security.

In brief, this bill would permit social security beneficiaries to earn up to \$3,000 annually and still qualify for full payments. In addition, the present age at which restrictions on earnings are completely removed would be reduced to 70.

It seems to me that this proposal reflects a realistic approach to a problem that has occupied the attention of the Congress for the past several years. It is time we faced the fact that drastic change has occurred in our social and economic structure since social security was adopted originally and that, at a time of inflationary pressures, the benefit payment simply has not kept pace with the ever-spiraling cost of living. In my judgment, it is evident that something must be done, both with regard to benefit payments themselves and also with regard to unrealistic restrictions now imposed on the earning capacities of those elderly citizens who are employable and anxious to work.

In recent years, we have seen countless cases of extreme hardship where social security recipients have been forced to live on low fixed incomes, while the price of the essentials for life has continued to rise. Many have been forced to accept part-time employment or public assistance as a means of supplementing a marginal income. In many of these cases, however, earnings from employment have had the material effect of reducing benefits and thereby further penalizing the individual struggling for survival. This bill, I am certain, will do much to correct this unfortunate practice and unnecessary injustice to our older employable citizens. Those who can earn and desire to do so should be permitted the opportunity, in order that they may provide for themselves and their dependents something more than bare existence.

There is another consideration which warrants our careful attention. It seems obvious that our expanded economy has been hampered by the fact that present social security laws have had the effect of forcing many older citizens from the labor market, particularly those with skills hard to replace. If we are to meet the demands of our industrial growth, in a time of full employment, then we must permit older citizens to return to existing vacancies in industry when there is a manpower shortage requiring specific skills. Just recently, the rate of unemployment in my own State of New Hampshire reached an all-time low, and one well below the national average, of 1.3 percent. We have in our State an estimated unfilled demand for some 15,000 workers, and our economic base continues to widen. In New Hampshire at least, there is ample opportunity for the elderly worker, on a seasonal or part-time basis, in our retail establishments, in our recreational industry, and elsewhere. In short, our economy would benefit no less than the individual. It is noteworthy that in times of national emergency we have found it desirable and imperative to utilize the skills and services of our older citizens, and they have performed admirably when younger men were required to bear arms. Certainly, if this can be done in times of emergency, then with all of our American ingenuity we can integrate the skills and abilities of this great and useful labor pool in an expanding peacetime economy for the benefit of all. As a matter of fact, in terms of manpower, we are faced with a somewhat comparable situation by reason of our involvement in Vietnam as we were in World War II. This clearly means, if to a somewhat lesser degree, that all employable citizens who have the ability and desire to work should be permitted reasonable employment without penalty. That is precisely why this bill allows annual earnings up to \$3,000 without reduction or loss of social security benefits.

I am convinced that this proposal will accomplish the end of raising the standard of living for a large segment of our elderly population, that it would responsibly meet requirements of our growing economy, and that it achieves these two objectives without being financially disruptive. Accordingly, it is my hope that this measure will be reported favorably at the earliest possible time and that the Senate will give its approval.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 557) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, and to lower from 72 to 70 years the age after which such benefits are no longer subject to deductions on account of earnings, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice

by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ELIMINATION OF DISCOUNT WINDFALLS ON FHA INSURED MORTGAGES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, the purpose of which is to eliminate discount windfalls enjoyed by lenders on FHA insured mortgages. There has unquestionably developed a practice of lenders making a charge in many instances of 10 percent of the capital loan as extra compensation in making the loan. The lender charges not only the regular rate of interest prevalent in the community, but also a charge most often of 10 percent and more for making the loan. The FHA insures the repayment of the mortgage loan. It has been insuring these payments not only in the actual amount loaned but also in the amount of the discount enjoyed by the lender. To illustrate, a loan of \$20,000 in which the lender charges a 10-percent discount nets in cash only \$18,000 for the borrower. The FHA guarantees covers not only the \$18,000 but the \$2,000 discount as well.

This is a bad practice. It was never intended by the Congress in my judgment that the FHA should guarantee not only the repayment of the actual money paid out, but also the enjoyment of the 10-percent or more discount. This evil and abuse must be stopped.

Mortgage lenders collect discounts as a means of increasing the income or yield on the money being loaned. The effective yield on a mortgage that has been discounted varies inversely with the term of the mortgage. If a lender who has purchased or disbursed a 30-year mortgage at a discount of five points holds the mortgage for its full term, the percentage profit represented by the five points is considerably less than it would be if the mortgage were paid in full in the early years of the mortgage term. The incentive for a lender to liquidate a discounted mortgage before the expiration of its full term is in direct proportion to the amount of discount involved. This incentive is further promoted by the fact that a lender who has acquired a mortgage at a discount receives a claim settlement from the FHA based upon the full unpaid balance of the mortgage without taking into consideration that the claimant did not actually disburse 100 percent of the original loan.

As a means of removing the lender's incentive for liquidating mortgages in the early years of the mortgage term, it is recommended that provision be made for deducting discounts realized by the lender from the amount of the FHA settlement on claims filed within the first 3 years of the insurance or guarantee. The amount of discount to be deducted should include all amounts, other than the FHA approved service charge or origination fee, paid directly or indirectly to the lender as an inducement for the making of the loan. Amounts withheld from the proceeds of the loan or realized through related financial arrangements should also be taken into consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that the bill be held at the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Ohio, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 560) to eliminate discount windfalls on FHA insured mortgages, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"CONTROL OF DISCOUNTS"

"SEC. 524. (a) Claims made for the payment of insurance on mortgages insured pursuant to commitments issued on and after the date of enactment of this section by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under the National Housing Act (except loans insured under Title I of the National Housing Act) shall be subject to adjustment. There shall be deducted from any such claims, made within three years after the effective date of such contracts of insurance, the total of all discounts received or realized by the mortgagee originally disbursing the mortgage loan with the exception of amounts approved at the time of insurance by the Secretary as reimbursement to such mortgagee for expenses incidental to the originating or closing of the loan transaction.

"(b) For the purpose of this section, the term 'discounts' shall include all funds received by the mortgagee or for the account of the mortgagee (1) as an inducement to make a loan, (2) as interest in addition to that provided for in the mortgage instrument, (3) as a deduction from the principal amount of the loan advanced, (4) as a service charge, or (5) as an offset against any anticipated loss to the mortgagee which may occur upon the sale of the mortgage. In addition, such term shall include any sum paid to a mortgagee other than an originating mortgagee in consideration of an agreement to purchase a mortgage from an originating mortgagee."

POTATO LABELING LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at the Church household these days, we are still feasting on the ample stockpile of Idaho potatoes sent by friends at home. But along about March the bottom of the last box will be exposed and we will once again be at the mercy of eastern grocery stores. Then it will be a little like fishing in a grab bag: you can never be sure what will turn up.

Last fall, my wife and I went shopping in a nearby grocery store. A sign said, "Prime U.S. No. 1 Idaho Potatoes." The biggest one was about the size of my fist balled up, and about the same shape. When baked, it oozed water, and when opened, the skin cracked like a dry leaf. This was definitely not a "Prime U.S.

Grade No. 1 Idaho Potato," yet the experience is repeated thousands of times a day as housewives prepare what they think are world famous Idaho potatoes.

For some consumers, this experience has become so routine, they do not know any better. Give them genuine Idaho's, as I have done many times, and they will tell you it must be that they have never served Idaho potatoes before.

The reason this misconception prevails is obvious. Idaho potatoes cost more in eastern markets, and the unscrupulous are anxious to make an extra profit by selling all their potatoes under an assumed "Idaho" name.

Misrepresentation will probably be more prevalent in 1967 than ever before. Last fall, a disastrous 25 million hundredweight of potatoes were lost due to decay and shrinkage, as a result of a sudden and severe frost. With a shorter supply and higher prices, trading on the Idaho reputation will be a greater temptation than ever. Potatoes will be labeled "U.S. Grade No. 1 Idaho Potatoes" which are neither up to grade nor grown in Idaho, and which bear little resemblance to our quality potato.

And such flagrant misrepresentation is not the only temptation. Idaho producers spend a great deal of money each year to advertise their product. An increasing number of packers are capitalizing upon this advertising and misrepresenting, by inference, that potatoes actually grown elsewhere come from the fields of Idaho. They try to make the word "Idaho" a designation of variety, rather than a place of origin, claiming that the term "Idaho potato" is like "Irish potato"—an entirely inappropriate analogy, as any horticulturist can verify. Potatoes are sold as "Idaho russet potatoes" or "Idaho-type potatoes" with no designation of where the potatoes were grown.

Who suffers from these two types of deception?

Obviously the Idaho grower does, and so does the Idaho shipper. It has been estimated that at least 20,000 carloads, or about half of Idaho's normal fresh shipment total, are sold under false pretenses. Some say the figure is closer to 80,000, and they could be right.

However, of late, growers all over the country, not just in Idaho, have increasingly recognized that misrepresentation injures the entire potato industry. Potato quality is generally low nationwide, because no incentive exists to maintain quality. If potatoes could be labeled by their State of origin, the incentive would be provided.

The potato growers of Idaho have laid the groundwork for acceptance of such legislation by communicating with counterpart grower organizations all over the United States. Although there may be some variance of opinion on one point or another, support for the concept of labeling has won the endorsement of growers, through their organizations, in Washington, California, Wisconsin, Florida, New York, and Maine. I am pleased to say that a Senator who has long concerned himself with the welfare of farmers in his own State, and has also been recognized as a trusted friend of the consumer, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, of

Washington, is this year joining as a co-sponsor of the State-of-origin bill.

And can anyone doubt that consumers would like to be rescued from "grab bag" buying of potatoes? Pride in the product by growers and packers will inevitably insure an upgrading of quality. When the housewife can begin to depend on the integrity of the product, she will make her own choice and an improvement in quality is sure to follow.

To this end, Senator JORDAN and I have twice introduced the State-of-origin bill, which provides that potatoes be labeled according to the State in which they are grown. As written, the bill concentrates enforcement procedures at the point where the most flagrant violations occur, the repacking terminal. Federal inspectors will not need to be dispatched to the retail level, and adequate provision is made to avoid burdening the processor as well.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator JORDAN, of Idaho, and Senator MAGNUSON, I once again introduce the State-of-origin bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 562) to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 562

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 "National Potato Labeling Act".

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "State" means the forty-eight contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "interstate commerce" means commerce between any State or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State or the District of Columbia but through any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "potatoes" means potatoes of any variety included in the species *solanum tuberosum* and which are in a state generally considered as perishable, but not including potatoes which have been processed by cooking, freezing, peeling, drying, or canning, or by any other means which changes them from their natural state into a prepared food.

(d) The term "container" means the immediate container in which otherwise unpackaged potatoes are contained, including but not limited to sacks, bags, trays, crates, boxes, barrels, bulk boxes, display cases, bins, bulk cars, or trucks. Such term also means the master container in which any immediate container or containers may be packed.

(e) The term "invoice" means any written itemized list of potatoes sold, offered for sale, shipped, delivered for shipment, or consigned for selling or shipment in interstate commerce.

(f) The term "dealer" means any individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation engaged in the buying or selling of potatoes in wholesale or jobbing quantities,

but such term shall not include any individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation which purchases potatoes solely for selling at retail if the total purchases of all perishable agricultural commodities (as defined in the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, as amended) made by the individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation in the preceding calendar year did not exceed \$90,000.

(g) The term "wholesale or jobbing quantities" means two thousand or more pounds of all types of potatoes purchased or sold by any dealer in any day.

(h) The term "to pack" or "packed" means the placing of potatoes into containers for the purpose of sale, shipment, or display.

(i) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture or his designee.

(j) The term "State of origin" means the State in which any potatoes subject to the labeling provisions of this Act were produced.

(k) The term "label" means a display of written, printed, or graphic matter upon or attached to any container of potatoes in such a manner as to be readily seen under ordinary conditions of purchase.

(l) The term "repacker" means any individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation engaged in the packing of potatoes in containers for shipment or delivery to any wholesale or retail outlet after such potatoes have been previously shipped or delivered in containers one or more times.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, it shall be unlawful for any dealer to—

(1) sell or offer for sale,
(2) ship or deliver for shipment,
(3) receive and having so received, sell, offer for sale, or deliver or offer for delivery, or

(4) consign for selling or shipment, any quantity of potatoes, if such transaction is in interstate commerce or directly or indirectly affects interstate commerce, unless the container in which such potatoes are packed bears a label which clearly indicates, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary, the State of origin of the potatoes and the name and address of the packer or repacker, and unless the invoice for such potatoes clearly indicates the State of origin of the potatoes and the name and address of the packer or repacker.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any dealer to sell, offer for sale, ship, deliver for shipment, or consign for selling or shipment any quantity of potatoes in a container labeled with more than one State of origin.

(c) It shall be unlawful for any person to detach, alter, deface, or destroy, in whole or in part, or to do any other act with respect to any label required under the provisions of this Act to be affixed to a container in which potatoes are packed if such act may defeat the purpose of this Act.

(d) The provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to—

(1) potatoes officially certified as seed potatoes and tagged or otherwise appropriately identified by the official State potato certifying agency of the State concerned or by any other certifying agency approved by the Secretary;

(2) potatoes which have been sold, offered for sale, shipped, delivered for shipment, or consigned for selling or shipment in interstate commerce and which, prior to being offered for sale at retail, are to be processed by cooking, freezing, drying, canning, or in some other manner so as to change them from their natural state; or

(3) the transfer or delivery of potatoes from the farm on which they are produced to a temporary storage facility or packing shed, if such temporary storage facility or packing shed is not outside the area (as defined by the Secretary) in which such potatoes are produced.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Act—

(a) Officers and employees designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials to the person in custody of any potatoes subject to the provisions of this Act, are authorized, at reasonable times, to inspect such potatoes and the containers in which they are packed.

(b) Carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and persons selling, shipping, or receiving potatoes subject to the provisions of this Act shall, upon the request of an officer or employee designated by the Secretary, permit such officer or employee, at reasonable times, to have access to and to copy all records relating to potatoes subject to the provisions of this Act and the quantity, shippers, and consignee thereof; and it shall be unlawful for any such carrier or person to fail to permit such access to and copying of any record so requested. Evidence obtained under this subsection shall not be used in a criminal prosecution of the person from whom obtained. Carriers shall not be subject to the other provisions of this Act by reason of their receipt, carriage, holding, or delivery of potatoes in the usual course of business as carriers.

(c) Dealers shall, from time to time on request of the Secretary, report to the Secretary such information and keep such records as the Secretary finds to be necessary to enable him to carry out the provisions of this Act. Such information shall be reported and such records shall be kept in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe. For the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any report made or record kept, or of obtaining information required to be furnished in any report, but not so furnished, the Secretary is hereby authorized to examine such books, papers, records, accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents, and memorandums as he has reason to believe are relevant and are within the control of such dealer.

SEC. 5. Any person who violates any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation promulgated under authority of this Act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than \$100 or more than \$1,000 or be imprisoned for not more than ninety days, or both; but for the second and subsequent offenses the penalty shall be a fine of not less than \$500 or more than \$3,000, or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both such imprisonment and fine.

SEC. 6. (a) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to restrain violations of this Act.

(b) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section, which violation also constitutes a violation of this Act, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

(c) All criminal proceedings and all injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this Act shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 9. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President,

I am pleased to join my colleague as cosponsor of this bill that will be of assistance not only to Idaho and other producers of quality potatoes but American consumers as well. When a product of recognized superior quality is made available to the buying public, particularly the housewives of our Nation, we want to be sure that such a product can be properly identified and protected.

The reputation of Idaho Russett potatoes is known and respected not only in the United States but in most foreign countries. They are grown in high mountain valleys where there is a lot of sunshine during the growing period. We have a very productive soil classified principally as volcanic ash. It is light yet rich in minerals. We use irrigation, both gravity and sprinkler systems so the potato crops get moisture when they need it and in the proper amounts. These along with the use of only the best certified seed and with proper care in cultivation, harvesting, storing, and transportation keeps the quality of this fine food at a very high level. Idaho baked potatoes are light, nourishing, and have a delicious flavor.

Through this bill we will require that fresh potatoes purchased and sold in interstate commerce be labeled so that the buyer will know the State in which the potatoes are grown. This will be a challenge to potato producers in States other than Idaho. It will be an incentive to our potato growers to continually improve the quality of their products and it will give the consumer the protection of purchasing the high quality potatoes that he desires.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL NEEDS AND RESOURCES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a temporary national commission on intergovernmental fiscal needs and resources. The proposed Commission, with 15 members appointed by the President from inside and outside of Government, would examine the fiscal relations among all levels of Government and would report its recommendations to Congress within 2 years.

It was exactly a year ago this week that I introduced S. 2828, an identical bill, in the 89th Congress. Since then there have been a multitude of statements, proposals, and bills on the subject of tax sharing. I am sure this session will bring more of the same. I considered S. 2828 to be an important measure last year to stimulate public discussion of tax sharing. The events of the intervening months have made its passage a matter of urgency and necessity.

First, with each new proposal it becomes clear that different people have different ideas about what is encompassed in the term "tax sharing." Is it with strings or without strings? Does it supplement Federal assistance programs or supplant them? Should it be a permanent feature of our fiscal machinery or a temporary one designed to stimulate States to strengthen their own machinery? Is it a means of achieving

basic changes in intergovernmental relations or is it a means of avoiding such changes? We must have an answer to these questions. We must know exactly what the alternatives are before we can decide whether we really want to proceed with the "tax sharing" concept.

Second, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the time is not now ripe for "tax sharing" under any set of definitions or goals. The need for new State and local general fiscal resources is evident now. But the potential for the Federal revenue system as a direct source is still a latent potential. The potential for "tax sharing" arises because we have such an efficient and effective Federal revenue gathering system that the revenues available can be expected to increase at some \$8 billion a year. If these increments do not find their way back into the economy they will cause what economists call a "fiscal drag." If these amounts are to be spent by the governmental sector then we will have the question of how and by whom, and this is where revenue sharing becomes relevant. Yet it is painfully obvious that neither 1967 nor 1968 can possibly pose these questions. There cannot be a question as to spending revenue increments while we are spending \$2 billion every month in Vietnam, and when we find that we do not have adequate funding to attain our existing national goals in combating poverty, ignorance, and illness.

Third, it may be that on the basis of deliberate study we will conclude that some sort of revenue sharing plan is warranted. And there may come a time when the use of such a plan is fiscally appropriate. But when that time comes, we must have ready a carefully wrought design to carry it out. We must have the benefit of the advice of experts, and we must have insights from the experience of those involved in government at every level. They must not be rushed in their work. The plan which is finally adopted by the Congress must not arise suddenly out of partisan opportunism or as a public relations facade.

Mr. President, I firmly believe that the area of intergovernmental fiscal needs and resources is one which goes to the heart of our federal system, and that we must tread firmly and immediately, but cautiously and thoughtfully, through it. The proposed Commission will enable us to fulfill this responsibility.

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

The bill (S. 567) to establish a Temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Fiscal Needs and Resources, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Election Reform Act of 1967.

The strength of free representative government rests squarely on public confidence in its political institutions and processes. The American people have a right to expect that elections are con-

ducted fairly and honestly. My bill seeks to guarantee this right by requiring full disclosure and publicity of the sources and uses of political campaign funds.

My bill strengthens existing laws which govern the financing of election campaigns for Federal offices in the following significant respects:

First. It requires candidates and political committees to file periodic financial statements not only in the general elections, but in prenomination campaigns, including primaries and national conventions, as well. These statements must detail the amounts and sources of campaign funds and how they were spent.

Second. It extends its reporting requirements to political committees operating in a single State, thus closing a serious loophole in existing statutes.

Third. It assures full disclosure of campaign receipts and expenditures by establishing a Federal Elections Commission to enforce its provisions. This important responsibility is relegated under present laws to the understaffed and overburdened Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate.

Fourth. It removes the unrealistic ceilings on the amount of money that candidates and political committees can spend in Federal election campaigns.

My bill also requires Members of Congress and candidates for Congress to disclose all gifts and honoraria above \$100 which they received.

We urgently need to reform our laws on political finance so that the American people can have no doubt that the elections in which they exercise their precious franchise are clean and are shored up by effective legislation to that end. They deserve no less than this assurance.

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

The bill (S. 596) to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

GENERAL REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I introduce, by request of the Librarian of Congress, a bill to provide for a general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code.

With the exception of a few minor changes of a technical nature, the bill is identical with the amended version of H.R. 4347 of the 89th Congress as reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary. I introduce this text of the bill to provide a basis for the continuation of the Senate hearings on copyright law revision. The bill does not necessarily represent my personal views on the many important issues involved in this legislation.

It is presently the hope of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights to schedule hearings on this bill at an early date in this session.

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

The bill (S. 597) for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing my bill to grant court leave to employees of the United States when appearing as witnesses on behalf of a State in any judicial proceeding. This legislation would make comparable the circumstances involving Federal employees called as witnesses for the State and those involving such employees serving as witnesses for the Federal Government.

In our continuing war on the growth of crime, we try to encourage every citizen to do his part in combating the problem and to overcome his natural reluctance to participate in criminal prosecutions. However, we are also throwing roadblocks in the paths of many of our conscientious citizens who are Federal employees and who wish to assist their State in coping with the daily occurrences of lawbreaking.

Under our existing law, Federal employees are allowed to testify on behalf of Federal and District of Columbia proceedings without being penalized by having the time away from work charged against annual leave. Yet, Federal employees appearing for the State in criminal prosecutions are unfairly discriminated against as they must either take annual leave or leave without pay.

I have found the problem particularly acute in suburban Maryland courts which summon numerous Federal employees to testify for the prosecution. An employee's hesitation to testify because of the leave penalties is understandable; certainly, we should not levy a fine against those who must do their civil duty just because they are on the public payroll. It is imperative that we make court leave available so that witnesses will volunteer to enlist in the war against crime, and so that the civic-minded citizen will not be thwarted in his attempts to do the public a service.

Mr. President, court appearances are a civic and social responsibility that must be assumed by all members of our society if we are to make any headway in our efforts to quell the present trend of crime. We should encourage good citizenship—not penalize it. Increased police protection amounts to little if, after an arrest, State witnesses do not come forward and confront the accused in a court of law.

My bill will alleviate the existing restrictions against Federal employees when serving for the benefit of the State, and therefore is equally important both to combating crime and to encouraging good citizenship and cooperative attitudes toward our judicial system.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to give this legislation their support and would hope to see early action on the measure in this Congress.

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

The bill (S. 598) to grant court leave to employees of the United States when appearing as witnesses on behalf of a State in any judicial proceeding introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMPUTATION OF CERTAIN SERVICE OF CIVIL SERVICE ANNUITY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill that will provide for the inclusion of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States in the computation of civil service annuities.

My bill enumerates the 15 Federal-State cooperative programs that would be covered by this legislation. The problem has long been a matter of contention in the past, and I have received numerous communications not only from Marylanders, but from Federal employees throughout the country who have several years of service in a Federal-State cooperative capacity, yet who cannot have this tenure added to present Government service for credit toward retirement benefits.

The Federal-State cooperative instrumentality is largely a proving ground for research specialists and administrators who later join the Federal service and bring valuable firsthand knowledge and experience to Government agencies. These men and women in State operations often form the backbone of their particular field of service in the Federal Establishment. Yet the obstacle we place in the paths of those employees who wish to combine periods of State and Federal employment for retirement credit is inequitable and unjust. It hinders the movement of persons with backgrounds useful to the Government in their search for Federal careers.

We must not let our Government suffer from lack of competent, qualified personnel in any segment of its operations, particularly because of our own unwillingness to offer employees benefits to which they are justifiably entitled. The complexities of the times and our increasing specialization in the various divisions of Government services demand a high caliber of Federal workers. If we are to recruit adequately experienced, knowledgeable people for positions in the areas of government affected by this legislation, we must recognize the existing shortcomings in the treatment of these Federal employees.

I feel we must be cognizant of the needs of our employees in State instrumentalities by giving them the opportunity to pay into the retirement fund that sum, plus interest, which would have ordinarily been deducted from their base pay had they been subject to the Retirement Act during cooperative

service. If we are to have responsible and respected public servants, we must afford them equitable treatment in their benefit program. If we are to fulfill our obligations and live up to the duties which we have to our employees as the Nation's number one employer, and thereby afford the public the service which it demands, we must recognize the need for this corrective legislation in the retirement limitation on employees of Federal-State cooperative programs.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give this legislation their consideration and should like to express my hope that it will receive favorable action during this session of Congress.

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

The bill (S. 599) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, for the purpose of computing a civil service annuity, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER (for himself and Mr. McGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENTS TO THE LOBBYING ACT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend title 3 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the "Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act." Except for one technical change, this is the identical bill that I offered in the last session of the Congress in the Rules Committee, which committee reported favorably the bill, S. 2233, to the Senate in report No. 419 on June 30, 1965, and I ask that it be referred to that committee.

My bill would place administrative responsibility in one agency, the Comptroller General, where none exists at present. The Comptroller General is selected as he is an arm of the Congress and has wide investigatory authority.

The bill would provide the Comptroller General with authority to investigate compliance with the act by ascertaining whether any person or organization has failed to file reports or statements as required by the act, or has filed incomplete or inaccurate reports or statements. If violations are discovered, the Comptroller General would be directed to report such violations to the Department of Justice for action.

The Comptroller General would be required also to transmit to Congress any recommendations to further the objectives of the act, and to file annually a complete report on the administration of the act.

Finally, the Comptroller General would be required to transmit to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House copies of the filed registration statements so that they could be readily available for public inspection at both Houses of Congress.

Persons and organizations registering under this act are now required to file their registration statements quarterly

with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of the House. One of the weaknesses of the act as presently written is that there is no body or authority to administer it, to examine the statements to determine if the terms of the statute have been complied with, and to seek inquiries and make investigations of individuals or organizations who have not filed so as to ascertain if such individuals or organizations are entitled to an exemption or are excepted from the provisions of the act, or are engaged unlawfully in lobbying.

The basis for this legislation is the testimony heard by the Senate Rules Committee in the course of the investigation of Mr. Robert Baker. It was evident that persons who should have been registered under the Lobbying Act had not done so. One witness testified that he received \$50,000, he said, for representing an ad hoc trade association in legislation before the Congress, that he did not consider his activities as "lobbying" and that, therefore, he felt no need to register under the Lobbying Act. His testimony further disclosed that 2 days after the particular legislation became law he paid some \$5,000 to Mr. Robert Baker through the latter's law firm.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a few of the questions I asked this witness when he appeared before the Rules Committee, and his answers.

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

The bill (S. 609) to provide for the administration of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act) by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. COOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The testimony presented by Mr. COOPER is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper.

Senator COOPER. At the time you gave this check for \$5,000 you had determined that you were not going to attempt to qualify yourself to practice law in the District of Columbia?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. What services did you expect the firm of Baker & Tucker would render you in the future?

Mr. WEINER. Well, sir, whenever a corporation hires an attorney on a retainer—

Senator COOPER. Would they be rendered to your public relations firm?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. Since that time have you maintained an office for your public relations firm in Washington?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. Have you had any clients?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. Has Baker or Tucker rendered you any services in connection with those clients?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

Senator COOPER. Not a bit?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

Senator COOPER. Have you called on them for advice?

Mr. WEINER. I have never called on Mr. Tucker for advice.

Senator COOPER. Have you called on Mr. Baker for advice?

Mr. WEINER. I did not have the opportunity to. That is why—I am sorry, sir.

Senator COOPER. It has been 3 years, and you have never called on Baker & Tucker?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir. This retainer was for 1 year.

Senator COOPER. In that 1 year did you call on Baker or Tucker?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir; I never had occasion to call on them for one drop of advice, and that is why the retainer was not renewed.

Senator COOPER. Who are your clients for the year following the date you gave the check to Tucker?

Mr. DONOHUE. Senator, if you press for an answer, it is really a bit unfair for a man in a profession to be asked to disclose at a public hearing of this character the identity of his clients. It is unfair to the clients, and it is certainly unfair to him, because it might well cause him to lose it.

Senator COOPER. I want to be very fair, but I don't agree with you at all.

Mr. DONOHUE. Could he supply that information—

Senator COOPER. Here is a man who comes and testifies that he had hired Baker & Tucker to give legal advice relating to future business. I think it is certainly relevant to find out if he had any business.

Mr. DONOHUE. May I ask, Senator, if you will permit him to disclose the names of his clients that he may have represented in 1961 in a written memorandum to the committee and not on the public record?

Senator COOPER. I don't agree with that. This man is testifying. He deserves credit for coming here to testify, but he admits himself that he has made contradictory statements, and our duty is to search out the truth. He himself has said he was expecting advice in the future, and he said he expected it in connection with work that he might perform for clients. I think it is important to know if he had any clients.

Mr. DONOHUE. I would say, Senator, it would certainly be apropos within the period of a year when, in which the retainer was stated to have covered from September 21, 1961, to September 21, 1962. I think it would be pertinent to ask him if he had any clients during that period of time, if on their behalf he asked the law firm of Baker and whatever the man's name is, Tucker, for any advice.

Senator COOPER. I have asked him that and he has said, "No." But I would like to know if he had any clients and to know their names. He said he had clients, and I want to find out if he had them. That can be determined by giving their names. So I will ask him again to furnish the names of the clients during the year following the issuance of the check.

Mr. DONOHUE. If the Senator presses the question, I will have to advise my client that he must answer it.

Mr. WEINER. Otis Elevator.

Senator COOPER. I would—

Mr. WEINER. Senator, I assure you I am not concealing except to protect the clients, because there is no possible involvement and no possible connection.

Senator COOPER. I know that I am right as far as the law is concerned, and so I will ask that the chairman ask him to—

Mr. DONOHUE. I would not embarrass the Senator to ask the chairman. If the Senator asks the question, my client will answer.

Senator COOPER. All right. You had clients during the one year following the date which you gave the check you expected to secure advice for from this firm. Give the names of those clients.

Mr. WEINER. Would you repeat that? I'm sorry, sir; I did not understand the last part of your question.

Senator COOPER. We had been discussing it here.

Mr. WEINER. No, sir; but I want to answer it correctly.

Senator COOPER. If you had any clients in the year following the date of the check for \$5,000, will you give to the committee the names of those clients.

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir. I represented the Otis Elevator Corp.

Senator COOPER. The what?

Mr. WEINER. The Otis Elevator Corp.

Senator COOPER. Otis Elevator?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. Anyone else?

Mr. WEINER. I am not prepared to answer that question, sir. There are other minor clients, but I do not recall their names.

Senator COOPER. Well, it is late, and I am sure he will be called back, but we would like to go through these papers, and I will ask that he furnish the committee the names of those clients. Now, in any event—

The CHAIRMAN. You will furnish that?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. In any event, Mr. Baker or Mr. Tucker did not give you any advice following your issuance of the check?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir; they did not.

Senator COOPER. Did you expect Mr. Baker to give you advice, as well as Mr. Tucker?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. Now, you said that you were rather naive about conditions here in Washington. Yet in your own venture in Washington at that time as a representative of the freight forwarders, you were quite successful. Is that correct?

Mr. WEINER. Yes; the first venture was very successful.

Senator COOPER. You represented the freight forwarders in Washington?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. You heard Mr. Barr testify?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Barr's testimony was the absolute truth.

Senator COOPER. Mr. Barr remembers that he stated in talking to you that you convinced him and his committee that you could be successful in securing or helping to secure the freight forwarders' desired legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. What information did you give him to assure him that you could help in the passage of this legislation?

Mr. WEINER. I didn't give him any information that procured passage of a bill, sir. I was merely able to convince them—

Senator COOPER. What?

Mr. WEINER. I was merely able to convince these gentlemen that I possibly had the ability to serve—distinguishing fact from fiction—that I would devote all of my time to this effort, even to the extent of neglecting my law practice in New Jersey.

Senator COOPER. You remember he stated that you and he were in almost daily touch and you reported to him?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir; several times a day.

Senator COOPER. Reporting that you were making good progress. You submitted requests for payment of your retainer of \$50,000. What were you doing here to secure this progress in the passage of the bill?

Mr. WEINER. My duties here, sir, were really confined to watching and evaluating exactly what was happening and reporting back to my client. As indicated by Mr. Barr, in the previous year they had had a bill that was passed by both the House and the Senate, and then it got stuck in the conference, and because the year ended, they did not have time to go back and attempt to revise it and get together. These people were at their wits' end when I did speak to them because of the regulations imposed by the Federal Maritime Board, and it was a question that every one had to put forth the utmost effort, otherwise they would all have been out of business.

Senator COOPER. Were you an expert in this field?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir. I had no experience

at all in it, and they knew it. I think they were convinced that perhaps I had—

Senator COOPER. Did you testify before committees?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir; nor did I ever prepare a statement for anybody to use in giving testimony.

Senator COOPER. What did you do then to secure the passage of the bill?

Mr. WEINER. These gentlemen for many years—

Senator COOPER. What?

Mr. WEINER. Senator, these gentlemen, I think you understand the situation as I found it when I was approached and gained a client—

Senator COOPER. What is this?

Mr. WEINER. I think you understand fully the exact circumstances that are necessary. These people for many years have been attempting to get legislation through. At the time my services were engaged, a bill had already been introduced by Senator Yarborough and Congressman Lennon. I did not know these gentlemen, and when I was engaged I did not know any Members in either the Senate or the House of Representatives on the committees that were working on the bills that had to report them out. I was merely able to convince these people that I had the ability to perform—I guess I am a good salesman—and they did retain my services. There was no representation made by me, as was said by Mr. Barr.

Senator COOPER. The substance of your statement is then that you didn't testify at the hearings and that you are not an expert in this type of legislation?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

Senator COOPER. You didn't consult with any employee of the Senate or the House or any Member of the Senate or Member of the House? Is that correct?

Mr. WEINER. No sir; it is not correct.

Senator COOPER. What did you do?

Mr. WEINER. I was introduced to members on the committee after I was engaged by the freight forwarders, members that they had spoken to, members that seemed sympathetic to the cause, people that they secured to introduce the bill, people that they had convinced that the bill was worthy, and that the industry was worth saving.

Senator COOPER. Did you talk to them?

Mr. WEINER. I did, sir, after I was introduced by the freight forwarders; I spoke to no one; I, in fact, knew no one, Senator. I did not know any member of the House or the Senate committees that had these bills.

Senator COOPER. You just talked to Members.

Mr. WEINER. After I was introduced to them by the freight forwarders. I did not go up and say, "I would like to meet you, Senator. I am working on a bill." I went in the company of people that knew them.

Senator COOPER. Did you tell them that you were working on the bill?

Mr. WEINER. I was introduced, as I say, by the trade, the freight forwarders, though, and they were told I was to be the representative in Washington to watch the progress.

Senator COOPER. Did you discuss the merits of the bill with the members of the committee?

Mr. WEINER. Members?

Senator COOPER. Did you give them any literature?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir; I did not give them any literature.

Senator COOPER. Not being an expert, were you able to discuss the merits of the bill?

Mr. WEINER. Well, sir, the people that I was introduced to did not have to be convinced of the merits of the bill because the freight forwarders had done an excellent lobbying job, and they had convinced them. It was not my job to convince any Senator or Congressman to vote for this bill, nor did I attempt to.

I did, however, speak to Senators and Congressmen on the committees after being introduced to them, who had already been spoken to by the freight forwarders in the various parts of the country, and were sympathetic to the bill.

Senator COOPER. Were you registered as a lobbyist?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir; I was not lobbying.

Senator COOPER. Not lobbying? Did you talk to Mr. Baker about this bill?

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Baker knew that I was working on the bill.

Senator COOPER. Did you talk to him about it?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir.

Senator COOPER. Never did?

Mr. WEINER. Other than the fact that—

Senator COOPER. What?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir; other than the fact that this was a client I had, and what I was doing, but I did not ask for his help nor did I receive any.

Senator COOPER. How long had you known Mr. Baker?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I had met Mr. Baker, I would say, a year or so before this occurred. It was truly social.

Senator COOPER. Who introduced him to you? Do you remember?

Mr. WEINER. No. I was in a restaurant here in Washington one day when I was down on one of my visits, and I was having lunch with somebody. Obviously the person I was having lunch with did know Mr. Baker because Mr. Baker came along and said, "Hello," and he sat down, and had a drink, and that was all there was to it.

Senator COOPER. Why were you in his office so often during the time that this bill was under consideration?

Mr. WEINER. As I indicated before, sir, when up on the Hill it was a very convenient place to go, and I didn't have many friends on the Hill, and there is no explanation other than the fact that I did, sir.

Senator COOPER. And it is your statement in all this time that you never discussed with him the legislation or your interest or asked for his help in securing its passage?

Mr. WEINER. No, sir. He knew I was working on it. I did not ask for nor receive any help on this matter.

Senator COOPER. Did you also keep an apartment in the La Salle Hotel?

Mr. WEINER. I am still there, sir.

Senator COOPER. What?

Mr. WEINER. My office is in the La Salle Hotel, sir.

Senator COOPER. Now?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. Then you have this office and also an apartment that you mentioned before?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir; it is all in one.

Senator COOPER. What?

Mr. WEINER. It is all in one.

Senator COOPER. It is the same place?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. When you gave this check you said that you wanted to be very correct and to show what it was for and so you wrote on the check the services to be rendered. Why didn't you submit some written memorandum or why didn't you make the check out to the firm of Tucker & Baker?

Mr. WEINER. I'm sorry, sir; I did not hear the last part of your query.

Senator COOPER. You have said that you wanted to be very correct and so you wrote upon the check the purpose of the check being for legal services. Why didn't you spell it out more explicitly either in the nature of some memorandum between you and Baker & Tucker or make the check out to Baker & Tucker?

Mr. WEINER. It just was not done, sir. I had no reason to do it. If I did not trust the people to act according to their agreement I should not have engaged their services to

start with, particularly as attorneys. I just did not feel that there was need for a written retainer agreement.

Senator COOPER. Mr. Weiner—

Mr. WEINER. I wish I had at this point, sir.

Senator COOPER. Counsel has read to you certain statements you have made. Of course, you have known the reason you have been interviewed and its connection with this inquiry?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. And you know that the central figure in this inquiry has been Mr. Baker; that most of the problems we have gone into have arisen from the central figure, Mr. Baker. Is that correct?

Mr. WEINER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. Then why did you in your answer withhold an important central fact about which you could testify?

Mr. WEINER. I was not attempting to withhold—

Senator COOPER. What?

Mr. WEINER. Actually I was not attempting to withhold anything, Senator.

Senator COOPER. What is that?

Mr. WEINER. I was not attempting to withhold anything.

Senator COOPER. But whether you attempted or not—

Mr. WEINER. All that occurred, I was trying to keep away from this issue since I had really nothing to do with Mr. Baker except paying him a legal fee, and the fact that I knew him, and I was not involved in any business dealings with him or anything else that I have read in the newspapers and, as a result, I just wanted to stay away from this.

NONREIMBURSEMENT FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES OF BANKS LAKE ON THE COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my colleague, Senator MAGNUSON, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable.

Banks Lake is an equalizing reservoir on the Columbia Basin project. The lake is now operated for irrigation purposes alone and the water level fluctuates widely, thus making recreational use difficult, if not impossible. This bill would authorize the Secretary to stabilize the water level of the lake by permitting additional pumping. Stabilization of the water level of the lake would enhance values for recreation users of the area and would be especially beneficial for the most effective utilization of existing and planned facilities at Coulee City in the State of Washington.

I believe this legislation merits the approval of the 90th Congress.

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

The bill (S. 605) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO THE POWER OF COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADMIT VOLUNTARY CONFESSIONS OF GUILT IN CRIMINAL TRIALS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. DODD, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENER, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would reestablish the very sensible and sound rule that the voluntary confession of an accused in a criminal case shall be admissible in evidence against him on his trial.

After years and years of increasing crime rates, I feel sure that we must all agree with the President's recent pronouncement in his state of Union message that "this Nation must make an all-out effort to combat crime." The latest crime statistics available from the Federal Bureau of Investigation indicate that serious crimes throughout the United States increased 10 percent during the first 9 months of 1966. Since 1960, the volume of crime in the United States has risen 46 percent while the population has grown only 8 percent.

In our great cities citizens are faced with increased odds that they may become the victims of muggings, vicious assaults, burglaries, and the wanton destruction of property. Last November, for example, was the 54th successive month that crime has risen in the Nation's Capital.

Of course, the problem of increasing crime is closely related to the effectiveness of law enforcement, and national commissions and Federal grants to improve the effectiveness of our law enforcement officials are important facets of our war on crime; but these useful and necessary steps do not alter the fact that we must grant our police the opportunity to do their job. Increasingly in the last decade, our law enforcement officers have been denied reasonable procedures which were once great bulwarks against crime. Recent high court rulings, particularly the case of *Miranda* against Arizona, have stressed individual rights of the accused to the point where the public safety has been relegated to the back row of the courtroom.

As a result of the *Miranda* case, the Supreme Court has erected a number of artificial rules which have the effect of excluding confessions of guilt in criminal cases no matter how voluntary such confessions may have been given. I have been concerned for years with decisions of the Supreme Court on this aspect of criminal law because such decisions have placed unjustified handicaps upon law enforcement officers and trial courts and have resulted in the freeing of multitudes of criminals of undoubted guilt.

The fundamental purpose of the criminal law is to protect society against criminals. The law desires, however, to avoid the conviction of any innocent man. To this end, it erects in favor of

any persons charged with a crime a presumption of innocence, requires the prosecution to establish every essential element of his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, secures to him the services of a lawyer, gives him the compulsory process to obtain the attendance of witnesses in his behalf, and secures to him the right to cross-examine through the agency of his lawyer the witnesses against him. These things are as they should be.

However, the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on the subject of confessions seem to be based on the theory that society needs little protection from criminals, but criminals need much protection from law enforcement officers. This theory is most unjust to the honorable law enforcement officers who frequently jeopardize and sometimes lose their lives in efforts to protect society from those who prey upon it. I agree with those who call this philosophy the "fox hunt theory of law enforcement" because it tends toward viewing the criminal law as a mere game in which the criminal, like the fox, should be given an even chance to escape.

There is no doubt that the *Miranda* case tilts the scales of justice in favor of those accused of crime and against the prosecution. The Court has lost sight of the fact that the accuser and society are just as much entitled to justice as the accused.

My proposed constitutional amendment provides in substance that the only test of the admissibility of the confession of guilt in a criminal case is its voluntary character, and the decision of the trial judge that a particular confession is voluntary shall not be reversed if it is supported by any competent testimony in the case. Thus, the amendment would retain the rule which the Supreme Court itself recognized as valid until recent days and which prevailed in all States whose legal systems are based on the common law.

The trial judge sees the witnesses who give testimony concerning the circumstances under which a confession is made. He has an opportunity to observe the witnesses and to determine which of them is telling the truth. The rule which I propose would exclude from evidence in criminal cases involuntary confessions irrespective of whether they may be true or false, and this is the only practical and reasonable way in which courts can deal with the confessions problems.

The sole test for the admissibility of a confession into evidence should be whether or not it was voluntarily made. The truth is that there is no stronger evidence against any man than his voluntary confession that he committed a crime which the law requires to be established by other testimony independent of his confession. By allowing a determination of whether the confession was voluntary, my amendment will afford protection to the civil liberties of suspects while allowing proper leeway to the protection of the general public interest in having the crime either prevented or solved.

Already, the effects of the *Miranda* case are being felt around the country.

Solicited by the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, of which I am a member, reports from many district attorneys from all over the Nation indicate that the percentage of criminal suspects who now refuse to make confessions or statements is greater than before the *Miranda* case. In New York, for example, the district attorney of Brooklyn has stated that there was a 40-percent increase during recent months after *Miranda* in the number of suspects who refused to make statements to Brooklyn authorities in criminal cases.

I urgently appeal to you to give every consideration to this amendment. Our thousands of dedicated and honorable law-enforcement officers deserve this vote of confidence; and the people of America, sick and tired of criminals going unpunished and crime increasing, demand it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my proposed joint resolution, together with two statements which I have recently given on the *Miranda* decision, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the voluntary admission or confession of the accused in a criminal prosecution shall be admissible against him in any court sitting anywhere in the United States, and that the ruling of a trial judge admitting an admission or confession as voluntarily made shall not be reversed or otherwise disturbed by the Supreme Court or any inferior court established by Congress or under its authority if such ruling is supported by competent evidence, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 22

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

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Except when the Congress establishes a different test in prosecutions for crime against the United States or a district, commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States, or when the State establishes a different test in prosecutions for crime against it, the sole test of the admissibility of an admission or confession of an accused in a criminal prosecution in any court sitting anywhere in the United States shall be whether or not it was voluntarily made, and the ruling of a trial judge admitting an admission or confession in evidence as voluntarily made shall not be reversed or otherwise disturbed by the Supreme Court or any inferior court ordained and established by the Congress or under its authority

If the ruling is supported by competent evidence. The provisions of this amendment shall be applicable to an admission or confession even though it was made by an accused under arrest or in custody during his interrogation by a law enforcement officer prior to the commencement of the criminal prosecution when no counsel representing him was present."

The statements presented by Senator ERVIN are as follows:

MIRANDA V. ARIZONA: A DECISION BASED ON EXCESSIVE AND VISIONARY SOLICITUDE FOR THE ACCUSED

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in its recent 5 to 4 decision, in *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, the Supreme Court reversed State court convictions for kidnaping, rape, and robbery, and a Federal court conviction for robbery on the ground that they were based upon voluntary confessions made by the accused while they were being questioned by law enforcement officers who had them in custody. As a result of the decision, some of these self-confessed criminals may go free.

While none of the convictions was for murder, the decision calls to mind Daniel Webster's aphorism:

"Every unpunished murder takes away something from the security of every man's life."

I wish to make some observations concerning the majority decision in the *Miranda* case, and its impact upon constitutional government and the capacity of our society to protect its law-abiding members from those who commit murder, rape, robbery, and other crimes.

In so doing, I shall exercise a right vouchsafed to all Americans by these words of the late Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone:

"Where the courts deal, as ours do, with great public questions, the only protection against unwise decisions, and even judicial usurpation, is careful scrutiny of their action, and fearless comment upon it."

The Constitution of the United States makes these fundamental principles as clear as the noonday sun in a cloudless sky:

First. The power to amend the Constitution of the United States, which is the power to change its meaning, belongs to Congress and the States, and not to the Supreme Court.

Second. The legislative power of the United States, which is the power to prescribe rules of conduct for the people of the United States, belongs to Congress, and not to the Supreme Court.

Third. The Supreme Court has no power in respect to the Constitution and laws of the United States except the power to interpret them, which is merely the power to ascertain and give effect to their meaning.

Fourth. The power to amend their constitutions belongs to the respective States and their people, and not to the Supreme Court.

Fifth. The legislative power of the States, which is the power to prescribe rules of conduct for their people, belongs to the lawmaking bodies of the respective States, and not to the Supreme Court.

Sixth. The Supreme Court has no power in respect to the constitutions and laws of the States except to interpret them for the purpose of determining whether they conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

Moreover, there is not a syllable in the phraseology of the Constitution of the United States which is not in accord with these self-evident truths:

First. The laws relating to crime and criminal procedure were made to protect society from those who commit murder, rape, robbery, and other offenses, and not to free self-confess criminals.

Second. The most convincing evidence of the guilt of the accused in a criminal case is his own voluntary confession that he committed the crime with which he stands charged.

My love for the law disables me to pay homage to deviations from constitutional principles and self-evident truths, even when Supreme Court Justices are responsible for the deviations. As a consequence, it constrains me to say that the majority decision in the *Miranda* case is incompatible with the six constitutional principles which have been enumerated, and the two self-evident truths which have been stated.

I digress momentarily to point out our country's present plight in respect to crime.

Crime is rampant and rising in our land. Since 1960, the volume of crime in the United States has risen 46 percent while the population has grown only 8 percent. The tragedy implicit in these figures is heightened by the FBI study of offenders, which reveals that over 48 percent of them repeat their offenses within 2 years after being released upon a prior charge.

I state in epitome the statistics relating to crimes committed in the United States during 1965:

Serious crimes: 2,780,000, an increase of 6 percent over 1964.

Murders: 9,850, an increase of 6 percent over 1964.

Forcible rapes: 22,470, an increase of 9 percent over 1964.

Robberies: 118,920, an increase of 6 percent over 1964.

Aggravated assaults: 206,700, an increase of 6 percent over 1964.

Burglaries: 1,173,200, an increase of 6 percent over 1964.

Grand larcenies: 762,400, an increase of 8 percent over 1964.

Automobile thefts: 486,600, an increase of 5 percent over 1964.

This catalog of crime justifies certain conclusions concerning the hour. It is no time for judges to allow an excessive and visionary solicitude for the accused to blind their eyes to the reality that the victims of crime and society itself are as much entitled to justice as the accused. It is likewise no time for judges to let an excessive and visionary solicitude for the accused prompt them to usurp and exercise power they do not possess and invent new rules to turn loose upon society self-confessed criminals.

The *Miranda* case is the latest step in the journey which some Supreme Court Justices began in *McNabb v. U.S.*, 318 U.S. 322, and *Mallory v. U.S.*, 354 U.S. 449, and continued in *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478.

The dissent of Justice White in the *Escobedo* case may reveal the purpose of the journey. He said:

"The decision is thus another major step in the direction of the goal which the court seemingly has in mind—to bar from evidence all admissions obtained from an individual suspected of a crime, whether involuntarily made or not."

The rulings in the *McNabb* and *Mallory* cases are not based upon constitutional grounds. In those cases, the Court seized upon a rule of criminal procedure applicable solely to arresting officers, converted it into a rule of evidence, and held that the rule as thus converted barred voluntary confessions made by the accused during a period of unnecessary delay between arrest and arraignment. Hence, the rulings in the *McNabb* and *Mallory* cases can be nullified by a simple congressional enactment.

It is otherwise, however, with respect to the rulings in the *Escobedo* and *Miranda* cases. It will require either some judicial repentance or a constitutional amendment to protect the American people from the consequences of these rulings.

The *Escobedo* case illustrates the truth that hard cases are the quicksands of sound law. In it, the Court considers the provision of the sixth amendment, which specifies that "In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to have the assistance of counsel for his defense," and holds by a 5-to-4 vote that the right to have the as-

sistance of counsel for one's defense established by it antedates the beginning of a criminal prosecution, and arises whenever a law enforcement officer begins to suspect that a person in his custody might be the perpetrator of an unsolved crime which he is investigating.

The decision of the majority in the *Miranda* case stamps with approval the *Escobedo* case's ruling in respect to the sixth amendment right to have the assistance of counsel for one's defense. After so doing, the majority opinion proceeds to hold that no matter how spontaneous it may be, and no matter how intelligent or versed in law its maker may be, no voluntary confession made by a suspect in custody while being questioned by a Federal or State law enforcement officer investigating an unsolved crime can be admitted in evidence in any Federal or State Court, unless the law enforcement officer strictly observes the newly invented requirements which are laid down in the *Miranda* case, and which did not even exist until the majority opinion in that case was written. The majority decision undertakes to justify this holding by asserting that these requirements are implicit in the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

According to these newly invented requirements, the suspect in custody "must be warned prior to any questioning that he has the right to remain silent, that anything he says can be used against him in a court of law, that he has the right to the presence of an attorney, and that if he cannot afford an attorney, one will be appointed for him prior to any questioning if he so desires. Opportunity to exercise these rights must be afforded to him throughout the interrogation."

The requirements provide, moreover, that even if the specified warnings are given, no subsequent voluntary confession of the suspect can be received in evidence in any court unless his attorney is present when it is made or unless he waives the right enumerated in the warning before making it. And the requirements further prescribe that the suspect can waive such rights only by expressly saying that he "is willing to make a statement and does not want an attorney." And even in that event the voluntary confession is inadmissible unless it "closely" follows the express waiver.

The majority decisions in the *Escobedo* and *Miranda* cases in respect to the sixth amendment right to have the assistance of counsel for one's defense are repugnant to the words of the Constitution and all prior cases construing them. According to the words of the Constitution, the sixth amendment right to have the assistance of counsel for one's defense does not exist except in a criminal prosecution, and hence cannot possibly arise until a criminal prosecution is commenced. A criminal prosecution is a prosecution in a court of justice in the name of Government against an individual charged with crime and involves a determination of his guilt or innocence. This being true, the informal questioning of a suspect in custody by a law enforcement officer cannot be rightly equated with a criminal prosecution.

While Congress and State legislatures may enact statutes applicable in their respective jurisdictions which enlarge the right of an individual to have the assistance of counsel, the Supreme Court is powerless to add to or take from the scope of the constitutional right to have the assistance of counsel as such right is defined in the sixth amendment. Accordingly, the majority decisions in the *Escobedo* and *Miranda* cases represent an attempt to change the meaning of the sixth amendment.

The Supreme Court virtually confesses this to be so in the subsequent case of *Johnson v. New Jersey* (384 U.S. 719), by refusing to apply the ruling in the *Escobedo* case to cases antedating it.

The majority decision in the *Miranda* case

does even more violence to the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

This constitutional provision had its origin in a court of evidence which arose in England out of abhorrence for the notorious Court of Star Chamber, which actually forced men to be witnesses against themselves on the trial of criminal charges against them. The principle it embodies has been incorporated into the constitutions of virtually all States in the Union.

It seems appropriate to note that the Miranda case has nothing to do with involuntary confessions. Involuntary confessions have been inadmissible in criminal cases in Federal and State courts since the founding of the Republic. It is needless to inquire why this is so. It seems appropriate to observe, however, that involuntary confessions are barred from evidence in criminal cases in State courts not only by their own laws, but also by the due process clause of the 14th amendment.

The majority decision in the Miranda case is without support in any prior decision. Moreover, it is in actual conflict with a number of prior decisions which expressly reject arguments of counsel for accused that requirements similar to those invented in the Miranda case ought to bar the admission of voluntary confessions. The majority decision in the Miranda case lacks validity of these three reasons:

First. The language of the fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination is inapplicable to voluntary confessions.

Second. The precedents and the writings of legal scholars are to the effect that the privilege against self-incrimination has no relation to voluntary confessions.

Third. The history of the privilege against self-incrimination shows that it has nothing to do with voluntary confessions.

The dissenting opinions of Justices Clark, Harlan, Stewart, and White in the Miranda case elaborate these reasons with convincing force. Consequently, I will forego detailed discussion of them and content myself with making some brief comments upon the first of them.

The fifth amendment privilege against self-incrimination is expressed in these words:

"No person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself."

These words apply only to compelled or forced testimony. For this reason, they cannot be rightly applied to any voluntary confession made under any circumstances because voluntary confessions are voluntarily made. Besides, the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination belongs only to a witness; that is, one who gives evidence in a cause before a court or other tribunal. Moreover, the privilege attaches itself only to a witness in a specified cause; that is, a criminal case or its equivalent. Manifestly, the interrogation of a suspect in custody by a law enforcement officer investigating an unsolved crime does not make the suspect a witness before a court or other tribunal in a criminal case or its equivalent.

While Congress and State legislatures may enact statutes applicable within their respective jurisdictions which establish conditions precedent to the admissibility of voluntary confessions similar to those delineated in the majority opinion in the Miranda case, the Supreme Court cannot rightly do so because it is not authorized by the Constitution to change the privilege against self-incrimination as such privilege is defined in the fifth amendment.

Consequently, the majority decision in the Miranda case represents an attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the States, and to make laws for the United States and the States. The majority opinion really admits this to be true by speaking of the newly created requirements as "the principles an-

nounced today" and "the system of warnings we delineate today."

The Supreme Court corroborated this admission of the majority in the Miranda case by subsequently holding in the Johnson case that the newly invented requirements, allegedly based upon a constitutional provision dating back to June 15, 1790, have no application whatever to cases begun prior to June 22, 1964.

When one reads and ponders the majority opinion in the Miranda case, he is impelled to the abiding conviction that its rationale is as follows: That despite any protestations to the contrary, the Supreme Court Justices who join in the majority opinion believe that a substantial percent of all law enforcement officers, who investigate unsolved crimes and interrogate suspects in custody, resort to undue pressure or trickery to obtain confessions from the suspects; that in consequence, suspects in custody need protection from the law enforcement officers who interrogate them; and that the most efficacious way to give suspects in custody the needed protection is to impose upon law enforcement officers conditions precedent to interrogation which will prevent or substantially deter the suspects from making any confessions, or from even making any statements asserting their innocence.

I submit that this rationale is unjust to the thousands of dedicated and honorable law enforcement officers who seek to protect the lives, the bodies, the habitations, and the other property of our people in all areas of our land from criminal depredations. All of us should remember that each year scores of law enforcement officers die in the performance of their duty in order that we might live.

To be sure some law enforcement officers abuse their authority. Some judges do likewise—especially when they attempt to amend constitutions and make laws rather than to interpret them. Hamstringing all law enforcement officers because some of them err is about on a par with padlocking all courtrooms because some judges err.

Despite some intimations in the majority opinion that confessions constitute unreliable testimony, there is no proof that they are more unreliable than other testimony which is daily received without complaint in our courts. I assert without fear of successful contradiction that experience in the administration of justice makes this plain: The rule which excludes from evidence in criminal cases involuntary confessions, irrespective of whether they be true or false, is the only practical and reasonable way in which courts can deal with this problem.

No person can be convicted of crime in any court, Federal or State, unless the prosecution proves these two things beyond a reasonable doubt:

First. That a crime has been actually committed.

Second. That the accused was the perpetrator of such crime.

The prosecution must prove the first of these things, which the law calls the corpus delicti, by independent evidence. It is permissible to use a voluntary confession of the accused only as evidence that he was the perpetrator of the crime established beyond a reasonable doubt by other testimony.

I repeat what I have said before: The most convincing evidence of the guilt of the accused in a criminal case is his own voluntary confession that he committed the crime with which he stands charged.

The trial judge, who sees the witnesses and observes their demeanor upon the stand, ordinarily has little difficulty in determining whether a confession offered in evidence was voluntarily or involuntarily made.

When I had the privilege of serving as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, I had occasion to describe the simple procedure by which the trial judge determines this question.

I take the liberty of quoting from an opinion which I wrote at that time in *State v. Rogers*, 233 N.C. 390, 64 S.E. 2d 572, 28 A.L.R. 2d 1104:

"When the admissibility of a confession is challenged on the ground that it was induced by improper means, the trial judge is required to determine the question of fact whether it was or was not voluntary before he permits it to go to the jury. In making this preliminary inquiry, the judge should afford both the prosecution and the defense a reasonable opportunity to present evidence in the absence of the jury showing the circumstances under which the confession was made. When the trial court finds upon a consideration of all the testimony offered on the preliminary inquiry that the confession was voluntarily made, his finding is not subject to review, if it is supported by any competent evidence."

The rule which prevails in most jurisdictions that the finding of the trial judge on this question is not subject to review if it is supported by any competent evidence is exceedingly wise. He has an opportunity to see the witnesses and judge their credibility. This opportunity is denied to an appellate court which is compelled to act upon the basis of printed testimony. When the testimony of the witnesses is reduced to cold type, it is not easy to distinguish the testimony of an Ananias from that of a George Washington.

Justice Harlan appraised the majority decision in the Miranda case aright when he declared in his dissenting opinion that "the decision of the Court represents poor constitutional law and entails harmful consequences for the country at large."

It has always been recognized in our country that the questioning of suspects in custody by law enforcement officers investigating unsolved crimes constitutes a legitimate instrument of law enforcement. By the judicious use of this instrument of law enforcement, untold thousands of innocent suspects have been annually freed without trial, and untold thousands of guilty suspects, who would have otherwise gone unwhipped of justice, have been annually brought to judgment.

The drastic limitations, which the majority opinion in the Miranda case places upon the interrogation process, are well designed to induce suspects in custody to remain silent when law enforcement officers undertake to question them concerning unsolved crimes and thus destroy the effectiveness of the interrogation process itself.

As the inevitable consequence of these drastic limitations, the number of innocent suspects freed without trial will diminish, the detention of innocent suspects will be prolonged, and the number of criminal trials will be multiplied.

Moreover, multitudes of guilty suspects will escape conviction and punishment, and be turned loose upon society to repeat their crimes simply because many crimes cannot be solved without confessions. This is particularly true of burglaries, grand larcenies, and automobile thefts, which are frequently committed in secret, and of forcible rapes, which are frequently committed under such circumstances that the victim cannot identify her assistant. Like observations are true of many felony murders, robberies, and aggravated assaults.

The country ought not to suffer these harmful consequences. As a Member of the U.S. Senate, I shall try to do something to avert them. I will ask the Congress to submit to the States a proposed constitutional amendment which will provide that in the absence of congressional or State legislation to the contrary, the sole test of the admissibility of confessions in criminal cases shall be whether or not they were voluntarily made, and that the Supreme Court cannot reverse the ruling of a trial judge admitting

a confession as voluntarily made, if such ruling is supported by any competent evidence.

I may not succeed in my purpose because the submission of a proposed constitutional amendment to the States requires the vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, and because many Senators and Congressmen seem to believe that judicial aberrations are sacrosanct and ought to be as unalterable as the laws of the Medes and the Persians.

I shall nevertheless try because I know these things to be true: Enough has been done for those who murder and rape and rob. It is time to do something for those who do not wish to be murdered or raped or robbed.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS ON THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION OF *MIRANDA v. ARIZONA*

Mr. Chairman, no problem more critically demands attention and action than the alarming increase in crime in this country. Last year, the President expressed great alarm that the crime rate had doubled in this country in 25 years and had increased five times faster than the population growth in the last seven years. In our great cities, citizens are faced with increased odds that they may become the victims of muggings, vicious assaults, burglaries, and the wanton destruction of property. When we consider the staggering cost of crime in terms of dollars lost, of death, injury and suffering inflicted on thousands of victims, and of fear engendered in millions of law-abiding citizens, we must agree with President Johnson that "crime is a national problem."

The series of hearings of your Subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, on the implications of the recent decision of *Miranda v. Arizona* will, I feel, shed valuable light on the problems posed by this decision and the action Congress can take to deal with them.

Of course, there are many ways in which crime can be fought. Poverty and substandard social conditions are part of the crime picture, but more welfare and social programs, the greatest in our country's history, have not made a dent in the crime problem. Also, the problem of increasing crime is intimately related to the effectiveness of law enforcement. Improving police administration should certainly be considered by everyone sincerely interested in fighting crime, and I feel the "Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965" was a great step forward in this area. The upgrading of law enforcement activities is one of the most important steps that can be taken to reduce crime and I sincerely hope that Congress will continue to look for creative approaches in this area.

This investigation, however, deals with another part of the crime picture and I think this subcommittee should face the fact that increasingly in the last decade our law enforcement officers have been limited and often hamstrung in dealing with crime by high court rulings. These rulings have drastically limited police investigative powers, have forbidden the use of voluntary confessions by the accused in many instances heretofore permitted, and have altered reasonable procedures which once were the great bulwarks against crime. Recent high court rulings have stressed individual rights of the accused to the point where public safety has often been relegated to the back row of the courtroom. In the process, police have become confused in their efforts to protect the public from acknowledged criminals. Dissenting court opinions have pointed out that investigative procedural rules are becoming unrealistic.

Civilization represents at best a delicate balance between the rights of the individual and society's rights. As Mr. Justice Car-

dozo explained in *Snyder v. Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 122 (1934), "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser, also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

We have not kept the balance true. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court in recent years has moved through logic shattering sentiment and stifling procedures to favor the individual to such an extent that the administration of criminal justice is defeated. Indeed, in the prosecution of crimes, we have seen the powers of the police at any level to conduct in-custody interrogation gasp in the case of *Escobedo* and, more recently, die in *Miranda*.

Basically, the Court majority held in the *Miranda* case that:

"The prosecution may not use statements, whether exculpatory or inculpatory, stemming from custodial interrogation of the defendant unless it demonstrates the use of procedural safeguards effective to secure the privilege against self-incrimination."

The Court majority henceforth requires that before any suspect may be questioned he must be warned that he has a right to remain silent, that anything he says may be used against him, and that he has a right to the presence of an attorney, either retained or appointed. The suspect who submits to interrogation after being so warned may terminate such interrogation himself at any time simply by indicating that he wants it stopped.

Thus did the majority for all practical purposes fulfill the prediction by Mr. Justice White of its ultimate goal "to bar from evidence all admissions obtained from an individual suspected of crime, whether involuntary made or not." *Escobedo v. Illinois*, 378 U.S. 478, 495 (1964).

The claimed basis for the decision was the Fifth Amendment's protection of the privilege against self-incrimination, a basis which has no support in the language of the Fifth Amendment or in the history of the privilege. The clear language of the Amendment is that "in any criminal case" no person shall be compelled "to be a witness against himself." One of the foremost legal scholars of this century, Edward Corwin, after careful study, concluded that the Amendment, when "considered in the light to be shed by grammar and the dictionary appears to signify simply that nobody shall be compelled to give oral testimony against himself in a criminal proceeding under way in which he is defendant." This construction, that the privilege applies to prohibit compelled judicial interrogations only, is firmly supported by the English authorities and the common law history of the privilege. Moreover, the dissent by Mr. Justice Harlan and Mr. Justice White convincingly demonstrated that no legal precedent existed for the application of the privilege to police interrogation, a demonstration the majority opinion never really refuted.

It requires little reflection to realize what the Court majority has done. It has not only practically eliminated confessions from trial court considerations; it has probably made impossible the ordinary practice of police interrogation itself, a result which surely entails harmful consequences for the country at large. Mr. Justice Harlan in dissent warned that although the extent of the harm wrought by the decision could not be accurately foretold; it was readily apparent that it would impair law enforcement to some extent. He said:

"We do know that some crimes cannot be solved without confessions, that ample expert testimony attests to their importance in crime control, and that the Court is taking a real risk with society's welfare in imposing its new regime on the country. The social costs of crime are too great to call the new rules anything but a hazardous experimentation."

I believe that this "hazardous experimentation" is one which we cannot afford to take in view of the grave problems that crime now poses to this country. Accordingly, I propose to introduce a Constitutional Amendment to deal with the *Miranda* decision. My amendment will allow the law, as it did previously, to protect suspects and defendants from having confessions and other admissions coerced from them without rendering next to impossible the solving of many crimes. By providing that any admission or confession shall be admissible in evidence if made voluntarily, my amendment will return the rule which the Supreme Court itself recognized as valid until recent days and which has prevailed in all states whose legal systems are based upon the experience of the common law. When all is said, there is no reason residing in the proposition that persons charged with crime should be protected by law against their voluntary admissions and confessions that they committed the crime with which they are charged.

Beginning with *Brown v. Mississippi*, 297 U.S. 278 (1936), the Court applied due process standards to questions of admissibility of confessions in court. Excluded were confessions gained by threats or imminent danger, physical deprivation, physical brutality, repeated or extended interrogation, lengthy detention and other coercive means. The goal to be achieved, as in my amendment, was "voluntariness," not in the sense of the removal of all pressure but the removal of unfair, illegal, or reprehensible pressure.

My amendment will allow a determination of whether the confession was voluntary, and, as such, will afford protection to the civil liberties of suspects while allowing leeway to protection of the general public interest in having crime either prevented or solved.

After *Miranda*, we have the police handcuffed. In many cases, there are no clues at the scene of the crime. There may be no witnesses or the witness may be dead or disabled. The only thing the police may have to go on is a known criminal lurking in the area, or a crime being committed in a certain pattern. If they may not bring people in and question them, the rate of crime solving is likely to drop precipitately.

If we do not seriously consider the enactment of this type of amendment, the result will be that the civil liberties of criminal suspects will be over protected while the rights and liberties of society will be seriously infringed upon.

The danger in the constant innovating drive of the majority of the court was well set out by the late Mr. Justice Jackson. He said:

"This Court is forever adding new stories to the temple of constitutional law, and the temple has a way of collapsing when one story too many is added." *Douglas v. Jeannette*, 319 U.S. 157, 181 (1943).

I maintain that we must act before the temple collapses.

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

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] for taking the leadership in this important matter. I do not know of any one thing that will do more to curb crime in this country than the passage of this resolution.

Criminals today, although they confess voluntarily that they have committed crimes, are getting away free simply because a lawyer was not present or because of some technicality. If a man voluntarily confesses that he is guilty of a crime some technicality should not allow him to go free.

Mr. President, this is a most important resolution and I hope that the Senate will take prompt action on it.

AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION BILL—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 6 THROUGH 31

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk 26 amendments to S. 355, the legislative reorganization bill, which will be presented to the Senate by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] shortly after the disposition of the cloture motion tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that these proposed amendments be numbered consecutively, that they be printed in the RECORD serialim, together with short explanatory notes and the text of existing or related provisions.

I further ask unanimous consent that the text and explanatory notes be set in large-size type, as if orally delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments and other documents will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The amendment (No. 6) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

Beginning with line 9, page 7, strike out all to and including line 23, page 7.

On page 7, line 24, strike out the subsection designation "(c)", and insert in lieu thereof the subsection designation "(d)".

MOTION TO STRIKE INCREASED COMMITTEE QUORUM REQUIREMENTS, ABOLITION OF PROXY VOTING—EXPLANATION

This amendment would delete the provisions in S. 355 which abolish proxy voting in committee, and require the actual presence of a majority for a committee to take any action. Under existing law, the actual presence of a majority is required only to report. Committees and subcommittees are free to adopt rules permitting any other action to be taken by a quorum of only one-third. This amendment would preserve the existing situation.

The amendment (No. 7) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. Paragraph 6(a) of Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"6. (a) Three members of the following named committees, to be selected by their respective committees, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on said committee when the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the following table opposite the name of the committee is being considered by the Committee on Appropriations:

"NAME OF COMMITTEE AND PURPOSE OF APPROPRIATION

"Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: For the Department of Agriculture, and related matters.

"Committee on Armed Services: For the Department of Defense.

"Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: For aeronautical and space activities and matters relating to the scientific aspects thereof, except those peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"Committee on Banking and Currency: For the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Export-Import Bank.

"Committee on Commerce: For the Department of Commerce and related activities, including the Department of Transportation.

"Committee on the District of Columbia: For the District of Columbia.

"Committee on Finance, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: For the Department of the Treasury and the Post Office.

"Committee on Foreign Relations: For the Department of State and related agencies, and for the foreign assistance programs.

"Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: For the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

"Committee on the Judiciary: For the Department of Justice and for the Judiciary.

"Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: For the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Committee on Public Works: For public works.

"Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (to be selected by said Members): For the development and utilization of atomic energy."

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS OF APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE—EXPLANATION

The Senate rules presently provide for the selection of three ex officio members of the Appropriations Committee from each of eight legislative committees. These ex officio members serve on the Appropriations Committee for the limited purpose of considering annual appropriations for programs within the jurisdiction of their particular legislative committee. The revision of this rule adds six more legislative committees to this list, on the ground that they have equally valid claims to participate in appropriations decisions affecting matters within their jurisdiction. These six additional committees are: Commerce, Finance, Interior and Insular Affairs, Judiciary, Labor and Public Welfare, and Banking and Currency.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

6. (a) Three members of the following-named committees, to be selected by their respective committees, shall be ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations, to serve on said committee when the annual appropriation bill making appropriations for the purposes specified in the following table opposite the name of the committee is being con-

sidered by the Committee on Appropriations:

NAME OF COMMITTEE AND PURPOSE OF APPROPRIATION

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: For the Department of Agriculture.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: For the Post Office Department.

Committee on Armed Services: For the Department of War; for the Department of the Navy.

Committee on the District of Columbia: For the District of Columbia.

Committee on Public Works: For rivers and harbors.

Committee on Foreign Relations: For the diplomatic and consular service.

Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (to be selected by said members): For the development and utilization of atomic energy.

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: For aeronautical and space activities and matters relating to the scientific aspects thereof, except those peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

The amendment (No. 8) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

Beginning with line 12, page 14, strike out all to and including line 8, page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) No standing committee of the Senate or the House shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session. A motion for leave for a standing committee to sit while the Senate or the House is in session shall be a privileged motion and shall not be debatable."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS—EXPLANATION

Although standing committees may now sit without special leave during the period while morning business is conducted, a single Senator still has the power to prevent every standing committee and every subcommittee of a standing committee from meeting while the Senate is in session after the close of morning business. The Monroney proposal would alter this arrangement by carving out a statutory exemption for the Committee on Appropriations, and by permitting legislative committees to meet during sessions with the consent of the joint leadership, but only for the purpose of holding hearings. The Clark proposal, on the other hand, provides even handed treatment to all committees, by implementing the intention of the drafters of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by stating that a committee may obtain leave to sit without restriction as to purpose, while the Senate is in session by a privileged, nondebatable motion.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE XXV

5. No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session after (1) the conclusion of the morning hour, or (2) the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business, pending business, or any other business except private bills and the routine morning business, whichever is earlier.

PROPOSED MONRONEY PROVISION
COMMITTEE POWERS

Sec. 104. (a) Section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190b(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as hereinafter provided, no standing committee of the Senate or the House shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session. The prohibition contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or to the following committees of the House of Representatives: the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Un-American Activities. A standing committee of the Senate may conduct a hearing while the Senate is in session if consent therefor has been obtained from the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate. A standing committee of the House of Representatives may conduct a hearing while the House is in session if consent therefor has been obtained from the Speaker and the minority leader of the House. In the event of the absence of any such officer or leader, the consent of such officer or leader may be given by a Member of that House of which such officer or leader is a Member designated by him for that purpose."

(b) Paragraph 5 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is repealed.

The amendment (No. 9) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 5, line 13, strike out the words "new sentences".

On page 6, line 4, strike out "meeting.", and insert in lieu thereof "meeting."

On page 6, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following new paragraphs:

"The business to be considered at any meeting of a standing committee shall be determined in accordance with its rules. Any measure, motion, or matter within the jurisdiction of the committee which a majority of the members of the committee indicate their desire to consider by votes or by presentation of written notice filed with the committee clerk, shall be considered at such meeting.

"Action for the initiation, conduct, and termination of hearings by a standing committee upon any measure or matter within its jurisdiction shall be determined by majority vote of the members of the committee.

"Whenever any measure, motion, or other matter pending before a standing committee has received consideration in executive session or sessions of the committee for a total of not less than five hours, any Senator may move the previous question with respect thereto. When such a motion is made and seconded, or a petition signed by a majority of the committee is presented to the chairman, and a quorum as prescribed by committee rules pursuant to paragraph 3 of rule XXX is present, it shall be submitted immediately to the committee by the chairman, and shall be determined without debate by yeas and nays vote. A motion for the previous question shall be

decided by a majority vote of the Senators voting. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more pending measures, motions, or matters, and may embrace one or more pending amendments to any pending measure, motion, or matter described therein and final action by the committee on the pending bill or resolution. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, or matter that measure, motion, or matter shall be presented immediately to the committee for determination. Each member of the committee desiring to be heard on one or more of the measures, motions, or other matters on which the previous question has been ordered shall be allowed to speak thereon for a total of thirty minutes.

"These provisions shall be applicable to meetings and procedure thereat at any meeting of any subcommittee of any standing committee."

COMMITTEE BILL OF RIGHTS—EXPLANATION

In order to facilitate the efficient and democratic management of committee business, it is essential that a majority of the members of each standing committee be expressly authorized to convene meetings; to direct the initiation, conduct, and termination of hearings; to call up bills for consideration; and to terminate debate in committee after a measure has received adequate consideration.

The Monroney bill provides a procedure by which a majority can convene a meeting and direct that a measure be reported. This amendment complements these provisions by clarifying the right of the majority to fix the agenda; to halt filibusters in committee by terminating debate after a measure has received consideration in executive session for a total of 5 hours; and to direct the initiation, conduct, and termination of hearings.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 10) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"4. A majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference shall have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasion the appointment of the committee."

SELECTION OF CONFEREES—EXPLANATION

A majority of the Senate members of a conference committee would have to be chosen from those who indicated by their votes their concurrence with the prevailing view in the Senate on matters on disagreement with the House.

Existing provisions: None

The amendment (No. 11) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. (a) Rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE III

"COMMENCEMENT OF DAILY SESSIONS

"1. The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, motions to correct any mistakes made in the entries of the Senate Journal of the preceding day shall be in order and proceeded with until disposed of, unless objected to. If objection is made, the Senator moving to correct the Senate Journal and the Senator objecting may file at the clerk's desk briefs in support of their positions. Such briefs shall be printed in the Senate Journal for the calendar day on which the motion to correct was made, together with a notice that a vote on the motion will take place on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session at a time certain to be set by the Presiding Officer. At the designated time, the motion to correct shall be submitted to the Senate and decided without debate.

"2. Unless a motion to read the Senate Journal of the preceding day, which shall be nondebatable, is made and passed by majority vote, the Senate Journal shall be deemed to have been read without actual recitation and approved.

"3. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn."

(b) Rule IV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE IV

"SENATE JOURNAL

"1. The proceedings of the Senate shall be accurately stated in the Senate Journal which shall be the Senate section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Messages of the President in full; titles of bills and joint resolutions, and such parts as shall be affected by proposed amendments; every vote, and a brief statement of the contents of each petition, memorial, or paper presented to the Senate; the legislative proceedings; and, the executive proceedings in open executive sessions, shall be entered.

"2. The executive proceedings in closed sessions, the confidential legislative proceedings, and the proceedings when sitting as a Court of Impeachment, shall each be recorded by the Journal Clerk in a separate book."

JOURNAL—EXPLANATION

The Senate Journal is nothing more than a quaint anachronism which is never looked at by anyone and is read only for the purposes of delay. Its place has been taken, for practical purposes, by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This amendment recognizes this fact, and satisfies article I, section 5, clause 3, of the Constitution, which requires each House to keep a journal of its proceedings, by stating that the Senate section

of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be the Senate Journal.

Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is printed and available to Senators each morning following a session, there is no need to have it read aloud, and the right to require that is abolished. Presumably any errors in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be corrected informally, or by unanimous consent, as they are today. But a procedure for correcting mistakes by motion, without debate, is provided for those cases in which unanimous consent cannot be obtained. Under this procedure, the Senator seeking to make the correction, and the Senator objecting to the correction may file written briefs in support of their positions for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in advance of the vote.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE III

COMMENCEMENT OF DAILY SESSIONS

1. The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read, and any mistakes made in the entries corrected. The reading of the Journal shall not be suspended unless by unanimous consent; and when any motion shall be made to amend or correct the same, it shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of.

2. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

RULE IV

JOURNAL

1. The proceedings of the Senate shall be briefly and accurately stated on the Journal. Messages of the President in full; titles of bills and joint resolutions, and such parts as shall be affected by proposed amendments; every vote, and a brief statement of the contents of each petition, memorial, or paper presented to the Senate, shall be entered.

2. The legislative, the executive, the confidential legislative proceedings, and the proceedings when sitting as a Court of Impeachment, shall each be recorded in a separate book.

The amendment (No. 12) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"9. During the consideration of any measure, motion, or other matter, any Senator may move that all further debate under the order for pending business shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate. If such a motion, which shall be nondebatable, is approved by the Senate, all further debate under the said order shall be germane to the subject matter before the Senate, and all questions of germaneness under this rule, when raised, including appeals, shall be decided by the Senate without debate."

GERMANENESS OF DEBATE—EXPLANATION

The present rule, which provides for a daily 3-hour period of germane debate, would be made more flexible by the adoption of a procedure whereby a majority of the Senate, by nondebatable motion, could require further debate on the pending business to be germane to the subject matter before the Senate until the business was disposed of.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 13) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLI

"AMENDMENTS—GERMANENESS

"No amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in a bill under consideration shall be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto; and all questions of relevancy of amendments, when raised, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer, subject to appeal to the Senate to be decided without debate."

GERMANENESS OF AMENDMENTS—EXPLANATION

This provision, which is similar to the present practice of the House of Representatives, incorporates a general prohibition against nongermane amendments. Questions of germaneness are to be decided by the Presiding Officer subject to appeal to the Senate without debate.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 14) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE V

"QUORUM—ABSENT SENATORS MAY BE SENT FOR

"1. No Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave.

"2. If, at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate, a question shall be raised by the Majority Leader or the Minority Leader, or, in their absence, by the Acting Majority Leader or the Acting Minority Leader, as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate.

"3. Any Senator may raise the question as to the presence of a quorum but only for the purpose of seeking recognition and calling for a vote on the pending business once the presence of a quo-

rum has been ascertained; and, declaration of such intention shall be made by such Senator immediately prior to his raising the question as to the presence of a quorum. Immediately upon the statement of such intention and the raising of such question by any Senator, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and proceed as above provided.

"4. Whenever, during any quorum call as provided for in paragraphs 2 and 3, the Presiding Officer ascertains that a majority of the Senators are present in the chamber, he shall direct that the quorum call be halted, and declare that a quorum is present.

"5. Whenever upon such rollcall it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and, when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order."

QUORUMS—EXPLANATION

The unrestricted right of any Senator to call for a quorum has frequently been the source of great harassment and delay. This amendment circumscribes this right by requiring a Senator to declare his intention to call for a vote on the pending business once the presence of a quorum has been ascertained. Only on this condition could an individual Senator suggest the absence of a quorum. However the majority or minority leaders, or in their absence, the acting majority or minority leaders, could call for a quorum at any time. The Presiding Officer would have the duty to halt the quorum call once he ascertains the presence of a quorum in the Chamber.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE V

QUORUM—ABSENT SENATORS MAY BE SENT FOR

1. No Senator shall absent himself from the service of the Senate without leave.

2. If, at any time during the daily sessions of the Senate, a question shall be raised by any Senator as to the presence of a quorum, the Presiding Officer shall forthwith direct the Secretary to call the roll and shall announce the result, and these proceedings shall be without debate.

3. Whenever upon such roll call it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present, a majority of the Senators present may direct the Sergeant at Arms to request, and, when necessary, to compel the attendance of the absent Senators, which order shall be determined without debate; and pending its execution, and until a quorum shall be present, no debate nor motion, except to adjourn, shall be in order.

The amendment (No. 15) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. The first sentence of paragraph 1 of Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized; and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him, except that he shall first give recognition to the following Senators in the order prescribed if any of them shall also seek recognition:

"(1) The Majority Leader, or, in his absence, any Senator designated as Acting Majority Leader by the Majority Leader, and occupying the Majority Leader's desk.

"(2) The Minority Leader, or, in his absence, any Senator designated as Acting Minority Leader by the Minority Leader, and occupying the Minority Leader's desk."

ORDER OF RECOGNITION—EXPLANATION

This amendment codifies and elaborates the unwritten rule that the Chair will always give preference in recognition to the majority and minority leaders. In the absence of the leaders, it gives equivalent rights to any Senator designated to act in that capacity and occupying the leader's desk.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE XIX
DEBATE

1. When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him.

The amendment (No. 16) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer; *Provided, however,* That such consent shall not be required where any Senator shall raise a germane point of order that the Senator in possession of the floor has transgressed the rules of the Senate. Unless submitted to the Senate, the germane point of order shall be decided by the Presiding Officer subject to an appeal to the Senate as provided in this Rule. Any Senator against whom a germane point of order shall have been raised and any Senator raising such point of order may appeal from the ruling of the Presiding Officer, which appeal shall be open to debate. If the Presiding Officer shall sustain the germane point of order and no appeal is taken, or if upon appeal the Senate shall sustain the germane point

of order, the Senator against whom it has been made shall take his seat; otherwise he shall retain possession of the floor.

"A germane point of order may be raised in respect to enforcement of this Rule.

"When a question of order has been submitted to the Senate, or a debatable appeal has been taken on a decision of the Presiding Officer as provided herein, debate on such submission or appeal shall be limited, in all, to one hour, to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the point of order, unless the Senate shall otherwise direct."

GERMANE POINTS OF ORDER—EXPLANATION

The revision seeks to clear up the confusing situation which presently exists with regard to the right to interrupt a Senator who has the floor for the purpose of raising a point of order. It provides that a Senator may be interrupted without his consent for the purpose of raising a point of order that the Senator in possession of the floor has committed a transgression of the rules of the Senate germane to his possession of the floor.

EXISTING PROVISION

... No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer. ...

The amendment (No. 17) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"9. Upon the request of any Senator who has been recognized, his remarks upon any subject may be delivered in writing, and if so delivered shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the same manner, and in the same size print, as if those remarks had been delivered orally. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall contain a notation that the material was submitted but not delivered orally."

SUBMISSION OF SPEECHES WITHOUT DELIVERY—
EXPLANATION

Upon request, a Senator would be permitted to have his written remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in normal size print without the requirement of full oral delivery. However, the RECORD would contain a notation to the effect that the material was submitted but not delivered orally.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 18) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule XX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. When a question of order has been submitted to the Senate, or a debatable appeal has been taken on a decision of the Presiding Officer as provided herein, debate on such submission or appeal shall be limited, in all, to one hour, unless the Senate shall otherwise direct."

POINTS OF ORDER—EXPLANATION

This new provision would limit debate on questions of order submitted to the Senate, and debatable appeals from rulings of the Chair, to 1 hour, in all, unless the Senate orders otherwise.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE XX—QUESTIONS OF ORDER

1. A question of order may be raised at any stage of the proceedings, except when the Senate is dividing, and, unless submitted to the Senate, shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, subject to an appeal to the Senate. When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate; and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once, and without debate; and any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer.

2. The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate.

The amendment (No. 19) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. (a) Rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE VII

"MORNING BUSINESS

"1. One hour, if that much time be needed, shall be set aside for the transaction of morning business as set forth in paragraph 2 of this rule, on each legislative day at the opening of proceedings unless the Senate shall otherwise order by unanimous consent. The period for morning business may be extended for up to one additional hour, upon motion, which shall be nondebatable, approved by majority action.

"2. The Presiding Officer shall, during the period for morning business, lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for:

"The presentation of petitions and memorials.

"Reports of standing and select committees.

"The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

"Concurrent and other resolutions.

"Statements or comments not to exceed three minutes which may include requests for unanimous consent to insert articles and other printed matter in the Senate Journal and to submit statements.

"3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the Calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given, the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up."

(b) Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"9. It shall not be in order to interrupt a Senator having the floor for the purpose of introducing any memorial, petition, report of a committee, resolution, or bill. It shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce this rule without any point of order hereunder being made by a Senator."

(c) The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rules:

"RULE XLI

"PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

"1. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred to the appropriate committee without debate. But no petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

"2. Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question, unless objection to such reference is made; in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

"3. Only a brief statement of the contents of such communications as are presented under the order of business "Presentation of petitions and memorials" shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and no other portion of such communications shall be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless specifically so ordered by the Senate, as provided for in rule XL, paragraph 1; except that communications from the legislatures or conventions, lawfully called, of the respective States and insular possessions shall be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD whenever presented, and the original copies of such communications shall be retained in the files of the Secretary of the Senate.

"4. Senators having petitions, memorials, or private bills to present after

the conclusion of the morning business may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their names. Said petitions, memorials, or bills shall, with the approval of the Presiding Officer, be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the names of the Senators presenting them as having been read twice and referred to the appropriate committees.

"RULE XLII

"CALENDAR MONDAY

"1. At the conclusion of the morning business on each Monday, unless upon motion decided without debate the Senate shall otherwise order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions, and bills and resolutions that are not objected to shall be taken up in their order. An objection may be interposed at any stage of the proceedings, but upon motion the Senate may continue such consideration; and this order shall commence immediately after the conclusion of morning business, and shall take precedence of the unfinished business and other special orders."

MORNING BUSINESS—EXPLANATION

The morning hour rule would be revised extensively to abolish the confusing distinction between morning hour and morning business, and to dispense with the need for unanimous consent to make statements or comments of not more than 3 minutes' duration. There would be a daily period of 1 hour, if that much time should be needed, set aside at the opening of each new legislative day for the conduct of morning business. The Senate, by majority vote without debate, could extend the period for up to 1 additional hour. During this period, under the regular order of business, Senators would have the privilege of making 3-minute statements and could seek unanimous consent to have printed matter inserted in the RECORD.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE VII

MORNING BUSINESS

1. After the Journal is read, the Presiding Officer shall lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for, in the following order:

The presentation of petitions and memorials.

Reports of standing and select committees.

The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Concurrent and other resolutions.

All of which shall be received and disposed of in such order, unless unanimous consent shall be otherwise given.

2. Senators having petitions, memorials, pension bills, or bills for the payment of private claims to present after the morning hour may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their names and the reference or disposition to be made thereof, and

said petitions, memorials, and bills shall, with the approval of the Presiding Officer, be entered on the Journal with the names of the Senators presenting them as having been read twice and referred to the appropriate committees, and the Secretary of the Senate shall furnish a transcript of such entries to the official reporter of debates for publication in the RECORD.

It shall not be in order to interrupt a Senator having the floor for the purpose of introducing any memorial, petition, report of a committee, resolution, or bill. It shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce this rule without any point of order hereunder being made by a Senator.

3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the Calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent; and if such consent be given, the motion shall not be subject to amendment, and shall be decided without debate upon the merits of the subject proposed to be taken up; *Provided, however,* That on Mondays the Calendar shall be called under Rule VIII, and during the morning hour no motion shall be entertained to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the Calendar except the motion to continue the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject against objection as provided in Rule VIII.

4. Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question, unless objection to such reference is made; in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

5. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have endorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate. But no petition or memorial or other paper signed by citizens or subjects of a foreign power shall be received, unless the same be transmitted to the Senate by the President.

6. Only a brief statement of the contents, as provided for in Rule VII, paragraph five, of such communications as are presented under the order of business "Presentation of petitions and memorials" shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and no other portion of such communications shall be inserted in the RECORD unless specifically so ordered by vote of the Senate, as provided for in Rule XXIX, paragraph one; except that communications from the legislatures or conventions, lawfully called, of the respective States, territories, and insular possessions shall be printed in full in the RECORD whenever presented, and the original copies of such communications shall be retained in the files of the Secretary of the Senate.

7. The Presiding Officer may at any time lay, and it shall be in order at any time for a Senator to move to lay, before

the Senate, any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any question pending at that time shall be suspended for this purpose. Any motion so made shall be determined without debate.

The amendment (No. 20) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. Rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XIV

"BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS

"1. Every bill and joint resolution shall receive three readings previous to its passage. The first reading and the second reading may be on the same calendar day, if the Senate by majority vote without debate, shall so direct; but the third reading must be on a different calendar day. The Presiding Officer shall give notice at each reading whether it be the first, second, or third. The first or second reading of each bill, or both, may be by title only, unless the Senate by majority vote without debate shall otherwise order.

"2. Every bill or joint resolution shall immediately after second reading be referred by the Presiding Officer to the appropriate committee. Appeals from rulings of the Presiding Officer referring bills and joint resolutions to committee shall be decided by the Senate without debate. A motion to place a bill or joint resolution on the Senate Calendar immediately and not refer it to committee may be made by any Senator after such bill or joint resolution has been read twice but before it has been referred to committee, and such motion shall be decided by majority vote of the Senate after debate not to exceed a period of one hour.

"3. Every bill and joint resolution having been read twice and referred to a committee, shall, upon being reported by the committee, immediately be placed on the Calendar. Every bill and joint resolution originating in a committee shall, upon being reported by the committee, be read twice and then placed on the Calendar.

"4. The Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

"5. All resolutions shall lie over one calendar day for consideration, unless the Senate shall by majority vote otherwise direct."

PROCEDURE FOR BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS—EXPLANATION

This rule has been extensively rewritten both to clarify its operation, and to reduce the potential for disruption of normal legislative procedures by the objection of a single Senator. The provision by which any Senator can prevent a bill from being referred to committee, and have it placed directly on the calendar after second reading, has been eliminated. However, this may be done on motion by a majority of the Senate after 1 hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents. The section permitting any Senator to force a postponement of the introduction of any bill or joint resolution for 1 day has also been eliminated.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE XIV

BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS

1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for one day.

2. Every bill and joint resolution shall receive three readings previous to its passage, which readings shall be on three different days, unless the Senate unanimously direct otherwise; and the Presiding Officer shall give notice at each reading whether it be the first, second, or third: *Provided*, That the first or second reading of each bill may be by title only, unless the Senate in any case shall otherwise order.

3. No bill or joint resolution shall be committed or amended until it shall have been twice read, after which it may be referred to a committee; bills and joint resolutions introduced on leave, and bills and joint resolutions from the House of Representatives, shall be read once, and may be read twice, on the same day, if not objected to, for reference, but shall not be considered on that day nor debated, except for reference, unless by unanimous consent.

4. Every bill and joint resolution reported from a committee, not having previously been read, shall be read once, and twice, if not objected to, on the same day, and placed on the Calendar in the order in which the same may be reported; and every bill and joint resolution introduced on leave, and every bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives which shall have received a first and second reading without being referred to a committee, shall, if objection be made to further proceedings thereon, be placed on the Calendar.

5. The Secretary of the Senate shall examine all bills, amendments, and joint resolutions before they go out of the possession of the Senate, and shall examine all bills and joint resolutions which shall have passed both Houses, to see that the same are correctly enrolled, and, when signed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, shall forthwith present the same, when they shall have originated in the Senate, to the President of the United States and report the fact and date of such presentation to the Senate.

6. All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

The amendment (No. 21) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. The first paragraph of Rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to voting) is amended to read as follows:

"1. A demand for the yeas and nays, when seconded by eleven Senators, shall be sufficient to require a rollcall vote. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question unless excused by the Senate. Senators entering the Chamber after their names have been called may obtain recognition from the Presiding Officer and have their votes recorded prior to the announcement of the vote; but no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, except that a Senator may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent."

VOTING—EXPLANATION

Two additions have been made to the existing rule, both for the purpose of codifying existing practice: (1) A demand for the yeas and nays, when seconded by 11 Senators, shall be sufficient to require a roll call vote; and (2) Senators entering the Chamber after their names have been called may obtain recognition from the Presiding Officer and have their votes recorded prior to the announcement of the vote.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE XII

VOTING, ET CETERA

1. When the yeas and nays are ordered, the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically; and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the Presiding Officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the Presiding Officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent.

The amendment (No. 22) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XII

"DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS"

"1. Each individual who at any time during any calendar year serves as a Member of the Senate, or as an officer or employee of the Senate compensated at a gross rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate for that calendar year a written report containing the following information:

"(a) The fair market value of each asset having a fair market value of \$5,000 or more held by him or by his spouse or by him and his spouse jointly, exclusive of any dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family, at the end of that calendar year;

"(b) The amount of each liability in excess of \$5,000 owed by him or by his spouse, or by him and his spouse jointly at the end of that calendar year;

"(c) The total amount of all capital gains realized, and the source and amount of each capital gain realized in any amount exceeding \$5,000, during that calendar year by him or by his spouse, by him and his spouse jointly, or by any person acting on behalf or pursuant to the direction of him or his spouse, or him and his spouse jointly, as a result of any transaction or series of related transactions in securities or commodities, or any purchase or sale of real property or any interest therein other than a dwelling occupied as a residence by him or by members of his immediate family;

"(d) The source and amount of each item of income, each item of reimbursement for any expenditure, and each gift or aggregate of gifts from one source (other than gifts received from any relative or his spouse) received by or accruing to him, his spouse, or from him and his spouse jointly from any source other than the United States during that calendar year, which exceeds \$100 in amount or value; including any fee or other honorarium received by him for or in connection with the preparation or delivery of any speech or address, attendance at any convention or other assembly of individuals, or the preparation of any article or other composition for publication, and the monetary value of subsistence, entertainment, travel, or other facilities received by him in kind;

"(e) The name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States in which he has a financial interest; and the name, address, and a brief description of the principal business of any client of such firm for whom any services involving representation before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States which were performed during that calendar year, together with a brief description of the services performed, and the total fees received or receivable by the firm as compensation for such services;

"(f) The name, address, and nature of the principal business or activity of each business or financial entity or enterprise with which he was associated at any time during that calendar year as an officer, director, or partner, or in any other managerial capacity.

"2. Each asset consisting of an interest in a business or financial entity or enterprise which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name of such entity or enterprise, the location of its principal office, and the nature of the business or activity in which it is principally engaged or with which it is principally concerned, except that an asset which is a security traded on any securities exchange subject to supervision by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States may be identified by a full and complete description of the security and the name of the issuer thereof. Each liability which is subject to disclosure under paragraph 1 shall be identified in each report made pursuant to that paragraph by a statement of the name and the address of the creditor to whom the obligation of such liability is owed.

"3. Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, each individual who is required by paragraph 1 to file a report for any calendar year shall file such report with the Secretary of the Senate not later than January 31 of the next following calendar year. No such report shall be required to be made for any calendar year beginning before January 1, 1964. The requirements of this rule shall apply only with respect to individuals who are Members of the Senate or officers or employees of the Senate on or after the date of adoption of this rule. Any individual who ceases to serve as a Member of the Senate or as an officer or employee of the Senate, before the close of any calendar year shall file such report on the last day of such service, or on such date not more than three months thereafter as the Secretary of the Senate may prescribe, and the report so made shall be made for that portion of that calendar year during which such individual so served. Whenever there is on file with the Secretary of the Senate a report made by any individual in compliance with paragraph 1 for any calendar year, the Secretary may accept from that individual for any succeeding calendar year, in lieu of the report required by paragraph 1, a certificate containing an accurate recitation of the changes in such report which are required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year, or a statement to the effect that no change in such report is required for compliance with the provisions of paragraph 1 for that succeeding calendar year.

"4. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be made upon forms which shall be prepared and provided by the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be made in such manner and detail as he shall prescribe. The Secretary may provide for the grouping within such reports and certificate of items which are required by paragraph 1 to be disclosed whenever he determines that separate itemization thereof is not feasible or is not required for accurate disclosure with respect to such items. Reports and certificates filed under this rule shall be retained by the Secretary as public records for not less than six years after the close of the calendar year for which they

are made, and while so retained shall be available for inspection by members of the public under such reasonable regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

"5. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'asset' includes any beneficial interest held or possessed directly or indirectly in any business or financial entity or enterprise, or in any security or evidence of indebtedness, but does not include any interest in any organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

"(b) The term 'liability' includes any liability of any trust in which a beneficial interest is held or possessed directly or indirectly;

"(c) The term 'income' means gross income as defined by section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

"(d) The term 'security' means any security as defined by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b);

"(e) The term 'commodity' means any commodity as defined by section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2);

"(f) The term 'dealing in securities or commodities' means any acquisition, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity;

"(g) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS—
EXPLANATION

This new rule would require every Senator and every Senate officer or employee compensated at a gross rate in excess of \$10,000 per annum, to file a financial report each year. The report, which would be maintained as a public record by the Secretary of the Senate for a period of six years, would contain the following kinds of information:

a. Assets: The identity and fair market value of any asset having a fair market value of \$5,000 or more.

b. Liabilities: The amount of each liability in excess of \$5,000, and the name and address of the creditor.

c. Capital gains: Source and amount of all capital gains realized in the preceding calendar year in excess of \$5,000.

d. Income: Source and amount of every item of income for the calendar

year in excess of \$100, including gifts other than gifts from a relative.

e. Assets belonging to a trust: assets, liabilities, capital gains, and income of a spouse; and capital gains earned through a strawman are all covered. Family homes and tax-exempt charitable entities are exempted.

f. Association with a professional firm which practices before Federal Government agencies.

g. Service as director, officer, or manager in a business enterprise.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 23) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new Rule:

"RULE XLI

"PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

"1. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may engage or participate in any business or financial venture, enterprise, combination or transaction with any person, firm, or corporation which is—

"(a) engaged in any lobbying activity;

"(b) engaged for compensation in the practice of rendering advisory or public relations services relating to the securing of contracts with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

"(c) engaged in, or seeking to become engaged in, the performance of any construction, manufacturing, research, development, or service contract with the United States or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

"2. No Member of the Senate or any officer or employee of the Senate may accept—

"(a) at any time from any individual, entity, or enterprise which is engaged in lobbying activity any gift or money, property, entertainment, travel, or any other valuable consideration in an amount or having a value in excess of \$100; or

"(b) within any calendar year from any such individual, entity, or enterprise such gifts in an aggregate amount or having an aggregate value in excess of \$100.

"3. No officer or employee of the Senate may be vested with or exercise any authority or responsibility for, or participate in any way in any consideration of or determination with respect to, the allocation among Members of the Senate of any funds available for use to defray expenses incurred or to be incurred by any individual for or in connection with any campaign for the nomination or election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate.

"4. As used in this rule—

"(a) The term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of

the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

"(b) The term 'lobbying activity' means any activity undertaken by any person other than a Member of the Congress to influence directly or indirectly the introduction, passage, defeat, amendment, or modification of any legislative measure in either House of the Congress."

RELATIONS WITH LOBBYISTS—EXPLANATION

This new rule prohibits Senators, and Senate officers and employees from engaging in joint ventures with lobbyists, and from accepting gifts worth more than \$100 from lobbyists.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 24) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLII

"OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT

"1. No officer or employee of the Senate shall engage in any business, financial or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

"(a) such activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

"(b) express permission has been granted by the Member of the Senate charged with supervision of such officer or employee by this rule;

"Provided, however, That in no event shall any officer or full-time employee of the Senate, without special leave of the Senate—

"(a) serve in any managerial capacity

in any business of financial enterprise; or

"(b) engage in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintain an association with any professional or consulting firm.

"2. For the purposes of this rule—

"(a) each Member of the Senate shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees;

"(b) each Member of the Senate who is the chairman of a Senate or joint committee or subcommittee shall be charged

with the supervision of each employee of such committee or subcommittee;

"(c) the Majority Leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the Majority, and the Minority Leader shall be charged with the supervision of each officer and employee of the Minority;

"(d) the Vice President shall be charged with the supervision of each of his employees; and

"(e) the President Pro Tempore shall be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

"3. As used in this rule, the term 'officer or employee of the Senate' means (1) an elected officer of the Senate who is not a Member of the Senate, (2) an employee of the Senate or any committee or subcommittee of the Senate, (3) the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and employees of his office, (4) an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and any person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, (5) a member of the Capitol Police force whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (6) an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, (7) an employee of a Member of the Senate if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and (8) an employee of a joint committee of the Congress whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

MOONLIGHTING BY SENATE EMPLOYEES—EXPLANATION

This rule would prohibit officers and full-time employees of the Senate from serving in any managerial capacity in any business or financial enterprise, or engaging in any regular professional or consulting practice, or maintaining an association with any professional or consulting firm without special leave of the Senate. In addition, it would permit moonlighting only if two conditions are met: (1) the activity or employment must not be inconsistent with the conscientious performance of the officer or employee's official duties; and (2) express permission must have been given by the Member of the Senate charged with the supervision of the officer or employee. For the purposes of this rule, each Senator would be responsible for supervising his own staff; chairmen of committees would supervise committee staffs; the majority and minority leaders and the Vice President would supervise their own employees; and the President pro tempore would be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 25) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 11, strike out all in line 24, and insert in lieu thereof "committee."

On page 11, after line 24, insert the following:

"(i) In each session of the Congress one-half of the bills making appropriations of the revenue for the support of the Government shall be introduced in

the House of Representatives, and one-half of such bills shall be introduced in the Senate. The chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall determine by agreement which of such bills shall be introduced in each House. No such bill shall be introduced in more than one House of the Congress. Hearings upon each such bill shall be conducted jointly by the Committee on Appropriations of the two Houses, or by subcommittees of those committees. A member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House in which any such bill was introduced shall preside at all joint hearings upon that bill."

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE PROCEDURES—
EXPLANATION

House and Senate Appropriations Committees would be authorized to hold joint hearings and half of the appropriations bills each year would originate in each Chamber to expedite congressional business.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 26) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule XXXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XXXII

"BUSINESS CONTINUED FROM SESSION TO SESSION

"1. At the second or any subsequent session of a Congress, the legislative business of the Senate which remained undetermined at the close of the next preceding session of that Congress shall be resumed and proceeded with in the same manner as if no adjournment of the Senate had taken place.

"2. The rules of the Senate shall be adopted at the beginning of each Congress on a ye a and nay vote, a quorum being present. A majority of the Senators voting and present shall prevail. They may be changed at any time as provided in these rules."

ADOPTION OF RULES FOR EACH CONGRESS—
EXPLANATION

The provision continuing the rules of the Senate from one Congress to the next Congress would be deleted, and a majority of Senators present and voting would be empowered to adopt rules at the beginning of each Congress.

EXISTING PROVISIONS—BUSINESS CONTINUED
FROM SESSION TO SESSION

1. At the second or any subsequent session of a Congress, the legislative business of the Senate which remained undetermined at the close of the next preceding session of that Congress shall be resumed and proceeded with in the same manner as if no adjournment of the Senate had taken place; and all papers referred to committees and not reported upon at the close of a session of Congress shall be returned to the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and be retained by him until the next succeeding session of

that Congress, when they shall be returned to the several committees to which they had previously been referred.

The amendment (No. 27) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. The Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new Rule:

"RULE XLI

"INSTRUCTIONS TO REPORT ON MAJOR
LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

"1. It shall be in order at any time after the conclusion of morning business for any Senator to make a motion to denominate any measure then pending in any committee or subcommittee of the Senate as a 'major legislative matter,' and such motion shall be a privileged matter and subject to immediate consideration, provided that a notice of intention to make such a motion shall have been presented on the previous calendar day on which the Senate was in session, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"2. Debate upon such motion shall be limited to eight hours, the time to be evenly divided between the opponents and proponents of the motion.

"3. Such motion, when agreed to, shall constitute an instruction to the committee to which the measure denominated a 'major legislative matter' has been referred to report such measure to the Senate within thirty calendar days, by poll or otherwise, with the recommendation (a) that it be passed, or (b) that it not be passed, or (c) that it be passed with such amendments as shall be recommended."

INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMITTEES TO REPORT ON
MAJOR LEGISLATIVE MATTERS—EXPLANATION

Although it is axiomatic that the committees of the Senate are its creatures and agents, no procedures presently exist by which the Senate can exercise its authority in a fair, orderly, and effective manner.

The rules do presently provide for a motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of a measure. But this motion cannot be used to secure committee consideration of a subject, nor does it provide a device for obtaining a committee's recommendations. Moreover, such a motion can be filibustered, since it is debatable.

This proposal remedies these defects by creating a privileged, motion to denominate any measure pending in committee or subcommittee as a "major legislative matter." This motion would be privileged, provided that a notice of intention to make such a motion had been presented on the previous calendar day, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Debate on the motion would be limited to 8 hours, the time to be divided equally between opponents and proponents. Such motion, if carried by a majority of Senators present and voting,

would constitute an instruction to the committee in which the measure was then pending to report it to the Senate within 30 calendar days, by poll or otherwise, with the recommendation (a) that it be passed, or (b) that it not be passed, or (c) that it be passed with amendments, stating the recommended amendments.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 28) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"9. Whenever a Senator has held the floor for three consecutive hours, he shall be required to yield the floor upon objection and any Senator may raise a point of order at any time thereafter that such Senator yield the floor."

THREE-HOUR RULE—EXPLANATION

Whenever a Senator has held the floor for more than 3 consecutive hours, an objection to his continued possession of the floor, if made by any Senator, would compel him to yield the floor.

Existing provisions: None.

The amendment (No. 29) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Sec. 123. Rule XXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XXIV

"APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

"1. At the beginning of each Congress the Senate shall proceed by ballot to appoint the members of each standing committee, and unless otherwise ordered, of each other committee of the Senate. All members of each such committee so appointed shall be appointed by one ballot. A plurality of the votes cast shall be required for the appointment of the members of each such committee.

"In the event a vacancy occurs for any reason in the membership of a standing committee and of any other committee of the Senate during a session of Congress, the Senate shall proceed by ballot to fill the vacancy. A plurality of the votes cast shall be required in the filling of a vacancy.

"2. Upon the appointment of the members of each such committee at the beginning of a Congress pursuant to paragraph 1, the majority members thereof shall elect by secret ballot of the majority members of the committee one member of that committee to be chairman thereof. Such member shall be of the

majority party of the Senate. A majority of the whole number of votes cast by the majority members of the committee shall be required for the election of a chairman of any such committee.

"No Senator shall be elected or shall continue to serve as chairman of a standing committee after he has attained the age of seventy years, but nothing herein contained shall prevent a Senator who has attained the age of seventy from serving as a member of any committee.

"When a permanent vacancy occurs for any reason in the chairmanship of a standing committee and of any other committee of the Senate, the vacancy in the membership shall first be filled (if necessary) as provided in paragraph 1 hereof, and a successor chairman thereafter elected as hereinabove provided.

"No Senator shall be chairman of more than one standing committee nor of more than one subcommittee of each committee of which he may be a member."

SELECTION AND RETIREMENT OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN—EXPLANATION

Chairmen of standing committees would be chosen by secret ballot of the majority members of the committee at the beginning of each new Congress. In addition, no Senator would be permitted to serve as chairman of a standing committee after he has attained the age of 70.

EXISTING PROVISIONS RULE XXIV

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEES

1. In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

2. When a chairman of a committee shall resign or cease to serve on a committee, and the Presiding Officer be authorized by the Senate to fill the vacancy in such committee, unless specially otherwise ordered, it shall be only to fill up the number on the committee.

The amendment (No. 30) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. Rule IX of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"All motions to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be debatable, unless otherwise provided in these rules; *Provided, however,* That any Senator may file, at the desk of the clerk, a notice of intention to move to consider any matter on the Senate Calendar on the following calendar day on which the

Senate is in session. The filing of such notice shall operate to limit debate upon the motion to one hour, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the motion. The notice of intent shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

MOTIONS TO TAKE UP—EXPLANATIONS

This revision would provide a means by which a Senator could convert a motion to proceed to the consideration of any measure on the Senate Calendar, which would ordinarily be debatable, into a nondebatable motion. This could be done by filing at the desk of the clerk a notice of intention to make such a motion on the following calendar day on which the Senate is in session. The notice of intention would be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXISTING PROVISIONS RULE IX ORDER OF BUSINESS

Immediately after the consideration of cases not objected to upon the Calendar is completed, and not later than 2 o'clock if there shall be no special orders for that time, the Calendar of General Orders shall be taken up and proceeded with in its order, beginning with the first subject on the Calendar next after the last subject disposed of in proceeding with the Calendar; and in such case the following motions shall be in order at any time as privileged motions, save as against a motion to adjourn, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or questions of privilege, to wit:

First. A motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill.

Second. A motion to proceed to the consideration of any other bill on the Calendar, which motion shall not be open to amendment.

Third. A motion to pass over the pending subject, which if carried shall have the effect to leave such subject without prejudice in its place on the Calendar.

Fourth. A motion to place such subject at the foot of the Calendar.

Each of the foregoing motions shall be decided without debate and shall have precedence in the order above named, and may be submitted as in the nature and with all the rights of questions of order.

The amendment (No. 31) submitted by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

On page 2, in the table of contents, immediately after the item relating to section 122 of the bill, insert the following new item:

Sec. 123. Standing Rules of the Senate.

On page 30, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following new section:

STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

SEC. 123. Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"RULE XXII

"PRECEDENCE OF MOTIONS—PREVIOUS QUESTION

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"To lay on the table.

"For the previous question.

"To postpone indefinitely.

"To postpone to a day certain.

"To commit.

"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged, except that after the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution, no motion to lay on the table shall be in order; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, for the previous question, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. (a) Whenever any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate has received consideration for a total of not less than fifteen hours, during a total of not less than three calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such motion or amendment.

"(b) Whenever any measure pending before the Senate, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, has received consideration for a total of not exceeding fifteen calendar days, any Senator may move the previous question with respect to such measure and any or all motions or amendments relating to it.

"(c) when such a motion is made and a quorum is ascertained to be present, it shall be submitted immediately to the Senate by the Presiding Officer, without debate and shall be determined by a "yea" and "nay" vote, a majority prevailing. A previous question may be asked and ordered with respect to one or more measures, motions, amendments, or matters, and may embrace one or more amendments to any pending measure, motion or matter described therein, and the passage or rejection of the pending bill or resolution; *Provided, however,* That any or all motions or amendments not so embraced by the motion for the previous question shall be deemed rejected. If the previous question is so ordered as to any measure, motion, amendment, or matter, that measure, motion, amendment, or matter shall be presented immediately to the Senate for determination. One hour of debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents, shall be allowed on any motion, amendment, or matter, other than the passage or rejection of the measure, bill or resolution on which the previous question has been ordered; and, four hours of debate, divided in the same manner, shall be allowed on the passage or rejection of the measure, bill or resolution covered by such order.

"All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate."

PREVIOUS QUESTION—EXPLANATION

The cumbersome and unwieldy cloture provisions of rule XXII would be deleted by this revision. In their place would be substituted a split-level motion for the previous question, by which a majority of Senators present and voting could ter-

minate debate: (1) on any motion or amendment to a measure pending before the Senate after that motion or amendment has received 15 hours of consideration on not less than 3 calendar days; or (2) on the measure itself, together with any motions or amendments relating to it, after the measure plus all related motions and amendments has received consideration for 15 calendar days.

If the previous question is ordered, 1 hour of debate equally divided between opponents and proponents, would be allowed as to any motion or amendment encompassed by the motion for the previous question, and 4 hours, divided in the same manner, would be allowed on final passage. Unlike the cloture procedure under which Senators may call up for a vote after cloture any germane amendment which has previously been presented and read, this procedure would limit consideration after the previous question had been ordered to amendments embraced by the motion. All other amendments would be deemed rejected.

EXISTING PROVISIONS

RULE XXII

PRECEDENCE OF MOTIONS

1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—
To adjourn.

To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

To take a recess.

To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

To lay on the table.

To postpone indefinitely.

To postpone to a day certain.

To commit.

To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one

hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be added as cosponsors to S. 16, a bill which I introduced on January 11, 1967, to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era and for other purposes.

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 483, a bill requiring the Veterans' Administration to give advance notice before any planned closing or relocating of a facility, the name of Senator BIBLE, of Nevada, be added as a cosponsor. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 218, a bill to extend to volunteer fire companies reduced postage rates, the name of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 47, a bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may be added to Senate bill 453, the Electrical Vehicle Development Act, the next time it is printed.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Also, Mr.

President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 438, the Disaster Relief Act, that the names of Senators BIBLE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey may be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 20, to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors: Mr. DODD, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Also on behalf of Senator JACKSON I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S.J. Res. 18) to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site, the name of Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL be added as a cosponsor.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND RESOLUTION

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

Authority of January 11, 1967:

S. 1. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act: Mr. CLARK, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. TYDINGS.

S. 8. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. PELL.

S. 17. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage, under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits established by part B thereof, of certain expenses incurred by an insured individual in obtaining certain drugs: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. PELL.

S. 20. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes: Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTTOYA, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. RHIBICOFF, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

S. 21. A bill to amend the national emergency provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide for dissolution of injunctions thereunder only upon settlement of disputes: Mr. BENNETT and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

S. 22. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to require a Board-conducted election in representation cases: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware.

S. 25. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Salt Lake National Monument, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes: Mr. GRUENING.

S. 36. A bill to provide a uniform closing time for polling places in certain Federal elections: Mr. MUNDT and Mr. THURMOND.

S. 47. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. DODD, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

S. 49. A bill to revitalize the American gold mining industry: Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. MURPHY.

S. 195. A bill to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor": Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. PELL.

S. 196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of housing facilities for agricultural workers by permitting the amortization over a 60-month period of the cost, or a portion of the cost, of constructing such housing facilities: Mr. BARTLETT.

S. 197. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. PELL.

S.J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to residence and physical presence requirements for voting in presidential and vice-presidential elections and for voting in elections for United States Senate and Members of the House of Representatives: Mr. BARTLETT.

Authority of January 12, 1967:

S. 220. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands: Mr. JORDAN of Idaho.

S. 277. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson: Mr. PELL.

S.J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of Labor to study the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act and to make appropriate recommendations for improvements in such laws: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. MUNDT.

S. Res. 14. Resolution establishing a standing Committee on Urban Affairs: Mr. CLARK, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. RUBINOFF.

THE STATE OF THE UNION—A REPUBLICAN APPRAISAL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Thursday, the distinguished Republican leader in the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and the distinguished Republican leader in the House of Representatives, GERALD R. FORD, spoke to the Nation on the state of the Union as seen through responsible Republican eyes. Each presented an extremely thoughtful statement, representing the kind of constructive comment which the people of this Nation seek from Republicans. The comments were those of responsible statesmen, and they contain no cry for immoderate spending, no demand for zealous expansion of untested programs.

When the leadership of this Government needed and merited the support of the American people, that support has been duly given by the Republican leadership. When constructive criticism was necessary in the public interest, that criticism has not been spared.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statements by Senator DIRKSEN

and Representative FORD be placed in the RECORD at this point in their entirety.

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

THE STATE OF THE UNION—A REPUBLICAN APPRAISAL

(Address of Senator Everett M. Dirksen, minority leader of the Senate)

My Fellow-Americans:

The State of the Union—that is, the condition of our country—what is it as we stand on the threshold of another year and another Congress? Last week the President, as the Constitution requires, presented his view of the State of the Union. It was an hour-and-ten-minute address. Tonight, we have but 27 minutes for a comparable appraisal. Time, therefore, permits but the briefest review of the matter. Mr. Ford has, very effectively, assessed the domestic State of the Union. Hence I shall speak only of our external relations with the world.

Perhaps Shakespeare said it all with the words he placed in the mouth of Macbeth. I paraphrase them slightly:

"We are in blood, stepp'd in so deep,

That should we wade no more,

Returning were as tedious as go o'er."

Our operations in Southeast Asia have provoked entreaties, demands, and demonstrations to draw back, to retreat, to leave our commitments unfulfilled. That would be an unthinkable course.

We promised to heed the Macedonian cry of a small weak nation against the Red aggressors and their threats to her freedom and independence. That cry for help came. We responded. At first our response was of a token nature. But it has grown to become a vast, full-scale military and pacification operation. One way or another, about 500,000 Americans are engaged. The cost in blood and treasure has been enormous. Vietnam has become our third-largest war.

The President was both realistic and candid in his comment in this regard last week. He emphasized the probability of "more cost, more loss, more agony."

The General commanding our forces in Vietnam seeks more troops. That would also mean more supplies, more weapons, more planes, and more of everything before the aggressor withdraws or the offer of negotiations is accepted. None of these seem probable at the moment and the grim Four Horsemen continue to stalk the land.

Is there an answer to this vexing problem other than the classical one of enough troops, enough weapons, enough firepower to render the aggressor unable to continue his nefarious intent and design? I wonder.

Have self-inspired fears of Soviet or Red China intervention dissuaded us from a more vigorous effort on land, sea and in the air to bring this conflict to an end, including stern measures to stop the inflow of supplies, food and weapons from supposedly neutral nations? Let us make plain to the world that we mean business! We are in this war to carry out our commitments. To do less would be to break our pledge. In this grim undertaking, a teaspoonful of gospel is not enough. We must do all that is necessary until the freedom and independence of Vietnam are assured.

I hope that in the weeks and months ahead the dilemma of Vietnam will stimulate the most thoughtful discussion possible among our people of all political faiths. As we search together for a solution to Vietnam let us demonstrate to the world our unity of purpose in full, free and orderly discussion of the best ways and means to achieve it.

War spawns many evils: swollen budgets, the dislocation of young manpower, inflation, surly attitudes of other nations, restrictions on investment abroad, a perishable prosperity, and the brooding danger that our economy may be forced into the straitjacket of

wage-and-price controls and perhaps higher taxes. And the evils rising from the crucible of conflict will multiply. Small wonders that the spirit of the nation is vexed and troubled!

We in the loyal opposition, with a primary accent on "loyal," while supporting to the fullest our fighting forces in Vietnam, ask—in fact, demand—that this Administration not only reinforce its determination to bring this conflict to an end in the shortest possible time but that it also look beyond the bombing and other violence of the conflict to where we shall stand and with whom we shall sit when the conflict ceases. What thought has been given thus far, not only to the exercise of far stronger military and diplomatic muscles as the war goes on, but, to the making of an eventual peace? What policy will we be asked then to support? Do we sit down at the conference table and bargain with elements other than representatives of the duly constituted government in Hanoi? To do so might mean that any agreements reached would disintegrate overnight and no line of defense would any longer exist from Saigon to Singapore if such a peace table surrender should occur. Foresight is the essence of leadership. We stand in need of it as never before.

But Vietnam is not our only migraine. Elsewhere in the world, American foreign policy and its conduct are coming, increasingly, into serious question. In Latin America, the Alliance for Progress causes us now to wonder: Where is the Alliance? Where is the Progress? The failures of economic and social reform required, under Alliance agreement, of those Latin American nations receiving our financial aid are all too visible.

In Africa, there is scarcely a country which has accepted our largess and is eager to accept more that has not become embroiled in internal or unneighborly conflicts that have resulted in a steady retreat from democracy and toward dictatorship or Red-tinted rule.

In Europe, the Common Market holds neither hope nor promise for us. NATO is withering on the vine. Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Forces has been ordered out of France and has had to find refuge in Belgium. Britain, because of pressure on the pound sterling, has foreshortened her lines of defense, diminished her troop strength and leaned ever more heavily upon us. West Germany is eyeing the Communist markets in eastern Europe but does wish to retain our troops—at our expense. What strange bedfellows have developed in Europe—after we have taxed our people to keep them afloat!

To all this one can add the explosiveness of the Middle East; the discouragement of American capital investment in India—unless Hindus or the Indian Government hold the controlling stock; the unpredictable attitudes of Laos, Cambodia, Indonesia; the constant, and unrelenting attacks by Soviet leaders upon our alleged imperialism.

There is virtue in the ancient admonition to "Be not weary in well-doing" but it is an aggravating experience to have the recipients of our aid and assistance bite the hand that seeks to help them.

Very pertinent now, because it will expire in June, is the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, intended, as its name suggests, to enlarge our trade abroad. It threatens, however, to do exactly the opposite. Well aware of the delicacy of our international economic position, finance ministers and trade negotiators of countless nations abroad have, for some months now, been horse-trading us out of the protection our industry and agriculture must have and have been enticing us down what begins to look like a rutted one-way street, especially as regards our farm products. It will be for the Congress, before June, to take a hard look at these proceedings, in the interest of American enterprise, the preservation of American jobs, and the continuation of the European markets for our farm products.

The current Trade Negotiations in Geneva are very important to all segments of our economy. Farmers should not be sold down the river in these Trade Negotiations. We will look with disfavor on any agricultural commodity agreement or arrangement that would limit our ability to export agricultural commodities as a substitute for a truly reciprocal trade agreement program.

When to these alarms there is added the critical problem of our endangered gold supply and the doubt now being expressed so often abroad as to the fiscal and monetary stability of the United States—never, for decades, hitherto questioned!—a clear, thorough and courageous evaluation of our foreign policy, our trade policies, and our international fiscal and monetary policies is clearly required. We call upon this Administration to agree to a bipartisan scrutiny and study—to begin *now*—conducted jointly with participants from industry, finance and agriculture.

As a point and base of beginning for such a study, let me now propose, specifically, that a detailed examination be made of the possibility of forming what I choose to call the Western Economic Union—a Common Market of the nations of the Western Hemisphere—a structure for trade and *mutual* aid designed to stimulate the production and exchange of industrial products and those of agriculture in which protective barriers will not take the form of prohibitive and self-defeating tariff walls but of economic policies of insurance against depression and want and despair from Attu to Patagonia.

As regards the Middle East, let me also add the proposal that the United States take the initiative in reconvening the conference of the Tripartite Guarantee Powers, and that these Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, and France—use this new conference to reaffirm their “unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force” in the Arab-Israel area and revive their pledge to preserve the frontiers and armistice lines in the Middle East.

Of the President's plea and proposals for the “building of bridges” to the East, it can be fairly asked whether it is truly intended that this East-West trade bridge be a double-decker, capable of moving traffic in each direction or whether it will, as has been so true in the past, become a structure for the conveying of our bounty and treasure to the unfriendly and uncooperative nations without any value whatsoever received in return.

What justification can be cited for the Administration's persistent effort to liberalize and extend terms tantamount to aid to the Soviet Union and communist governments of Eastern Europe, while these nations are supplying most of the guns and missiles that are killing American soldiers and shooting down American planes in Southeast Asia?

The answer to all of this is a clear one: more attention to the conservation of our own strength and resources and less to those nations of the world who regard us as an amiable, vulnerable, jolly Santa Claus who can be slurred at will and cuffed with impunity. The international bank of good-will shows a mounting deficit where our external relations are concerned.

How truly “Hope deferred maketh the heart sick.” As our problems multiply and our worries increase, the responsibility of the Executive Leadership becomes ever the greater. So, too, the responsibility of the Republicans in loyal opposition becomes ever more meaningful. As we Republicans assess the present State of the Union and appraise the progress that we know can be ours, we refuse despite the heat and burden which world affairs impose, to be dismayed or to despair. We refuse, indeed, as we look to the Seventies, to be weary in “well-doing”, but we are determined that our well-doing shall, to a greater degree, be directed toward the well-being of the American family and the American nation. We realize full well that

we are not only in this world but of it. For the beneficences we have showered on this world we deserve something more than the ungrateful cry of “Yanqui, go home”.

To this necessary end—with positive proposals we shall offer the nation—and to this high purpose the Republican Leadership and the Republican Party now commit themselves with a whole heart.

THE STATE OF THE UNION—A REPUBLICAN APPRAISAL

(Address of Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican of Michigan, minority leader of the House of Representatives)

Again we gather in this historic chamber, conscious of the invisible presence of great leaders of the past. This year we are reinforced by the visible presence of new leaders of the future. We welcome enthusiastically the 64 new Republican Senators and Representatives of the 90th Congress.

(New Members rise.)

Senator Dirksen and I are here to give a Republican Appraisal of the State of the Union.

November 8, the citizens of America voted on the State of the Union.

Their message came through loud and clear—a ringing vote for vigorous two-party government. It was a blunt demand for honesty and candor in public affairs. The Credibility Gap must go!

We rejoice in the mandate—a *New Direction* for America.

No era in our history began with higher hopes than the 1960's. We had bound up the Nation's wounds. We were blessed with eight years of strength, peace and progress under President Eisenhower.

As the decade dawned, all Americans were stirred by the words, “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.”

The years have slipped by and now Americans in 1967 see the decade that dawned in hope fading into frustration and failure, bafflement and boredom.

The President said that the election returns did not mean that people want progress to stop.

We agree.

They want progress to start—now!

For every problem of the Sixties, this Administration has revived tired theories of the Thirties.

For the past two years, positive and practical Republican programs have been largely ignored.

Things will be different in the next two years!

We won the first round in the House of Representatives, 364 to 64, with three-quarters of the Democrats following our unanimous Republican lead.

We will win more—many more!

NEW DIRECTION, NOT COALITION

Cynics may call every Republican victory in this Congress a coalition. Let's meet that issue head-on, right now.

By definition, coalition requires advance consultation and ultimate compromise of conviction to win a legislative victory.

Republicans will make no such deals.

Republicans will give leadership to the dynamic and Constructive Center in Congress.

We welcome every Democratic vote for positive Republican programs that will give New Direction to our Nation.

We will press for creative Republican action. When New Direction demands it, we will say “No” to the old Democratic failures.

Our “No” will be particularly emphatic if we are asked to slow down progress toward the equality that is the right of every American.

Never forget, the Republican Party came into being to make real the belief that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights. It is dis-

heartening to see evidence that the Administration is lowering the priority given to these matters in the 90th Congress.

SENSIBLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE SEVENTIES

As we look to the years ahead, Republicans see a program of Sensible Solutions for the Seventies.

That program must begin in 1967.

First priority—the growth and prosperity of our economy.

There are ominous signs of an economic slowdown this year. Unless our course is redirected decisively, we may well face the paradox of a recession with both increased inflation and increased taxation.

The Investment Tax Credit must be restored immediately.

An honest federal budget is imperative. If the Congress is to assess the needs of our economy intelligently, the Administration must not repeat its tragic error of presenting a budget of evasion, manipulation and gimmickry. This budget underestimated expenditures by at least \$14 billion, over \$4 billion of which was non-military.

Congress should immediately repeal the Participation Sales Act, which conceals and distorts the true budgetary situation.

When we know how much is needed for national security, the Congress can then make certain that essential domestic programs are adequately funded. Low-priority programs, desirable as they may be, must be postponed. We assure the President tonight that Republicans will move to cut non-essential spending—even if he doesn't.

In addition, billions of dollars approved by Congress in the past remain unspent. This Congress must take a hard look at those funds. We propose a Rescission Bill, withdrawing the President's authority to obligate and spend such funds that cannot meet the test of prudence of the new Congress.

The President belatedly promised to cut \$3 billion from expenditures by the end of June. He should spell out for the American people where these reductions have been made—if they have been made.

With such uncertainties, the President has not made a convincing case for his tax increase.

STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES—TAX SHARING

One of the most significant results of the 1966 elections was the people's choice of 23 new Republican governors, and more than 700 new state legislators.

This reflects not only confidence in our party and its fine candidates but also faith in state government itself.

Republicans have faith in the constitutional concept of Federalism, which requires strong and vigorous state as well as national action on a variety of problems. Yet, seen through the Democrats' rear-view mirror of the Thirties, everything can be cured by Federal dictation and Federal funds, doled out through grants-in-aid which keep Washington as the manipulator of all strings.

There are now over 400 Federal aid appropriations for 170 separate aid programs, administered by a total of 21 Federal Departments and agencies, 150 Washington bureaus and 400 regional offices, each with its own way of passing out Federal tax dollars.

Federal aid to states and municipalities through this tangled thicket increased from \$1 billion in 1946 to about \$17 billion this year.

Republicans reiterate their support for a system of tax sharing to return to the states and local governments a fixed percentage of personal income taxes without Federal control. This system would promote a swift improvement in education, law enforcement, community development, mass transit, and other essentially local problems.

Smog is replacing the weather as the No. 1 topic of conversation, but no two cities have identical problems. Cities are far more diversified than states. They have one com-

mon denominator—their problems multiply as people move to the suburbs. This exodus leaves less revenue to meet more problems.

Tax sharing would restore the needed vitality and diversity to our Federal system. Revenue sharing could also be accomplished with tax credits.

Many effective measures to improve agriculture originated with the National Commission on Rural Life, established by President Theodore Roosevelt. Republicans propose a National Committee on Urban Living be created without delay.

An exaggerated example of urban problems is our own national capital. Yet a swarm of Federal experts is telling the cities how to cure their ills while the only Federal city in our Nation is a disgrace.

Republicans believe Washington, D.C., should be made a "model city" for demonstration projects and new initiatives in urban progress.

EDUCATION

Higher education and vocational education acts bear strong Republican imprints.

We will continue our efforts to provide assistance to those who bear the rising cost of higher education through tax credits.

The Elementary and Secondary Act, however, at minimum require substantial revision to simplify forms, reduce excessive paperwork and eliminate the heavy-handed Federal intrusions. All pre-school and early-school problems should be consolidated in the Office of Education. Republicans trust local school boards to formulate policy and set priorities far more than we trust bureaucrats in Washington.

Congress should take the Federal handcuffs off our local educators. The best way to do this is by tax sharing and tax credits. If the Democrats, who control Congress, refuse to consider tax sharing legislation, Republicans will seek to substitute block education grants, without Federal earmarking or controls.

We will propose new approaches to reinforce the vitality and diversity that is the genius of our educational system. It is in the school that the doors of opportunity open to all American children. We shall not deny them the best that can be given.

SOCIAL SECURITY

President Johnson proposed Social Security changes that it is estimated would cost the equivalent of a 1.6 percent Social Security payroll tax increase.

At the present tax base, this would ultimately raise the total Social Security payroll tax to 12.15 percent. The Social Security trust fund must be kept sound. Greater benefits normally involve greater taxes, particularly burdensome to our younger citizens.

As in the past, Republicans now favor an increase in permitted earnings by Social Security recipients. Present earning limitations reflect the depression mentality of the Thirties and make no sense for the Seventies. Widows benefits and minimum benefits must be brought into line with today's inflated living costs. Those still uncovered should, as soon as possible, be blanketed into the Social Security system at least by age 72.

Our older citizens must be protected from the extortions of Great Society inflation. They can't wait while we debate.

Congress should enact, retroactive to January 1, an 8 percent increase in Social Security benefits. These increased benefits can be achieved without any tax increase.

About 1/2 of the nation's poor are elderly citizens. Their situation is tragic and desperate. The Poverty War has passed them by.

In the past two years of Democratic control, basic Social Security benefits have fallen 7 percentage points behind the consumer price index.

Republicans propose Social Security bene-

fits rise automatically with rising prices. It is time we took Social Security out of election-year politics.

VETERANS

Republicans believe those called upon to sacrifice in Southeast Asia should be treated equally with other veterans. All veterans, war widows and their dependents should be protected from skyrocketing inflation by increased benefits.

POVERTY

The greatest poverty in this country today is the poverty of realistic ideas among Poverty War generals—and sergeants. Sensible Republican proposals have been rejected arbitrarily.

Republicans will continue to press for total revamping and redirection of the Poverty War. We want an Opportunity Crusade that will enlist private enterprise and the states as effective partners of the Federal Government in this fight. We would give the children of poverty the very highest priority they deserve. As Republicans have urged for two years, Head Start requires follow-through in the early grades.

We propose a new Industry Youth Corps to provide private, productive employment and training on the job.

We propose the Republican Human Investment Act to induce employers to expand job opportunities for the unskilled.

We propose to enlarge the opportunities of low-income Americans for private home ownership.

All Americans demand a thorough airing of poverty administration, poverty publicity and poverty politics.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

The need for streamlining the national government has become even more urgent since we recommended a new Hoover-type commission a year ago. The President's only specific proposal for reorganization—to combine the Departments of Labor and Commerce—merely scratches the surface.

We believe the Post Office Department should be taken out of politics from top to bottom. Republicans favor selecting all Postmasters on merit alone.

What irony—we will probably deliver a man to the Moon before we can consistently deliver the United States Mail to its correct address on Earth.

The colossal Department of Agriculture is another executive agency that needs reform. Republicans will continue to support the concept of fair farm prices in the marketplace, without price-depressing manipulation by bureaucrats. The mass and maze of federal farm laws, rules, regulations and forms must be simplified. Every farmer knows there's enough to do in every 24-hour day on the farm without a load of federal paperwork. We applaud efforts to create more parks and seashores and will give special emphasis to the preservation of jobs and community stability.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT LAWS

A year ago President Johnson promised Congress he would soon propose new ways to handle national emergency strikes. In the interval he has made no proposals whatsoever. Incredibly, he never mentioned it in his latest State of the Union Message.

Without waiting further, Congress should choose a balanced commission of experts to make recommendations in this complex and sensitive area.

Our unswerving purpose should be to strengthen free collective bargaining between equals, without unnecessary government meddling. Congress should undertake, without delay, a full review of labor-management laws and the operations of the National Labor Relations Board.

It is unfair to both labor and management for Congress to legislate blindly in an atmosphere of crisis.

CONGRESSIONAL, CAMPAIGN, AND ELECTION REFORMS

To do our job better, Congress should act promptly on the bipartisan recommendations for congressional reorganization endorsed last session by our House Republican Policy Committee, but pigeon-holed by the Democratic majority.

We call for a strong House Ethics Committee and an investigating committee under the control of the minority.

Such reforms would restore the people's confidence in Congress and their Government.

Congress must also move ahead on the President's year-old pledge for a Clean Elections Law. Such a law must be in force before 1968.

This Clean Elections Law should guarantee full and accurate reporting of political contributions and expenditures in support of national candidates and put an end to abuses in campaign finance. Legislation also is needed to encourage an increased flow of small contributions. Republicans are proud that 69 percent of our contributions in the last Presidential campaign were in sums of less than \$100.

Last year the Congress unwisely rushed through a bill which would provide as much as 60 million taxpayers' dollars to political parties for the 1968 campaign. This serious mistake should be reversed without delay.

Instead, the Congress would be wise to permit contributors an income tax deduction for political contributions up to \$100.

Our antiquated Electoral College system of choosing the President should be changed to make sure the people's will prevails.

In planning for the 1968 Presidential campaign and elections, the Congress must come to grips with the foremost factor in political competition today—a factor unknown when present laws were written—television.

The biggest single campaign expense for any national candidate today is television time. Television brings the national political debate into every American home. Yet no really thorough study has been made of the public's interest in television as a political medium. Television channels, of necessity limited in number, really belong to all the people.

They should not be at the service of the highest bidder or the party in power. They cannot be regulated solely by the conscience or convictions of network executives and their most popular television faces.

An illogical federal law now operates to prevent television and radio stations from granting time without charge to major party candidates without making equal time available to a host of minor party candidates. We unequivocally favor nationally televised debates between future Presidential contenders.

We propose legislation requiring television and radio to provide free and equal treatment to major parties and their spokesmen not only in future campaigns, but also for the presentation of divergent political views throughout the periods between formal campaigning.

CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Crime and violence, disregard of law and disrespect for authority, immorality and irresponsibility are on the rise. We welcome the President's recent recognition of this enlarging crisis.

Republicans in the last Congress authored legislation which created a National Commission for the Revision and Reform of Criminal Laws, a major step forward.

The House also adopted last year, although it died in the Senate, a proposal which Republicans will renew this session in a "Citizens Rights Act of 1967." The Act would make it a crime to travel from one state to another with an intent to incite riots. It would also protect individuals in the exercise of their constitutional rights.

Wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping worry all Americans who prize their privacy. Properly used, these are essential weapons to those who guard our Nation's security and wage ceaseless war against organized crime.

The Congress, the President and the Courts must promptly spell out the permissible limits of their use.

At all levels of government a massive effort should be made to reduce crime by attacking some of its basic causes: poverty, slums, inadequate education and discrimination. However, our laws and actions should never be based on the theory that a criminal is solely the product of his environment.

Fear of punishment remains an important deterrent to crime.

We call upon the independent Judicial Branch of our Government to uphold the rights of the law-abiding citizen with the same fervor as it upholds the rights of the accused.

Most Americans will resist any trend toward the establishment of a national police force or the unwarranted intrusion of Federal power into local law enforcement. Yet, there is a proper place for Federal assistance and leadership.

Within the Federal correctional system, the Work Release Program and other enlightened prisoner rehabilitation projects must be designed and expanded to reduce the number of second-time offenders.

The primary responsibility for law enforcement must remain with the states and local authorities. In the last analysis, public safety depends upon the courage and character of the policeman patrolling his beat. The Federal Government can properly help in making law enforcement a more attractive and professional career.

A National Law Enforcement Institute, similar to the successful National Institutes of Health, should be established for research and training and for the dissemination of the latest techniques in police science.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Not as Republicans but as Americans we are gravely worried about the Nation's security. This is not a partisan issue. The conflict is primarily between the Administration and the Congress.

The short-range military policies and the long-range defense posture of this country urgently demand searching re-examination and New Direction. Nothing in the President's State of the Union Message lessened our deep concern in this all-important area.

Our strategic thinking of the 1970's and beyond, the timely planning and production of advanced weapons systems, and the prudent management of our total national defense capabilities have become stalled on a dead-end street.

Republicans renew, with even greater urgency, our call for a Blue Ribbon Commission of the most able and independent Americans Congress can choose to get on with this job.

Within its Constitutional responsibility, Congress can do more.

We must take prompt action to modernize our Navy, increase our superiority in nuclear propulsion, and counter the growing threat of missile-carrying enemy submarines.

We must take prompt steps to rebuild the American Merchant Marine, already shrunken to one-fifth its former size, and regain our lost lead over the Soviet Union in modern shipbuilding. Shockingly, the U.S. is no longer a major maritime power. The Maritime Administration must be upgraded as an independent agency.

We must proceed at top speed with the development of long-delayed Advanced Manned Strategic Bombers and Improved Manned Interceptors.

We must strengthen our Reserve and National Guard forces and eliminate inequities in the Draft. Our defense posture should be tailored to our global commitments.

The Administration has finally confided in

the American people that the Soviet Union has increased its Intercontinental Ballistic Missile capability and is deploying an Anti-Ballistic Missile Defense System. In anticipation of a life-and-death decision on just such a development, Congress has voted millions of dollars which the Administration did not seek and apparently has not used.

The Congress did its duty and gave the President a clear expression of its will and the means to carry it out.

Before more precious time is lost, Congress and the American people are now entitled to a clear explanation from the President of the perils and problems facing the United States in the new global balance between offensive and defensive missileery.

We too are concerned about a possible costly new round in the nuclear arms race. But the least the Nation must do now is speed up its readiness to deploy Anti-Ballistic Missiles in a hurry if our survival requires it.

Americans are properly devoted to the concept of civilian control in defense matters. This civilian control never before has meant consistent civilian disregard for professional military judgment, intimidation of dissenters and substitution of soulless computers for human experience.

The first place to close the Credibility Gap is at the Pentagon.

All Americans join in the President's earnest hopes for an honorable peace and fool-proof disarmament. But they are deeply concerned that the Communists even now are intensifying both the hot and the cold wars. This worldwide test of willpower and weaponry is not of our choosing.

Nothing has higher priority, in our judgment, than the safety, strength and survival of the United States of America, our people and our posterity.

There will be no Sensible Solutions for the Seventies, Republican or Democratic, if we fail in this supreme test of a nation.

Although the Democratic Party continues to control the Senate by almost 2-to-1 and the House by 3-to-2 majorities, Republicans as a more meaningful minority will move forward as the Constructive Center of the Congress in the best interests of all Americans.

Republicans pledge their support and their leadership to preserve, protect and defend our country, whatever the cost and whatever the sacrifice.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR RIBICOFF AT CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business, the rule of germaneness notwithstanding, I be allowed to proceed for 1 hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

VIETNAM—THE HIGH PRICE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there are three legs to the platform of our national security: that of diplomacy, that of the military, and a third leg—equally important but about which there is relatively little discussion—the Nation's economy, correlated with its financial position. It is the latter about which I plan to speak briefly today.

Effective diplomacy in our relationships with the other nations of the world would appear to be the paramount force in our search for world peace; and with that premise, it is distressing to note that,

primarily because of the long drawn-out struggle in Vietnam, our relations with most of the other countries have been deteriorating.

The studied enmity of General de Gaulle, recent developments in Germany, general irritation among relatively friendly nations at our continuing failure to correct our continuing unfavorable balance of payments—with the consequent steady drain on our gold supply—all are cases in point.

The latter is directly related to the high and mounting costs of this major ground war in Asia, and is coupled with the fiscal and monetary problems which these costs present.

In turn these increased costs make it increasingly difficult for this Government to recognize the importance of such domestic problems as adequate education and the deterioration of our cities.

There has been a steady 18-year loss of our gold reserves. Recently, the Vietnamese war has increased that loss; and whether we like it or not, gold is one of the two basic elements which back up our diplomatic efforts in this ungovernable world.

Starting in 1939, in effort to maintain the independence and well-being of the countries of the free world, the United States have given over \$180 billion.

We have military agreements with some 40 of these countries. But only three have sent any combat troops to Vietnam.

As to one of the latter, we have more troops in their country than they have in South Vietnam, and pay for the cost of both; and the contribution of another has been negligible.

The United States has maintained many hundreds of thousands of its citizens in Europe alone for over 20 years. During that same period we have also maintained tens of thousands of our people in Japan; and for over 15 years have kept tens of thousands in Korea, plus many additional thousands in other parts of the world.

In 1949 the United States had \$24.6 billion in gold bullion. At that time it owed \$7.6 billion abroad, primarily to the foreign central banks.

Since 1949, we have run a continuing unfavorable balance of payments, with consequent continuing loss of our gold reserves, to the point where the gold now held by the Government is down to \$13.2 billion—and \$9.5 billion of this is "nonfree" monetized gold, held for the 25-percent reserve guarantee against issued Federal currency.

Today our current obligations, redeemable in gold and held abroad, again primarily by the foreign central banks, have increased to \$30.4 billion.

In other words, on the basis of double-entry bookkeeping comparable to that practiced by any normal business, this Nation has some \$3.7 billion of free gold to pay, if called, total obligations held abroad of over \$30 billion.

Some say, "They—the foreign countries—would never call us, would never ask for our gold bullion in exchange for paper dollars."

But that is exactly what General de Gaulle has done. He has liquidated billions of our paper dollars in exchange for our gold, an action of great embar-

rassment to the U.S. Treasury as the latter attempts to preserve the value of the dollar.

As a result of the nature of the Bretton Woods agreement of 1944, the British pound is as synonymous with gold as is the dollar; and the pound also is currently having troubles; well summed up by Senator Paul Douglas in his recent book, "America in the Marketplace."

In that book, Senator Douglas took notice of the fact that British borrowings, including those from the International Monetary Fund, now exceed total British reserves.

When the growing problems incident to our present heavy expenditures are defended before the Congress by various Government witnesses, they attempt to justify current fiscal policy by referring to the size of our gross national product.

That size, however, is not necessarily a valid justification for these expenditures, because productive strength does not automatically either signify, or imply, comparable financial strength.

In other words, and nothing could be more important from the standpoint of what is best for the future of the United States, the productive power of a nation in no sense automatically guarantees fiscal and monetary health.

A government, as is the case with an individual, or a business, can only improve its living standards through additional borrowing so long as it is trusted by its lenders.

When one adds to the cost of our many other commitments the price incident to underwriting the heavy additional cost of the new SHAPE, presumably necessitated by the withdrawal of France from NATO, and also our additional recent commitments in Germany, one can only wonder how long the United States can continue these and its many other foreign and domestic expenditures by continuing to print paper gold.

No economy, not even that of the United States, can continue to defend such a large percentage of the free world, at the same time it finances such a large percentage of the free world, without eventually becoming financially "non-viable."

Perhaps "bankrupt" would be the better word.

The growing cost of the Vietnamese war, apparently now running between two, and two and a half billion dollars a month, supports that conviction.

BIOGRAPHIES OF REPUBLICAN SENATORS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee has compiled an unusual biographical account of the Republican contingent in the Senate, and because of the interest which undoubtedly will be taken in this document I ask unanimous consent to have it placed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biographical accounts ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

Senate Republicans, 90th Congress: GOP presents the most versatile, and the most representative Group in history (with some facts not often found in the usual biographies).

Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont . . . a former Grange Master and author of several books, is senior GOP Senator in point of service . . . an authority on U.S.-Canadian relations, U.S. agriculture, medicare, Vermont maple sirup, Vermont marble . . . last month decided to inspect some land and timber atop a mountain in Vermont . . . drove up to the end of the road, then climbed several miles in deep snow to the top with his son-in-law, a tough ex-hockey player who became exhausted and after the ordeal went home to rest . . . but the day was just beginning for George Aiken who drove his sedan out into the fields and on trails in the woods, chopped down Christmas trees, loaded them into the car among several bushels of apples, hay, feed, seed, and whatnot . . . unknown to Detroit, he is an expert "proving ground" driver who takes his passenger car across fields, rocks, ditches . . . by the time he's finished he'll know whether his car is "truckworthy" . . . has been termed a liberal, a moderate, a conservative . . . so to prove such terms might be misleading, had his voting record checked vote-by-vote against that of the late Senator Robert A. Taft . . . with the exception of a handful of votes on such issues as public power, the Aiken voting record was judged more conservative than Taft's! . . . a former Vermont Governor, he is still addressed as "Governor" by staff members who have been with him since the beginning . . . of Scotch-Irish descent, Senator Aiken's family came to New England in 1629.

Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine . . . the only lady United States Senator . . . that latest Gallup Poll once again lists Senator Smith as one of the 10 most admired women in the world . . . on the wall, and to the right as you enter the door of the reception room for her offices, there hangs a citation from the United States Senate—the only one of its kind issued in history . . . it notes the longest, consistent answering of roll call votes by any Senator of any party in the history of our Republic . . . at the conclusion of Senate business January 19, Margaret Chase Smith has not missed a vote in 2,395 times! . . . she is an authority on the Armed Services and on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and is the ranking Republican on these committees. . . she has the shortest Senatorial biography in the Congressional Directory, to wit: "Margaret Chase Smith, Republican" . . . actually what more is needed? . . . her name means Maine, and Maine means Margaret Chase Smith . . . and on the basis of her work, effectiveness, and influence, Republican Senators unanimously elected her Chairman of the Conference of Republican Senators this month—the highest office within the Senate ever achieved by a lady Senator, Democrat or Republican . . . being a member of the distaff side had nothing to do with the election, but Republicans want to be good and sure everyone knows she belongs to Republicans! . . . she has a long-established reputation for running an efficient office and giving prompt service . . . during vacation time for her staff she can sometimes be found using a portable typewriter atop her desk to answer constituent mail . . . every Senator will vouch for the fact she is one of the best informed Members of Congress.

Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper . . . the name "Hickenlooper" is a respected, vote-getting household name in Iowa . . . the magazine New Yorker once published a poem about the man "with the gimmick in his pat-ro-nym-ic" . . . once again chosen by acclamation of his fellow Republicans this month as Chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee . . . he has been a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee longer than any present U.S. Senator, Democrat or Republican . . . one of the Nation's experts on atomic energy activities . . . "charter member" of the original Senate Atomic Energy Committee

which later established present Joint Committee of which he has been Chairman. . . . born on Iowa farm; science and law degrees; war veteran; served in Iowa House, also as Lieutenant Governor, Governor; elected and reelected four times to U.S. Senate; never defeated. . . . recognized authority on South American affairs and foreign policy. . . . consultant and congressional adviser on numerous occasions to various conferences abroad, including Inter-American Development Bank, Tenth Inter-American Conference in Caracas, the famed 1962 Conference of Foreign Ministers at Punta del Este, International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, etc. . . . the Senator's story about asafetida has become a classic not only in Iowa but in the Nation's Capitol.

Senator Jacob K. Javits of New York . . . one of the world's important Jewish lay leaders. . . . a cultivated man of wide interests—lawyer, author, historian, art critic, N.Y. State Attorney General, originator of numerous important pieces of legislation. . . . born in a New York City East Side tenement. . . . mother was born in Palestine and literally fled the country on foot during critical turmoil. . . . his father was a janitor. . . . the surname Javits was created from the first three names of one of the Senator's ancestors, the 18th century scholar and Talmudist who lived in Germany and Holland, Rabbi Jacob Ben Zebi Emden. . . . war veteran, serving in both European and Pacific areas. . . . frequently termed "the U.S. Senator for the Arts" because of his sponsorship of legislation for Government encouragement of the arts. . . . has been successful in far-reaching housing, education, labor, civil rights, health, and welfare legislation. . . . in 1956 and again in 1962, Senator Javits was elected and reelected with the greatest number of votes received by any candidate for office in the United States (excepting the presidential ticket). . . . he is also the only New York Senator whose constituents do not write him to cut his shaggy hair.

Senator John G. Tower of Texas . . . one of the great press releases of 1966 was issued only last month. . . . it simply stated: "Seaman First Class John G. Tower (USNR) . . . was promoted today to Boatswain's Mate Third Class. Boatswain's Mate Tower's civilian job is as United States Senator for Texas." . . . thus, when he goes to Vietnam later this month on an inspection tour he will have a little more rank than on his previous investigative trips for the Senate Armed Services Committee. . . . upon his return in February it is calculated he will have spent more time with our servicemen in Southeast Asia than any Member of Congress . . . he served in the Navy during World War II, enlisting at age 18 (he was actually 17) and served 3 years. . . . first elected after 9 years as a university professor . . . second youngest GOP Senator at 41 (two months older than Senator Baker of Tennessee). . . . occupies Senate chair once occupied by LBJ . . . when first elected in 1961, Senator Tower faced 71 candidates and led the field by about 10,000 votes . . . last November he was reelected by a plurality of nearly 200,000.

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel of California . . . widely hailed by the press as one of the most courageous Senators, Tom Kuchel was unanimously elected again this month by his Republican senatorial colleagues as Republican "Whip"—Assistant Leader . . . has consistently been elected Senate Republican Whip since the 86th Congress. . . . son of a weekly newspaper editor . . . lawyer, former California State Controller; war veteran . . . when last reelected, swept the State with more than 3 million votes and a plurality of more than 700,000 . . . active in international affairs, sponsor of natural resources legislation, author of Air Pollution Research Act, cosponsor of saline water field test plants; leader in fight to admit Alaska and Hawaii as States of the Union . . . during debate on the Labor-Management Act of

1959, Senator Kuchel sponsored a revised "Bill of Rights" provision which was ultimately retained in the Landrum-Griffin bill which became law (the "Griffin" in the bill's name is for former Representative and now GOP Senator Robert P. Griffin of Michigan) . . . Senator Kuchel never forgets that his grandfather was a political refugee from Europe.

Senator Howard H. Baker, Jr., of Tennessee. . . . by chance, facts about this new GOP Senator just happen to come at this point . . . and by chance of being born 2 months later than Tower of Texas, Senator Baker, at 41, is the youngest GOP Senator . . . and one of the seven GOP Senators 47 or younger (Baker, Tower, Griffin, Hatfield, Pearson, Brooke, Percy) . . . Senator Baker is the first Republican in history to be elected by direct popular vote in Tennessee . . . commanded PT boat in the Pacific Theatre of Operations at age 19 . . . (that's right, 19) . . . parents were both Members of Congress . . . new Senator has famous relative in the Senate and his sister is married to a Congressman . . . surveys taken after the November election showed that Senator Baker and the Republican Party had received 15 to 20 percent of the Negro vote, compared with 1 percent 2 years ago . . . one of his campaign aides reported that the Senate Republican Policy Committee staff study of population trends, entitled "Where The Votes Are," published as a Senate document was a prime campaign guideline.

Senator John J. Williams of Delaware. . . . well-known duck hunter . . . he also is one of the greatest hunters of his time in rooting out inefficiency, dishonesty, ineptness in Government and has been responsible for a change in the basic structure of the Internal Revenue Service, the publishing of tax compromises, giving the Justice Department the power to investigate the Treasury Department, and a score of others . . . helped thousands of wage earners by seeing to it employers paid social security tax . . . born on a farm; started own business at 19—raising chickens and farming . . . believes most expensive type of worker is a low-paid one . . . never addresses the Senate unless has every fact and figure backed with double or triple proof . . . rarely, if ever, will the opposition debate him or refute his charges on budget or tax matters . . . big favorite with staff workers; frequently has coffee or lunch with them in employee restaurants on The Hill . . . his grandchildren once started to campaign against him (when they were tots) in an attempt to keep him home to play with them.

Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania. . . . here is a man, who, in his second term in Congress, enlisted incognito as a merchant seaman on a tanker carrying octane gas to England through submarine-infested waters during World War II . . . later he served as a U.S. naval officer . . . drove the first Navy jeep into Tokyo . . . his legislative achievements are widespread . . . has been GOP National Chairman . . . his speeches are models of clarity, wit, and substance . . . is an author, writer of numerous magazine pieces, lawyer . . . this spring a new book by Senator Scott will be published (Charles E. Tuttle, publishers) and will give a good example of the range of Senator Scott's interests . . . the book's title: "The Golden Age of Chinese Art: The Lively T'ang Dynasty."

Senator Clifford P. Hansen of Wyoming. . . . great-grandparents came to America from Denmark, joining the Mormon Handcart Brigade which made its way on foot across the mountains and plains to Utah . . . father homesteaded in Wyoming in 1897, later served in State Senate . . . Senator Hansen born 1912, graduated from college, married, and settled at ranch near Jackson, Wyo., . . . successful rancher, cattleman, President of the Board of Trustees of the

University of Wyoming, a grandfather, Governor of the State of Wyoming, good hunter, and already a hit on national TV interviews . . . in the past campaign he bested the best the LBJ Great Society politicians could throw at him all the way from Washington.

Senator Roman L. Hruska of Nebraska. . . . 1st generation Czech who is a key member of the all-around, All-American contingent of Republican Senators . . . his immigrant father brought to this country as a baby, became a leading educator . . . Senator Hruska is an ideal example of the oft-expressed wish of political parties to search for the right man and draft him to run—which he was, after 23 years in private law practice . . . the leading expert on antitrust matters . . . leader in the fight to protect the farmer against unreasonable beef imports . . . authority on European Common Market . . . has sharp eye on appropriations to protect taxpayers . . . highly respected in judicial matters . . . frequently sought out by Senators for advice . . . reputation for (1) doing his homework; (2) effective staff work; and, (3) being forceful speaker.

Senator Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota. . . . goose hunter par excellence every single year for the past two decades at Madison, South Dakota, close by the Missouri River . . . one of the original organizers of National Forensic League in 1925, now a nationwide society . . . popular speaker, has been invited to speak in 48 States of the Union . . . also overseas in Canada, Great Britain, Scotland, France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Finland, Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Germany, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Greece, Turkey, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Egypt, and Portugal . . . elected to Congress in 1938, served 10 years, elected United States Senator in 1948, reelected in 1954, 1960, and 1966 . . . still hasn't affected his gun eye.

Senator George Murphy of California. . . . versatility the key descriptive word . . . son of a famous American Olympic track coach, Mike Murphy . . . track star himself at prep school and college; a coal miner; a star of stage and screen; a lifelong union member; twice elected President of the AFL-CIO Screen Actors Guild; for 15 years skilled negotiator in labor contract disputes . . . received the first award presented by the National Conference of Christians and Jews; recognized for his civic contributions by the State Department, Cancer Prevention Society, American Red Cross, the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick . . . has just been chosen as Chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee.

Senator Peter H. Dominick of Colorado. . . . Yale Law School, World War II pilot, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal and Cluster . . . still flies his own Twin Bonanza, occasionally taking his Labrador Retriever "Zen" into the cockpit with him . . . an activist, not a bystander . . . horseman, fisherman, tennis player, explorer, golf player (by his own admission, a bad one), omnivorous reader, avid scuba diver . . . hard-bolled romanticist . . . over past 4 years asked to deliver more than 250 speeches in behalf of the Republican Party . . . served 4 years in Colorado House, 2 years in House of Representatives, elected U.S. Senator in 1962.

Senator Frank Carlson of Kansas. . . . "If I am dedicated to one thing, it is preservation of the opportunities for the young," he has said over and over . . . one of the most active Senators, he sets a fast working pace for staffers . . . served Kansas as U.S. Representative, Governor, Senator . . . never defeated . . . farmer, son of parents who immigrated from Sweden . . . author of more than a dozen important laws . . . tax expert . . . hard worker for Government employees . . . awards include 1964

Wheat Industry Man of the Year . . . has been delegate to United Nations . . . nationally prominent religious lay leader . . . one-time Chairman of International Council for Christian Leadership . . . established annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast . . . termed by one Washington newspaper as one of the most popular and effective Members of Congress.

Senator Clifford P. Case of New Jersey. . . . the only Republican in New Jersey elected to statewide office since 1952 . . . has won 12—repeat, twelve—successive general elections . . . reelected in November 1960 by the largest plurality given any Republican across the country despite the fact that New Jersey—and the Nation—was carried by John F. Kennedy . . . reelected 1966 . . . three children, seven grandchildren . . . citation from the Council for United Civil Rights Leadership, "For his devoted efforts, his inspired leadership in the national interest and, above all, his dedication to American principles in helping secure passage of the historic civil rights bill of 1964." . . . receives one of the heaviest volumes of mail in the Capitol . . . frequently consulted by scholars from all over the Nation . . . fighter for strict rules of conduct for all Government officials and employees . . . author of numerous public welfare laws.

Senator Wallace F. Bennett of Utah. . . . his father, John Bennett, brought across the plains in 1868 as a child in covered wagon with group of Mormon pioneers . . . Senator Bennett ran in 1950 against Democrat Senator Elbert D. Thomas, who, for 18 years, had been one of the key figures in the New Deal . . . won that election, reelected 1956, again in 1962 . . . closely identified with problems of Government finance . . . and recognized as one of the GOP spokesmen on fiscal and monetary policies . . . active in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormon) and, since 1935, has served as national treasurer of the Church's Sunday School General Board . . . author of two books: "Faith and Freedom" and "Why I am a Mormon." . . . "Champion" grandfather in the Senate—25 (twenty-five) grandchildren . . . at one time was a school principal . . . in 1949, served as president of the National Association of Manufacturers . . . expert on minerals and water resources . . . zealous guardian of the taxpayer's dollar . . . popular with young people . . . reputation for great sincerity in all matters.

Senator Thruston B. Morton of Kentucky. . . . a seventh generation Kentuckian . . . epitomizes the renowned political skill and judgment of the "border States." . . . a three-term House Member from Kentucky, resigned in 1952 to manage John Sherman Cooper's successful race for the Senate . . . thereafter served 3 years as Eisenhower Assistant Secretary of State . . . makes a habit of defeating Democratic celebrities . . . in 1956, defeated Senate Whip Earle Clements for Senate . . . in 1962, won reelection, defeating former New Deal leader and Louisville Mayor Wilson Wyatt in such decisive fashion that result was known one hour after polls closed . . . as National Chairman, 1959-61, revitalized National Republican Party after its licking in 1958 . . . as Senatorial Campaign Committee Chairman, 1963-66, reawoke Republican Senate taste for higher living by increasing membership from 31 to 36.

Senator Robert P. Griffin of Michigan. . . . born, grew up, educated, and married a Michigan girl—all in Michigan . . . worked way through college as drug clerk, salesman, factory hand, reporter . . . war veteran, lawyer . . . five terms in U.S. House . . . appointed to Senate last spring . . . elected last November by plurality of nearly 300,000 . . . defeated former six-term Governor Soapy Williams . . . true story of his election shows he carried 75 of Michigan's 83

counties, losing 7 of the other 8 by only a total of 1,238 votes! . . . came within 44 votes of carrying previously heavy Democrat-controlled Macomb County . . . received an astounding 42.1 percent of the vote in Wayne County, with heavy labor vote . . . coauthor of famed Landrum-Griffin Act, coauthor of National Student Loan Program in National Defense Education Act, and other laws . . . age 43.

Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire . . . the White Mountain orator . . . among the most eloquent Members of U.S. Senate . . . lawmaker with 40 years' service to State and Nation . . . worked his way through Tilton School, Phillips Exeter Academy, Wesleyan University, The George Washington University Law School . . . started political career at age 22 as member New Hampshire House . . . served as county attorney, municipal judge, majority leader, Speaker of State House . . . elected U.S. House 80th Congress . . . served four terms . . . elected Senator 1954 . . . ranking Republican on Senate Commerce Committee . . . reputation for issuing widely quoted newsletter which he personally writes . . . marked success in legislation of help to New England.

Senator Winston L. Prouty of Vermont . . . first public service started in 1938 when elected Mayor of his home city of Newport, Vermont . . . twice reelected . . . 1941 became member Vermont legislature . . . 1948-1950, chairman Vermont Water Conservation Board . . . elected to U.S. House of Representatives, 1952 . . . to Senate 1958 . . . has performed outstanding service on Labor Committee in field of education, retraining, help for elderly . . . widely recognized as authority in these fields . . . impressive record of legislative success in many other fields . . . leader in saving independence of Small Business Administration . . . reputation for doing his homework.

Senator Hiram Leong Fong of Hawaii . . . another great all-American Republican Senator . . . father and mother migrated from Kwantung Province, China, as an indentured cane field laborer and maidservant respectively. . . Hiram Fong worked as an algarroba bean picker from the age of 4 to 7, then moved up to shoe shine and newspaper work on the streets of Honolulu . . . held three jobs while working his way through the University of Hawaii, from which he graduated with honors after 3 years. . . also a member of the Hawaiian Rifle Team at Grand National Matches, Camp Perry, Ohio, 1929. . . received Law Degree from Harvard in 1935. . . founder of law firm of Fong, Miho (Japanese), Choy (Korean), and Robinson (Caucasian); founder, President and Chairman of Board of eight business corporations; operates farm. . . served 4 years in U.S. Air Force in World War II; holds reserve Colonelcy. . . served 14 years in Hawaiian legislature. . . in 1959, first American of Asian ancestry elected to U.S. Senate. . . reelected in 1964, setting all-time record in senatorial elections by running 31.8 percent ahead of his Party's Presidential Candidate. . . active in legislation concerning civil service, flood control and water development, immigration and refugees, and problems of aging.

Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon . . . has had an unbroken string of 13 political victories in the last 16 years. . . when he ran for the Oregon State Senate, 1952, received more votes in his county than Eisenhower. . . son of a railroad blacksmith. . . former college professor and dean. . . only Oregon Governor to serve two full terms in this century. . . age 44. . . married to the comely former Antoinette Kuzmanich, former assistant dean of women and daughter of Yugoslav immigrants. . . as 10-year-old boy in 1932, pulled his coaster wagon around Dallas, Oregon, distributing Hoover literature. . . supports nominee his party selects; in 1964 spoke in eight States for Goldwater, and held Republicans to-

gether in his State with result Oregon GOP was only State in 50 where GOP captured a House of the Legislature from Democrats. . . veteran of Iwo Jima, Okinawa battles, World War II. . . once entertained Vice Presidential Candidate Nixon at the Hatfield kitchen table (that was the best the Hatfields could do at the time).

Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina . . . anyone visiting South Carolina soon discovers that Strom Thurmond is the State's most revered leader. . . a fighter with strong convictions and principles, he symbolizes Southern courtliness. . . 82d Airborne Division, Normandy invasion. . . five battle stars, Purple Heart, Legion of Merit. . . first—and only—man ever elected to the United States Senate as a write-in candidate. . . elected 1954, resigned 1956 to place the office in a primary pursuant to a promise made to the people during his 1954 campaign. . . renominated, reelected. . . reelected in 1966. . . States' Rights Democratic candidate for President of the United States in 1948, carrying 4 States and receiving 39 electoral votes. . . today, at 65, so physically fit that he is able to do more pushups than young men half his age.

Senator Jack Miller of Iowa . . . confounded opponent by sweeping every county in November . . . first statewide candidate ever to do so . . . second term Senator widely recognized as tax expert, tax lawyer . . . political fortunes meteoric . . . first elected Iowa State Representative for 1 term (1955-1956) then to State Senate (1957-1960) . . . won an impressive victory over Iowa's first 2-term Democratic Governor, November 1960, and moved into Senate as State's junior Republican Senator . . . was first (February 25, 1966) to propose all-Asian peace conference on Vietnam . . . war veteran. . . once a faculty member of U.S. Army Command and General Staff College . . . one-time university professional lecturer in taxation; assistant professor of law at Notre Dame . . . his wife's name is "Jerry," his is Jack, and each of their 4 children's first name begins with a "J"—Janice, Janice, Jimmy, Judy . . . thus, the Senator is the "Jack of All J's."

Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois . . . at 47 launches a new career after meteoric rise in the industrial world . . . was president of Bell & Howell Company at age 29 . . . youngest man to head major U.S. corporation . . . showed signs of budding business and political acumen while at University of Chicago . . . formed supply company for fraternity houses which grossed \$150,000 annually by time of graduation . . . went to work of Bell & Howell after school . . . entered Navy as apprentice seaman, left as Lieutenant (jg) . . . back to Bell & Howell . . . under his direction company expanded and grew . . . Chairman of the Board and Chief executive officer of firm from 1961-1966 . . . launched himself into politics through fund raising in 1955 . . . became known on the national scene in 1959 when appointed chairman of Republican Committee on Program and Progress . . . active throughout country in 1960 political campaign . . . unsuccessfully bid for Governor of Illinois in 1964 . . . capped a year-long campaign for U.S. Senate with thundering victory in November . . . among first remarks made upon arriving in Washington, D.C., was that it seemed strange to be staring into Japanese and other foreign-made cameras . . . has already moved into field of urban problems with proposals—gaining wide GOP support—for low-income family ownership of their own homes.

Senator James B. Pearson of Kansas . . . 46 . . . a lawyer . . . but first and always aviation enthusiast. . . owned private plane before moving to Washington . . . as Naval aviator was stationed at Olathe, Kansas . . . fell in love with Kansas and a Kansas girl . . . married her and has served the State ever since . . . after World War II

started as pilot trainee for American Airlines but decided to get law degree instead . . . attended University of Virginia Law School . . . returned to Kansas . . . Johnson County Probate Judge . . . City Attorney Westwood, Fairway and Lenexa, 1952-1961 . . . appointed to Senate in 1962 . . . elected to fill unexpired term November 1962 . . . reelected to Senate, November 1966 . . . deeply concerned with transportation problems . . . instrumental in helping provide adequate boxcar fleets to move mid-western grain harvests.

Senator J. Caleb Boggs of Delaware . . . "Cale" Boggs has successively earned in Delaware the titles of Judge, Congressman (3 terms), Governor (2, 4-year terms), and Senator (just reelected to 2d term), in civilian life, and in the U.S. Army he ranged from Pvt. to Brig. Gen. . . decorated five times while serving through five campaigns in the European Theatre during World War II. . . so decisive was his last Senate victory in Delaware that the Republican Party captured control of the State Legislature, the governorship, and the congressional seat . . . impressive legislative record in agriculture, medicare, pollution control, and military policy.

Senator Gordon L. Allott of Colorado . . . college track champ who hurdled his opposition to a 2-lap victory in the 1966 election campaign . . . at Colorado University he was track captain, held National AAU 440-yard hurdles title . . . selected for the All-American track team of 1929 . . . worked hard to develop water potential of Rocky Mountain area on sound, fiscally-responsible basis . . . long a staunch Republican he helped organize the Colorado YR's in 1935 . . . has been politically active since . . . known as one of the West's "Water Statesmen." . . as (1) effective speaker; (2) diligent homework; (3) use of able staff work.

Senator Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts . . . along with other new GOP Senators received major committee assignments . . . political success came hard . . . defeated in first three attempts for elective office . . . but when began to win, came on like gangbusters . . . in 1962, elected Attorney General of Massachusetts by 250,000 votes, only Republican to win statewide office that year . . . in 1964, reelected by 750,000 margin, highest victory surplus ever received by a Republican in State . . . made a habit of winning awards after exerting extraordinary effort . . . for service behind enemy lines with Italian partisans, while infantry officer in World War II, received Bronze Star . . . for academic excellence, while at Boston University Law School named editor of the Law Review . . . for skill and devotion displayed in one of the lengthiest courtships in terms of time and space, won the hand in marriage of Remigia Ferrari Scacco, whom he had met in Italy during the war . . . his career at age 47 represents the full circle in American history: Massachusetts sent its sons to every part of the U.S., and many of them were elected to Congress from the States they helped settle . . . now a native son of Washington, D.C., settles in Massachusetts and represents the Bay State in the U.S. Senate . . . one of the great purposes for which the Republican Party was established at last comes to fruition.

Senator Carl T. Curtis of Nebraska . . . reelected in November with almost 60 percent of the votes over strong Democrat effort . . . started his public life as prosecuting attorney of Kearney County, Nebraska . . . and the training stood the test during Rules Committee investigation of scandals . . . once convinced, he sticks by his guns through thick and thin . . . served eight consecutive House terms . . . entered Senate January 3, 1955 . . . flood, drought cycle of the Missouri Basin, so costly in human life, property and crops, so concerned Senator

Curtis he has spent much of his time working successfully on flood control-reclamation projects for the entire area . . . popular with Senate staffers . . . wide interests and work in Senate shown by his membership on Finance, Space, Rules, Joint Atomic Energy, and Government Operations Committees.

Senator Len B. Jordan of Idaho . . . self-made, colorful man of immense charm . . . started out an enlistee World War I . . . was commissioned . . . after war worked as laborer and ranch hand to earn his way into University of Oregon . . . continued to work on campus and as logger during summers . . . moved to Idaho's Hell's Canyon country in 1933 . . . served on State Highway Advisory Committee after World War II . . . elected Governor . . . appointed Senator to fill unexpired term August 7, 1962 . . . elected to Senate November 1962, reelected November 1966 . . . Phi Beta Kappa scholar . . . war veteran . . . expert horseman; real honest-to-goodness cowboy in his teens; now a rancher, businessman, economic adviser . . . never lost a statewide election.

Senator Paul J. Fannin of Arizona . . . businessman . . . 3-term Governor of Arizona . . . guided his State safely, smoothly through its growing pains when it was one of the fastest growing States in the Union . . . former partner in Fannin Brothers . . . dealers in liquefied petroleum gas, agricultural chemicals . . . actively interested in and instrumental to rapid growth of farm industry in Southwest . . . battled for water, for arid and semi-arid area as Governor, now as Senator . . . demonstrated leadership abilities as Governor when named chairman, Western Governors' Conference, Chairman, Committee on Roads and Highway Safety, National Governors' Conference . . . member of the Executive Committee of the Council of State Governments . . . member of National Civil Defense Advisory Council . . . although born in Ashland, Kentucky, his family undertook the rugged trip west almost immediately and they arrived in Phoenix when he was 8 months old . . . dedicated Republican . . . hard-working Senator with firm grasp of complexities of water and water problems.

Senator Milton R. Young of North Dakota . . . here's a pleasant little secret about one of the busiest, most influential, hard-working men in Washington (and we asked special permission to at last reveal it), to wit: ever since coming to the Senate he has maintained a policy of trying to see everyone who calls at his office if he is not on the Senate floor or in Committee meeting . . . this takes in the janitor in the basement to the Secretary of Agriculture, or anyone from North Dakota . . . hanging on the wall in one of his offices is a unique picture . . . it shows a North Dakota farm boy of 19, in baggy work clothes, seeding grain . . . it is Milt Young . . . and all his life he has been a man of the soil and is one of the outstanding authorities on agriculture . . . many far-reaching pieces of farm legislation bear his name . . . never defeated for reelection to public office . . . in 1956 he was the only GOP Senate candidate who received a bigger State majority than Eisenhower . . . he is the top Republican on the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee . . . has been Secretary of the Senate Republican Conference since 1948 . . . his newsletters, eagerly awaited because of facts on farm matters and foreign policy or defense developments . . . keeps eagle eye out on North Dakota's needs and interests . . . popular with his colleagues on both sides of the political fence.

Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky . . . prepared for a spectacular legal-political-diplomatic career with a spectacular athletic career, Centre College, Kentucky, later Yale College . . . was member of the Fabulous "Praying Colonels" of Centre . . . beat then mighty Harvard (7-0) . . . five members of All-American team named from Centre—all from Senator Cooper's hometown of Somerset . . . went to Yale . . . cap-

tained basketball team . . . then to Harvard Law School . . . elected Pulaski County Judge . . . entered World War II as enlisted man . . . emerged a captain . . . won bronze star . . . cited for his successful reform of Bavarian judicial system . . . elected Circuit Judge in Kentucky . . . to Senate in 80th Congress . . . served as U.S. Delegate to U.N. General Assembly . . . as advisor to Secretary of State at London and Brussels . . . NATO Council of Ministers . . . Ambassador to India . . . turned in a solid Republican victory in Kentucky in 1966.

And, in concluding these little vignettes of the All-American Republican team in the Senate, there is Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois . . . what more can be said of one of the great statesmen of our times that hasn't already been said? . . . true, he's Senate Republican Leader; but to many Americans he is the Senate . . . perhaps what he said during a Meet The Press program back about 1957 might help tell the story . . . he asserted: "I'm just an old-fashioned garden variety of Republican who believes in the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, in Abraham Lincoln, who accepts the challenges as they arise from time to time, and who is not unappreciative of the fact that this is a dynamic economy in which we live and sometimes you have to change your position." . . . there has been one development in the last year or so: he has become a great favorite of the young . . . to some he is the Al Hirt of the Senate; to others a Stern with a violin, even the avant-garde is delighted with his recording of "Gallant Men" . . . and the Senator reciprocates the regard young folks have for him . . . he thinks they are the best ever, more intelligent than ever . . . and why shouldn't they be, the Senator inquires and answers:

After all, they're a product of free enterprise.

WHITHER THE DISTRICT—AN INTERVIEW WITH REPRESENTATIVE BASIL WHITENER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently the Potomac magazine, a publication of the Washington Post, published an in-depth article concerning the District of Columbia based on an interview by Richard Lyons with Representative BASIL L. WHITENER, of North Carolina.

BASIL WHITENER is one of the most able and experienced Members of the House of Representatives, and he has for years devoted his time selflessly to the problems of the District as a member of the District of Columbia Committee. He has done this in spite of the fact that he knows there is no political reward in North Carolina for his tireless devotion to the affairs of Washington. As a Representative in Congress, he has been a longtime resident of the District and speaks as one personally familiar with its problems, and not as one crusading from the safe confines of suburbia. What BASIL WHITENER had to say, as published in the Potomac magazine, should be of great interest not only to the residents of the District of Columbia, but also to the Members of the House and Senate who are charged with the legislative responsibility for its government.

The interview is carefully thought out and carefully stated. Mr. WHITENER's views deserve the careful consideration of all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this interview, "Whither the District," appearing in the January 8,

1967, edition of Potomac magazine be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WHITHER THE DISTRICT—A MEMBER OF CONGRESS SPEAKS HIS MIND—AN INTERVIEW WITH REPRESENTATIVE BASIL WHITENER

(Questions by Richard Lyons)

(NOTE.—If you're interested in legislation for the city of Washington, the most important man at the Capitol today is Rep. Basil Lee Whitener (D-N.C.).)

(With only six years' service on the House District Committee, Whitener has emerged as its key member. In the last Congress he handled and largely shaped or killed most important District bills, including revenue, crime, home rule and the subway. His influence in the next two years should be even greater. The Committee's conservative chairman, Rep. John L. McMillan (D-S.C.), has found Whitener so reliable and willing to work that, in effect, he has made Whitener his agent and given him the important work to do.)

(Whitener's background is that of a southern prosecutor. He is a lanky, 51-year-old pipe smoker from the middle-sized North Carolina textile city of Gastonia.)

(In mid-December, Whitener—sitting in his second-floor walk-up law office—talked about Washington's problems and his view of the role of Congress in dealing with them.)

(His only stipulation was that his remarks be considered as those of only one of the committee's 25 members. "The legislative program will be determined by the chairman and the full committee, not by any one person," he said.)

Since I have been in Congress I have always lived in the District of Columbia. I have not fled to the suburbs. I can't lecture the District of Columbia as to how it ought to run its affairs. However, I do think that the crime conditions have made living in the District of Columbia less attractive to many people, particularly folks living in the more crime-ridden areas. It will not become an attractive place of residence until something is done to abate the crime situation. You are not going to meet it by apologizing for the criminals and disregarding the interests of the good people who are the victims of the criminal. The Capitol Hill area in which I live has been very hard hit by crime. In the apartment building in which I live there have been several robberies and breakings and enterings.

I think on the basis of the record we have to acknowledge that there is an increase in crime in most metropolitan centers. Washington has had a corresponding, if not a greater, increase than has been true in cities of similar size. But I think it is defenseless to permit the Nation's Capitol to become even a contestant for first place in crime. With all the Federal and local law enforcement interests, you would think that crime would just not be tolerated in the Nation's Capitol. But it is now. Because of the publicity that Washington has had, a condition where people from our own area here (in North Carolina)—I'm sure it's true all over the country—will call this office and ask if it is safe to visit Washington. We find that while a few years ago young ladies were anxious to go to Washington to work it is now a very difficult thing to get a young lady to leave her home community and go to Washington because of this crime problem. I think it is costing the city millions of dollars a year.

Racial make-up of the city has nothing to do with it, because the record shows that the majority of the crime is committed upon members of the Negro race. I think a young Negro woman in Washington is a lot more in jeopardy than a young white woman. Former Assistant Attorney General Herbert

J. Miller recently stated that since 1950 over 80% of the rape victims in the District of Columbia have been Negro, and 80% of all victims of aggravated assault have been Negro; 76% of the persons reporting their automobiles as stolen in the District of Columbia were Negroes. So it seems to me that if there is any racial issue involved it is a question of protecting the Negroes themselves from crime because they are the principal victims of it, according to the record.

To meet the crime problem I think one of the most effective things would be to have the Omnibus Crime Bill, which we passed in the last session, written into the law of the District of Columbia. I am realistic enough to know that in the face of the veto this would not be a very likely accomplishment. To meet this problem there must be a practical approach by getting the criminal off the street. You can't do that without a change in the attitude of the courts toward the criminal and perhaps without some strengthening legislation. We particularly, I think, need to get a more realistic attitude toward the law enforcement officer and his chore by both the public and the courts.

As I stated 6 years ago when our subcommittee first held hearings on crime in the District of Columbia, there will be no improvement in the crime picture until the community itself becomes aroused and is willing to cooperate with law enforcement officers in the apprehension of criminals. Citizens must go further and insist that their courts deal firmly with criminals once they are convicted. I still think that is the situation.

I am told that Justice Department officials are now giving study to certain proposals that they will submit as their answer to the problem of crime. I can't speak for the chairman or the full House District Committee, but my personal idea is that we should receive any suggestions that anyone has—in government and out of government—and have some open hearings without legislation, receive these suggestions and then see if there is anything we can do based upon those suggestions.

That is precisely what we did before the Omnibus Crime Bill was introduced. We held joint hearings with the Senate on crime. The subcommittee met around the table, and the Omnibus Crime Bill was actually put together over the table before we ever introduced it.

There are some people who get involved in crime that you can rehabilitate. There are others who will not rehabilitate, and the only thing to do with them is to put them out of circulation.

I have sponsored a Ball Reform Act for the District of Columbia which some folks say is a soft attitude toward criminals. I don't agree with that. I have been one of the principal supporters both in the Federal system and in the District of Columbia of work-release for prisoners because I think where prisoners want to rehabilitate themselves and where they show they are worthy of consideration by the courts they should be given that consideration.

Let them work and report back in at night. But we can't lose sight of the fact that there are people who are unworthy of consideration for work-release or the Ball Reform Act and the other programs such as probation and suspended sentences.

I was prosecutor in the most populous urban area in North Carolina for eleven years before I came to Washington, and there are many folks that we dealt with who can be helped, and we tried to help them. There were others; the only thing to do with them is to protect society from them. And in Washington we find, in my opinion, too much emphasis on a dreamy-eyed attitude toward rehabilitation and no appreciable emphasis on the other side of the picture where there is no solution other than incarceration.

I would not say the number one thing is crime legislation. I would think a more realistic attitude on the part of the community and the courts under existing law could bring about a much greater improvement.

Question. What about your views on the makeup of the District Government?

Answer. I think one of the problems we have had in the last six years in the District of Columbia has been that the Commissioners have not been given the opportunity that previous Commissioners have had to effectively head up the government of the District of Columbia.

I think the office of Special Presidential Assistant for District Affairs has complicated the governmental process in the District of Columbia. I am not talking in terms of personalities when I say that. I would hope that in the future the District Commissioners would not be interfered with by any such Special Assistant to the President.

When you put this additional layer on government structure you downgrade the position of Commissioner and create administrative problems which you would not have without that. The President appoints the Commissioners and there seems to me to be no reason why the President of the Board of Commissioners or the three Commissioners would not be just as available to the President as a man sitting in the White House would be.

I think the District Commissioners should be empowered to make more administrative decisions without outside interference than they have been able to make in the past. I think that the District Commissioners should reduce their desires to try to legislate through administrative orders under rather nebulous authority to do so.

I think there are too many agencies in Washington that have a voice in making decisions as to the programs.

The National Capital Planning Commission, for example. I am not criticizing the Planning Commission members. They are exercising their statutory role, but I don't know that their role should exist, at least in some areas in which they seem to have statutory authority. I think you have got overlapping veto power on the part of other agencies of government such as your Park Service. There are just such a multiplicity of agencies that have their hand in making decisions which in most other cities or states would be made by one group, the governing group of the city or state. In Washington this is not true. It is a city of divided authority.

I think ways to remedy this could best be approached by a study made by some impartial committee not operating under the handicap of their own preconceived notions. Maybe some strictly disinterested group can come up with suggestions which I am sure that the Congress would hear with interest. I don't know how long it's been since there has been such a study, but it seems to me it's time that one be made. And I don't think that the Congress should undertake it because there you may find that the committee making the study would be accused of having some personal axe to grind. Some of these foundations or the Federal Government itself might well be willing to have such a study made. They have had a study group to look at the Police Department. They had a consulting group to come in and look at the highway and transportation problems, but I don't know there has been one to look at the total picture.

Meanwhile, I think the office of District Commissioner should be one which would be filled by the most able individuals that the President could find, and I am sorry that we have a situation now where good men serving as District Commissioners seem to be of the opinion that they should get out just as soon as possible. And this is not a very high compliment to the position.

I think that one of the problems you have with the Commissioner setup is the requirement that an engineering commissioner only serves a limited period of time and then moves on out. Most jurisdictions seem to find that there is real value in long service by competent people in the public works field. The military has provided fine and able men, but I am sure that if these same individuals served over a period of 10 to 12 or 20 years that they would be able to make a much greater contribution than they can in a short time.

This military engineer commissioner concept is an old one, and it came about because of conditions which developed which seemed to require at the time a non-political type individual to run the public works program in the District of Columbia. Whether that condition would ever develop again if you went to the concept of a civilian engineering commissioner I don't know, but it seems to me that it is no more likely to happen there than it is to have the same man make a career of being head of the highway or the water department or some other municipal role under the District Engineering Commissioner. But I'm not suggesting that we should right now get away from the military engineering concept. I do think that would be another thing to be covered by an outside study group that would make a survey on the District of Columbia government.

Question. What is your attitude toward Home rule?

Answer. I think the Nation's Capital is, as the Constitution says, "the seat of the government," and we should never lose sight of the fact that the basic reason for Washington, D.C., is as a place where the Federal Government has its seat. I would not favor doing anything that would impinge upon the constitutional provision that the Congress shall have exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the seat of the government. I don't, however think a locally-elected official would impinge upon it simply because he was elected by the people of the District of Columbia. But I believe if that locally-elected official undertook to exercise any legislative authority, then he would.

The question of whether there should be Congressional representation in the District of Columbia with no voting power is one that I think can well be considered. But I think if you are going to have elected members of the Congress with voting power that it should include members of both the House and the Senate. I am not saying I favor that, but if you are going to have them in one body you should have them in the other.

Question. What is your attitude toward the problems of relocation raised by urban, highway and school building programs?

Answer. I think one of the biggest problems that the lower income group and small businessmen in Washington face has been that of relocation.

On numerous occasions—in public hearings and private conversations—I suggested I thought it was indefensible to plan a highway or an urban renewal project or any other type of government activity which destroys housing and small business locations without having as a part of the overall plan an established relocation program. For example, when we were considering the rapid transit program one of the things that appealed to me so much about it was that there will be practically no dislocation of people or small business with the rapid transit system. I am not anti-highway. I am pro-highway, but I do feel strongly that a highway construction project should take into account its effect upon the homes of people and upon the small businessman who is going to be wiped out by it, a cavalier disregard of their interest in this type of situation is deplorable.

I have not found much zeal on the part of the people in the District Government for relocation. The law provides a level of pay-

ment for the expenses of relocation, but the non-real-estate-owner gets the cost of moving, in effect. That does not build him a place to go to. Now the property owner, of course, gets just compensation as the law requires. But just compensation does not always cover his future losses. Take for example, a man running a small community grocery store, which perhaps his father ran before him, and his patronage is based upon his acquaintanceship with the people in the community and his long experience of dealing with them and the confidence they have in him. You can pay him for his grocery store, but if you destroy his customers and he goes to a new community to try to set up a similar business there is no way he can come out even as a general rule.

For six years our subcommittee has urged that a more realistic attitude toward relocation be taken, and I have been very disappointed at the results. Legislatively, we have provided a more liberal program of payment of relocation costs. If we undertake to write into legislation that you couldn't build a government office building complex, or you couldn't have urban renewal projects without first building accommodations for these displaced people I think you would have an impossible situation.

So it seems to me that the solution to it will be in the administration of these programs. Local officials should approach relocation with a little more interest than they have manifested before.

Question. What about transportation?

Answer. Transportation is, pretty well established as far as rapid transit is concerned. Now I am told there will be legislation presented which would have the effect of enlarging the present rapid transit concept within the District of Columbia.

Any proposal for additional routes could present problems because of the cost. Based on previous testimony the cost per mile, including rolling stock, works out at about \$25 million. So if you add many miles or many expensive new stations then you could run into a real problem getting approval. We must remember we lost the original proposal primarily because of cost.

I think too often people overlook the fact that the House District Committee is not the only committee which deals with issues which sometimes seem trivial. On the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, we spend a great portion of our time, probably one-fourth of our Full Committee time, in dealing with private claims, some of them amounting to \$100, some to \$200. You go to the Interior Committee and you find that they are constantly dealing with such considerations to determine whether or not the government should sell an acre of land to some local government or school district.

And so this matter of the District of Columbia Committee dealing with so many apparently trivial areas of legislation is true of practically every committee in the Congress. This is a part of the overall responsibility of the Congress, and you can't just deal with the major matters and let the issues which are not of great national interest and magnitude be left behind.

I spend more time on the Judiciary Committee than I do on the District of Columbia Committee although I spend a lot of time on the District of Columbia Committee.

We have the staff of the committee, and we can have assistance from other committees to help keep track of District affairs. I have never felt it was my role as a member of the District Committee to be a detective or to go out and meddle into the operation of the affairs of a particular agency, the day-to-day operations, or to go to a school and decide that some school teacher is not doing her duty.

If there is any information we need I think it is advisable to get it through the normal procedures rather than to personally med-

dle into all of it. If the members of our Committee undertook to do that they wouldn't get much else done.

POSSIBLE IMPERFECTION OF GENOCIDE CONVENTION—NO ARGUMENT AGAINST U.S. RATIFICATION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the United Nations Convention on Genocide has been the subject of continuing criticism from many sincere men of unquestioned good will. The late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles had grave reservations about the real efficacy of the Convention on Genocide.

I do not dismiss this criticism or skepticism. But if the U.S. Senate waited for the perfect law without any flaw or shortcoming, the legislative record of any Congress would be a total blank. I am amazed that men who daily see that the enactment of any legislation is the art of the possible can captiously nit pick an international covenant on the outlawing of genocide.

Admittedly the United Nations—in 1948 when the covenant was unanimously ratified and today—is an imperfect organization. But the failings and shortcomings of the United Nations merely faithfully reflect the human condition, which is imperfection. The United Nations is above all a standard for mankind. And that standard for mankind insists—as I am certain all Senators insist—that the plan of systematic murder to destroy a people—that is genocide—has no place in civilized society.

America is conspicuous. We are conspicuous for our remarkable national record in the struggle for human rights. We are just as conspicuous for our international absence in the ratification of the United Nations Convention on Genocide. We should resolve without further hesitation or excuse this hypocritical inconsistency between domestic achievement and international indifference. The role of the uninvolved critic is not a difficult one. One can always find another "the" to change to "an" if that be his objective. Almost 70 nations have recognized this elementary fact and chosen to ratify the Convention on Genocide. I am certain that if these nations had wished they could have found phrases not to their national taste in this document, but they perceived a larger responsibility—a responsibility to mankind—to individually and collectively condemn inhuman barbarism.

Let the U.S. Senate perceive that same obligation and move as quickly as possible to condemn inhuman barbarism by ratifying the United Nations Convention on Genocide.

L.B.J. FIGHTS TO KEEP INTEREST RATES DOWN

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, last year when interest rates were rising there was continuous criticism on the floor of the Senate of the President of the United States as being responsible for the high interest rates.

I thought that criticism was unfair

and said so. President Johnson has been a steady and generally very effective advocate of interest rates as low as consistent with economic stability throughout his long career.

This morning's newspapers carried a raft of articles and features all indicating that the corner seems to have been turned and the long and painful rise of interest rates may be turning around.

Mr. President, for this turnaround the President does deserve substantial credit. First, he has been a steady pleader with the independent Federal Reserve Board to ease up on the money supply so the price of money—interest—could drop. Second, he has repeatedly released Federal funds to ease the pressure on the money market, especially for long-term mortgages.

Third, he has proposed a tax increase—which I incidentally oppose—to increase Government revenues so that the Government will not have to borrow as much and will have a lesser tendency to bid up interest in doing so.

Only this weekend the President's finance minister, the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Fowler, succeeded in persuading Britain, France, West Germany, and Italy to join us to work together to achieve lower interest rates.

Mr. President, hovering very large in opposition to our reduction of interest rates has been the fear that lower interest rates here would result in a flow of capital abroad that could worsen our already difficult balance-of-payments situation. Indeed, the very great improvement of the balance-of-payments situation in the past couple of years has been in the view of some experts the result of our tight money policy.

At any rate the New York Times reported this morning:

The fact that the ministers got together to discuss their shared desire for easier and cheaper credit and their declaration "to cooperate" toward that end, may signal a gradual, important international shift in emphasis in dealing with economic and financial problems.

It is good to note, Mr. President, that the French were just as cooperative in this endeavor as other nations.

This conference, of course, was brought about because of U.S. initiative. President Johnson and Secretary Fowler deserve credit for this initiative and this success.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Times this morning reporting the weekend meeting at Chequers in England be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES AND FOUR NATIONS JOIN TO SEEK CUTS IN INTEREST RATES—BRITAIN, ITALY, WEST GERMANY AND FRANCE PLEDGE TO WORK FOR EASIER BORROWING—TIGHT MONEY IS CITED—TOP FINANCE OFFICIALS HOLD UNUSUAL 24-HOUR MEETING—BRITISH MOVE LIKELY

(By Edward Cowan)

LONDON, January 22.—The United States, Britain, France, West Germany and Italy pledged today to work together to achieve lower interest rates.

In a communiqué issued at the end of an

unusual 24-hour conference, ministers of the five countries declared that lower borrowing costs would benefit their own economies and "the world economy as a whole."

No "contract" or plan for coordinated reductions resulted from the meeting, or was sought, sources here said.

Nevertheless, the fact that the ministers got together to discuss their shared desire for easier and cheaper credit, and their declaration "to co-operate" toward that end, may signal a gradual, important international shift in emphasis in dealing with economic and financial problems.

BANK RATE CUT WEIGHED

As the conference ended, it appeared nearly certain that the next step in efforts to cut back interest rates would be a reduction in the Bank of England's loan rate, now at a crisis level of 7 per cent.

[In Cannes, France, 60 leading financiers and businessmen from the world's major industrial powers formed a new pressure group to persuade governments to help develop financial markets to provide capital for private enterprise. Page 70.]

High interest rates have been relied on heavily, on both sides of the Continent, both to check inflation and to avoid excessive outflows of money. One official called it "a vicious cycle with competition causing a ratcheting up" of rates in various countries.

This weekend's meeting, like President Johnson's avowed intention to raise taxes temporarily, may indicate a trend away from monetary measures and toward tax-and-spending policy.

Germany, Britain and the United States are concerned about the slack in their respective economies brought about by tight money. France and Italy are concerned about induced increases in their own money rates and weakening of their exports, particularly to Germany, one of their partners in the European Common Market.

But the countries with high interest rates, particularly Britain, have hesitated to cut them partly for fear that, without companion actions elsewhere, they would suffer an outflow of money seeking a higher return abroad.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIVE

The principal objective of this weekend's meeting, believed to be the first of its kind, was to strengthen the confidence of each participant in the others' desire to move along the same path, it was said.

The ministers gathered yesterday at Chequers, the official country residence of the Prime Minister, in the late afternoon and stayed there about 24 hours. They dined together last night, then held their first working session, which lasted until about midnight.

They conferred formally today from 10:30 A.M. until 1 P.M. lunched together and then spent an hour or so polishing the wording of the communiqué. The United States Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, arrived yesterday and left this evening for Washington.

Other ministers at the meeting were James Callaghan, Britain's Chancellor of the Exchequer, Michel Debré, France's Minister of the Economy and Finance; Karl Schiller, Germany's Economics Minister, and Emilio Colombo, Italy's Treasury Minister.

PROPOSED BY CALLAGHAN

Mr. Callaghan proposed the meeting last month to the United States, France and Germany. Italy was later included because Prime Minister Harold Wilson was visiting Rome last Monday when the conference was announced. The Netherlands and Canada were annoyed at being excluded.

For such diplomatic reasons, it was thought doubtful that such a Group of Five would acquire enduring status. Sources said there were no plans for a second meeting.

Mr. Callaghan has called for "international disarmament in the present level of interest rates" and a cut in the Bank of England's

loan rate may be the next move in that direction. A half-point reduction, to 6½ percent, has been expected in financial circles here for some weeks and in recent days speculation has mounted that the cut, when it comes, will be a full point, to 6 percent.

GERMAN MOVE RECALLED

West Germany's central bank lowered its loan rate to 4½ percent from 5 percent earlier this month and the Bonn Government would like to see it go down more. Money-market interest rates in the United States have been easing since late summer and money is much easier to find.

Washington presumably would like to pump still more credit into the economy, following a two-month leveling off in industrial production, to encourage borrowing and to force down Banks' business loan rates.

What appeared to be the most important sentences of the communiqué were the following:

"The ministers welcomed recent steps by some of the countries represented to ease credit and monetary stringency, which in the past had played a useful part in moderating their domestic inflationary pressures. They agreed that in some countries some further easing would be helpful in the context of the development of their own economies and of the world economy as a whole.

"The monetary policies called for in the present situation should be adopted to the different conditions obtaining in their respective countries and should have regard to their effect on other countries. The ministers agreed that they would all make it their objective within the limits of their respective responsibilities to co-operate in such a way as to enable interest rates in their respective countries to be lower than they otherwise would be."

COOPERATE OR CONSULT?

If the word "co-operate" meant anything more than consult, and some sources suggested it did, there was no clue to such a meaning. Participants said there had been no discussion of what France might do with dollars flowing to Paris as rates in New York softened—that is, whether France might modify her practice of using surplus dollars to buy gold from the United States Treasury.

France has been obliged to suspend gold purchases for several months because her international accounts have been in deficit and she has been losing, not gaining, dollars. Mr. Debré blamed the deficit partly on lower exports to, and higher imports from, Germany. Paris has also blamed high interest rates in New York.

"No other question was dealt with at the meeting," the communiqué concluded. Informants said that included the price of gold, international liquidity and related matters.

Participants stressed that the meeting had not been "a bargaining session" and that the atmosphere was "friendly." The mood contrasted with the important differences between France and the Anglo-Americans on how to augment the world's resources for financing trade and development.

That subject will be discussed in London this week at a joint meeting of the International Monetary Fund and officials of the industrialized nations known as the Group of Ten.

ROOSA SEES BALANCE OF PAYMENTS WORSENING

MR. PROXMIER. Mr. President, close to the same point, we cannot assume that the recent improvement in the balance of payments will continue. Few men have won the confidence of the experts in both business and Government in their field as enthusiastically as has Robert Roosa, the former Kennedy-Johnson monetary policy expert.

Roosa is considered one of the ablest men in the world in the complex field of balance of payments. Late last week he

warned that we may be in for a sharp worsening of the balance of payments in the coming year. Roosa said we may be getting in a seriously overextended position.

I ask unanimous consent that the Roosa article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 19, 1967]

ROOSA SEES SHARP WORSENING IN U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(By Lee Cohn)

Robert V. Roosa, formerly the chief architect of the administration's international financial policies, fears a sharp worsening of the U.S. balance of payments this year.

"Rapidly mounting deficits in our foreign accounts, if ignored, could make 1967 a crucial year for the dollar," Roosa warned in a gloomy speech to the New York Economic Club last night.

Financial and statistical quirks made the balance of payments look better than it really was last year, he said, and the pendulum may swing back this year.

Roosa said forthcoming figures may report the payments deficit was only about \$1.5 billion in 1966—not much bigger than the 1965 deficit of \$1.3 billion, despite the extra dollar drain caused by the Vietnam war.

An alternative calculation may actually show a payments surplus in 1966, he said.

The payments deficit is the excess of U.S. spending, lending, investment and gifts abroad over receipts from foreign sources. Chronic deficits have sharply reduced the U.S. gold stockpile and weakened the dollar.

As undersecretary of the Treasury for monetary affairs from 1961 through 1964, Roosa was largely responsible for the campaign to reduce the payments deficit. He now is a partner in Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., a leading banking firm, and still is influential with the Johnson administration.

Roosa said "serious deterioration" of trade and other basic elements in the balance of payments last year was hidden statistically by unusual inflows of "volatile" money.

Without these flukes, he estimated the 1966 payments deficit would have been \$2 billion to \$3 billion larger than the figures will show.

The special inflows of money resulted largely from tight credit policies here, Roosa said. Since the Federal Reserve is easing credit, he said, these flows may be reversed in 1967 and "the statistical deficit may be inflated . . . in the same way that it was reduced last year."

Warning against "euphoria," Roosa said it is urgent for the government to take strong action to reduce the basic payments deficit in 1967.

"We are as a nation beginning to show the early symptoms of a bank that is getting itself into an over-extended financial position," he said.

To improve the situation, he said, the "Fed" must limit the reduction of interest rates brought about through easing of monetary policy. If rates are much higher abroad than here, money tends to flow out of the United States—increasing the payments deficit.

Roosa said the Fed and the Treasury may have to revive the strategy of keeping short-term interest rates relatively high, while using special techniques to create and maintain "a general environment of ample credit availability."

He also said inflation must be checked and the pace of the domestic economy moderated to increase the surplus of exports over imports. If the economy bounces back from its present lull by mid-year, he said, the tax

increases recommended by President Johnson will be needed.

And, Roosa suggested, U.S. military outlays in Europe must be curtailed.

REDUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, never since coming into Government, some 21 years ago, have I read a more lucid or logical presentation than the one the majority leader gave the Senate last Thursday with respect to reducing the number of troops the United States has in Europe.

The majority leader made many wise points. They included the following:

First. The Senate should come to grips with this matter now.

Second. Two-thirds of our forces, plus their dependents, who are now being kicked out of France, will nevertheless be reassigned to other European countries instead of returned to the United States.

Third. Whereas the United States maintains supplies and equipment for a 90-day war, all other NATO countries maintain comparable reserves for only 10 to 30 days.

Fourth. Recent tripartite talks have taken us, if anything, further toward a unilateral underwriting of the burdens of NATO.

Fifth. British deployment in Germany has never been over 60 percent of their commitment. Nevertheless, when Britain understandably announced that they would have to reduce that to 40 percent, despite their troops being located on German soil, the German Government said it could not pick up this tab; so, in the end, as usual, it was the United States that supplied the money—\$35 million.

Sixth. Only the United States has met its NATO commitments in the common defense effort.

Seventh. No member of NATO spends as much of its gross national product for defense as does the United States, despite the fact that in recent years some of these countries have increased their gold and total reserves over 600 percent; whereas the United States has lost 45 percent of its same holdings.

Eighth. No NATO member has as great a percentage of its available manpower in uniform as does the United States.

Ninth. Only three relatively small—in industrial complex—members of NATO, Portugal, Greece, and Turkey, still draft their young men for 2 years of compulsory service; in fact, Great Britain abandoned conscription in 1960.

Tenth. France not only no longer has any military in NATO, but also will not guarantee NATO forces having access to French territory.

Eleventh. West Germany has an equivalent of eight Army divisions instead of its commitment of 12.

Twelfth. Belgium as well as Great Britain wants to reduce its military commitments to NATO.

Thirteenth. Western Europe, all of it, is partially maintaining its unprecedented prosperity by doing its best to expand its commerce with Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and even Red China; and at the same time this goes on, some people in the United States

both talk and work against our making any such sales. If we are to maintain the capitalistic system, with taxes coming from income including profits, this action is just planned economic suicide.

Fourteenth. As the majority leader so well points out, how long will it be before other nations in Europe ask us to leave their territory? I personally am convinced this would have happened long ago except for the financial benefits involved.

It is right to urge that this matter be decided now, not only because of the heavy paper gold and true gold outflow involved, but also because of all the other costly conditions around the world. I would hope, as the majority leader does, that the consultations involved do not "turn into a prolonged exercise for deferring decisions and action."

One can only agree also that—

This resolution calls upon those who remain shackled to an outdated policy based on a Europe as it was yesterday to face up to the fact that tomorrow will always seem to be a better time to take the action which is urgently required today.

As I see it, a few troops under the American flag in West Berlin, with a division or two, plus adequate airlift, in Great Britain, would fulfill our commitments—and at the same time give us a defense of substance, rather than the one largely of form that apparently is now being contemplated as the result of the French withdrawal.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Unfortunately, because of commitments which I could not avoid, I did not have the opportunity to hear all of the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, but I did hear the latter part. Without referring to what I said, which the Senator was so kind as to take cognizance of, I was a little surprised the other day, when the troops-in-Europe resolution was resubmitted, with the sponsorship of some 42 Senators, to have a Member indicate that, in his opinion, if I understood him correctly, the American forces in Europe should stay there indefinitely—in other words, permanently—and to hear another Member make reference to the fact that, because of the rise of neo-Nazism, our troops should remain there.

Frankly, I do not think that the American people or the Senate ever expected that Americans should remain in Europe as occupation troops for an indefinite or permanent period of time.

Certainly, I do not think that the forces which we have in Europe have as their purpose seeing to it that in any given country there will be no possibility of any rise of neo-Nazism or any other movement. Their only purpose is to assist in the common defense of the NATO region and it is misleading to suggest otherwise.

Frankly, I do not see, in the months ahead, the possibility of the rise of neo-Nazism. I believe the Germans, on the basis of the lessons they have learned, and the democratic attitudes they have

shown, can take care of a situation of that kind. I think the time is long overdue when American divisions should be withdrawn from Europe, along the lines suggested by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri. I make that statement on the thesis that our commitment has never meant that we must keep a certain level of U.S. troops there for an indefinite time.

We will honor our commitments to the last decimal point. However, we should face conditions as they are today, not as they were 20 years ago; and the time of the vested interest in maintaining our approximately six divisions in Western Europe is over.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the majority leader for commenting on the remarks I made with respect to his superb position on this particular issue.

I would hope that not only Congress but the administration and the American people as well pay thoughtful attention to the suggestion made in this connection by the majority leader. A great American, Alfred E. Smith, once said, "Nobody ever shot Santa Claus." It is easy to understand why so many countries welcome our paternalistic efforts in military matters because, in effect, we are financing the defenses of the free world at great economic benefit to many other countries, by means of additional issuance of more paper gold dollars.

As the majority leader has stated there is no doubt but what our commitments will be honored in every way. It was Lenin who pointed out that there are many ways of losing a war, one being economic. It was Lenin also who is supposed to have said that by debauching the currency along with confiscatory taxation, one could bring about a major change in government. The more I note of the percent that we are financing and defending the free world, the more apprehensive I am about the future.

ABC-ITT MERGER

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I would like to comment on the recent action taken by the Justice Department regarding the FCC approved merger between ABC and ITT.

We are all familiar, I think, with the background of this merger, particularly those of us who serve on the Senate Commerce Committee. Briefly, the FCC has spent almost 1 year studying the merits of the case and the Justice Department has spent over a year investigating the ramifications and effects of the merger.

I make these comments today because, as a ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am appalled at the ill-conceived action of the Justice Department and am thoroughly shocked by the statement of one of my distinguished colleagues that President Johnson should ask for the resignation of certain members of the Federal Communications Commission.

The time has come to set the record straight. The time has come to clear the air of emotionally charged and inaccurate statements which have been made about the situation.

First, I would like to say that the Fed-

eral Communications Commission is not an irresponsible body. It is well aware of the responsibility it has to Congress, to the public, and to business, both big and small.

In this particular matter the Federal Communications Commission, operating under the rules and regulations set forth by the Congress of the United States, has discharged its obligations in a manner that is beyond reproach. Public hearings were held before the entire Commission but, during the course of these hearings, the Justice Department elected to remain aloof. It did not participate. It was given the opportunity to come forth to voice its opinion, and it elected not to do so. Incidentally, no other interested parties have voiced an objection, either. As recently as last month, the Justice Department stated in a letter to the Federal Communications Commission that it did not have sufficient grounds to stay the merger; but now, at the last possible moment, the Justice Department has embarked upon a course of action which is inexcusable for its lack of substance, lack of fact, lack of judgment, and lack of carefully considered evidence. Perhaps it is the Justice Department who should be taken to task, not the FCC.

Who are these people who have taken it upon themselves to denounce the FCC?

Who are these people who have taken it upon themselves to imply that the Congress of the United States is not fulfilling its duties to the American people by giving sufficient guidance to the FCC?

I do not know the answers to these questions, but I am sure that the record will show that the FCC has indeed carried out its charter in a manner which is above and beyond the mud slinging and name calling to which it has been subjected this past week.

The present members of the FCC were appointed by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. The Justice Department has managed, in one thoughtless step to impugn not only the personal abilities of the Commission members and its staff, but to question the competency of Congress to supervise as well as the reputation of four U.S. Presidents who selected the Commission members.

I would like also to say a few words about the subject of innuendo. My distinguished colleague from Oregon, by innuendo, has implied that one of the corporations in this merger is, "a partner for all practical purposes with the Governments of Sweden, Denmark, and other northern European countries in their defense systems."

In that context, let me offer the following: ITT installed and now maintains the hotline between our Government and Moscow. ITT maintains the distant early warning line across the top of the world. ITT has been an active participant in the Gemini program; it furnishes communications equipment to our Armed Forces; it conducts research in the field of infrared and laser technology for the Department of Defense; it is active in almost all satellite programs; it provides ground control radar for our troops in Vietnam; it provides electronic gear for the F-111. I could go on and on. The point is this: If ITT is a partner in the

defense of the free world, I welcome that partnership.

The Justice Department purports to have the best interests of the American public in mind in taking this ill-advised action. But its action certainly does not justify that position. It has lulled the American investing public into assuming that the merger would be completed without objection and yet, by its action last Thursday, it created havoc on the New York Stock Exchange and caused ABC investors to lose \$67 million. Is that protection of the public interest?

Most of the allegations and the public statements made appear to me to be contrary to the American concept of justice. Two great corporations and the Federal Communications Commission have been judged guilty until proven innocent. This is not my understanding of justice.

Let us look as some of the specific charges.

The Justice Department says that the consummation of this merger will result in the possible elimination of ITT as a potential competitor in network broadcasting. This statement, at best, is speculative and, at worst, is just plain blue-sky thinking. The Justice petition also charges that the merger would result in the possible elimination of ITT as an operator of numerous and extensive CATV systems which might eventually be capable of competing with conventional network broadcasting. Once again, this is speculative and if facts are of interest, they might like to know that there are almost 2,000 CATV stations in the United States today. ITT has interests in seven. I repeat—seven. I fail to see where seven CATV networks can be considered to be capable of competing with national network broadcasting. Perhaps my colleagues could enlighten me.

The Justice petition also claims that this merger would result in the possible elimination of ITT as an independent source of basic technological development which could lead to new systems of communications which might multiply channels of access to the public and provide the basis for new entrance into network broadcasting.

This, once again, is speculative. I would remind the critics of this merger that the Radio Corp. of America is very actively engaged in research and development in the broadcasting field, the results of which have been very beneficial to all broadcasters, even though the Radio Corp. of America owns the National Broadcasting Corp. 100 percent.

Questions have also been raised about purported large cash flows which would result to ITT from the merger. I would suggest that the critics who have seized upon this statement seek financial counsel from qualified sources to obtain a clearer meaning, in their minds, of the definition of cash flow. I would suggest that such things as capital investment, dividends, depreciation, and so forth, also be evaluated in their financial appraisal. I believe they may learn something.

The question of the objectivity of ABC's news and public affairs programming has been bandied about during these discussions. Signed statements from the presidents of both corporations involved have been received by the

Justice Department and the FCC which state that the news department of ABC will operate independently and will not be subjected to any editorial interference. According to these corporate officers, such action would be a violation of the American journalistic tradition. It would also be impossible because of the competitive pressure from the other networks.

By scoffing at such an explanation, the Justice Department and others are implying that the officers of two great corporations do not recognize the difference between truth and prevarication. This is a serious position to defend, and I would recommend that the interested parties in this case weigh their public statements extremely carefully before releasing them.

Finally, I would suggest that, if the Justice Department has any new and pertinent information concerning this merger, it make its information available at once. Otherwise, I strongly recommend that the merger go through as approved by the FCC and that this body and the administrative agencies of our Government get on with the work at hand.

WIESNER ON HOW TO CURB THE ARMS RACE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the most terrible and serious problem on earth is how to curb the arms race that threatens to shove us up to and over the gulf of a nuclear cataclysm that could destroy most of our population.

We discuss and debate this terrible issue too little. Unless we can solve this problem, everything else will evaporate into nothing.

But for the nondoctrinaire—the great majority of American citizens who reject alike the simple unilateral option to disarm now completely, on the one hand, and the simple decision to proceed full speed apace with the arms competition, on the other—this is a tough, agonizing, painful problem. Too many have simply become fatalists on the assumption that at least on this problem it is up to God alone and that for nuclear arms control we might as well forget that "God helps them who help themselves."

For this reason, it is good and heartwarming to read a superlative analysis by Jerome Wiesner of what nondoctrinaire people who dearly want both peace and freedom can do to activate arms control.

Mr. Wiesner is recognized as a thoroughly competent scientist, an adviser to three Presidents, and a man who has helped to develop some of the most deadly weapons.

Mr. Wiesner analyzes the problem simply and concisely. He capsulizes the Gaither report, authorized by President Eisenhower to examine our vulnerability to nuclear attack.

He discusses hopeful progress in dropping the arms race and sets forth a series of practical steps toward arms control, toward which we should work.

These proposals include steps recommended by the Panel on Arms Control and Disarmament of the White House Conference on the International Co-

operation Year, of which Mr. Wiesner was Chairman. They include, in addition to the nonproliferation treaty, on which progress seems to have been made recently between the United States and the Soviet Union, pledges by the nuclear powers not to attack or threaten to attack any nonnuclear nation; a treaty among the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union to cease production of nuclear materials; creation of nuclear-free zones in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East; a freeze on the construction of new missiles; a one-third cut in the number of existing nuclear weapons by the major powers—leaving all of them far more than enough to serve as a deterrent against attack; and a moratorium, for at least 3 years, on developing and deploying antiballistic missile systems, which could have an immense economic impact as well as escalating the arms race. I am delighted to see that President Johnson seems to be moving in that direction.

In addition to controlling the nuclear weapons race, the Panel recommended measures to curb the conventional arms race among underdeveloped nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the splendid article by Dr. Jerome Wiesner, entitled "We Can Curb World Arms Race Now," reported by the Associated Press and published in the Milwaukee Journal, from which I took it, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WE CAN CURB WORLD ARMS RACE NOW

(By Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner)

(One of America's most renowned scientists, provost of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, science adviser to three presidents and co-developer of deadly military weapons, believes the nations of the world must achieve disarmament. In this article, written for the Associated Press, the eminent scholar outlines the steps he believes can and should be taken to ward off "history's greatest catastrophe.")

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Throughout the world men dread the specter of an annihilating nuclear war—yet the arms race goes on and the prospect of controlling it grows dimmer with each year. But there is still time to reverse this suicidal trend. As a scientist long concerned with the technical problems of disarmament, I am convinced that it is completely feasible to design a safe and practical system to limit and control the arms race. And we can do it without endangering our national security in any way. On the contrary, our own security will be strengthened as the world becomes a safer place in which to live.

If this is so, why don't we begin?

Unfortunately, there are formidable barriers. For instance:

Most people, in and out of government, look on disarmament as a utopian dream. If everyone believes the arms race is impossible to control, that very fear will make it impossible.

There is no effective constituency for peace. In our own congress on the councils of other governments, military interests, veterans organizations and weapons producers all have their large constituencies and powerful lobbies. No equivalent groups are pressing the cause of disarmament.

Many people who do advocate disarmament demand that it be total disarmament, all at once. But the only way we will get universal disarmament in one giant step is as a result of World War III. The survivors

of a nuclear war will no doubt make it their first order of business to ensure that it doesn't happen again. I'd rather not wait.

We participate in disarmament conferences, but we don't try sufficiently to understand the attitude of other people, such as the Russians, in these complicated problems. If you can't understand what is worrying the other fellow, you will never be able to reach an agreement with him.

In our own strategy discussions, arms control measures are evaluated in terms of the most dangerous possibility, no matter how unlikely, with no consideration given to what will happen if we fail to halt the arms race.

Lastly, what started in Europe after World War II as a political confrontation between west and east has become a major military problem, a matter of controlling the arms race. As these political and military issues overlap, they prevent movement in either field. By reducing the military component of the confrontation we would immediately open up more areas for political accommodations.

But against all of these barriers in the way of disarmament we must remember that the price of failure to prevent another major war is unbelievable horror.

Wars have occurred in 20 to 30 to 40 year cycles. If we continue to rely on the traditional forms of international security arrangements, which have always failed us in the past, the odds are in favor of a major war within the next two decades.

SHIFTED ON ANTIMISSILES

In many ways, however, the situation is very different today—in good part because of the scientific revolution. I suggest that this same scientific approach can show us how to avoid war.

I came to my own interest in disarmament on purely technical grounds. It was an outgrowth, in fact, of my work on the development of military equipment.

During World War II and thereafter, I was deeply involved in the development of many types of military weapons, including air defense systems, radar, the nuclear bomb and ballistic missiles. Ironically, I played a major role in persuading the government to do research in the antiballistic missile system that I am now trying my best to keep it from deploying.

Though we have performed a major technical feat and created a system capable of intercepting ballistic missile warheads, the economics so favor the offense and there are so many ways for clever engineering to deceive the system that I have become convinced that we would gain very little security even if we installed a 10 or 20 billion dollar system.

In 1957, President Eisenhower appointed the Gaither study group to examine our vulnerability to nuclear attack. I became a member of that group.

The President's question was in effect: Assuming that a nuclear war was going to occur, what actions should the government take to protect the people and insure the survival of our society?

Put that way, the question clearly led to an answer calling for a vast shelter and active defense program.

GAITHER STUDY INSIGHTS

After careful study of the facts, however, it became clear to us that the issue was not that simple. Nuclear war was not a certainty, nor even highly likely, which meant that other questions had to be examined. What course of action had the greatest likelihood of avoiding war?

A number of insights emerged from the Gaither study.

1. No level of defense could prevent a determined and technologically capable enemy from killing vast numbers of people and destroying much of our country. If we were to spend half of our gross national product on defense preparations, we still could not

keep a nuclear war from being history's greatest catastrophe.

2. A massive civil defense program, necessarily creating great public excitement, would almost certainly increase the likelihood of war.

3. The longer the arms race went on, the more convinced other nations would be that the Soviet Union and the United States could not come to an agreement. Then several other nations would start to build nuclear weapons.

4. Whatever security we might achieve in an arms race involving nuclear weapons would come from maintaining an adequate deterrent force. The Gaither panel recommended measures to insure the existence of the American deterrent force. They seemed reasonable then, but time has since proven that they were based on highly exaggerated estimates of the threat posed by the Soviet Union.

It is now evident that up until the time of Cuba, or slightly later, the Soviets were content to rely upon a kind of minimal deterrent force for their own security. They never tried to match our bombing forces or our missile forces. We were wrong in our early belief that they were preparing a first strike against the United States. Lately, there has been some evidence that the Russians are building hardened, dispersed missiles and increasing the size of their force. There is also some evidence that they may be contemplating the deployment of defenses against our missile systems.

If the Soviet leaders have now chosen to attempt to match United States force size, and we respond by trying to prevent this, the arms race could become more intense than it has been in recent years.

Many people take a gloomy view of the possibility of achieving significant disarmament agreements because of the belligerence of the Chinese leaders. While I think one of the most important tasks is to improve our relations with China, I do not think that anything in the existing situation really prevents the United States and Russia from taking major disarmament steps. Each of us is militarily very much more powerful than China.

Actually, at the moment, the problem with China is a different one. With no operational nuclear force of her own, she feels threatened by ours and by that of the Soviet Union, and her actions are dominated by these fears. Our problem is to minimize China's fears.

Ultimately, I am certain that the Chinese will want to avoid the dangers and the great costs of a continuing arms race.

TWO HOPEFUL STEPS

All of my experiences in the study of disarmament have convinced me that it is possible to design a militarily secure system of arms limitation. It must be done gradually, which does not mean that it must take 50 years.

We have already taken two steps, the test ban treaty of 1963 which forbade atmospheric testing of nuclear devices, and the agreement approved by the UN last month banning the use of outer space for military purposes.

One little understood fact about modern armaments is that it takes a long time and a great effort to change the balance of military power in any major way. It takes years to develop a new missile system, and years more before it can be produced and deployed. Defensive systems are even more difficult to develop and require even longer.

This means that the likelihood of the surprise appearance of a completely installed and operational new weapons system is vanishingly small. There is essentially no possibility that the clandestine development or production of new weapons can threaten our security before being detected and countered.

The fantastic power of the nuclear weapons provides a high degree of stability. A

single one megaton bomb will devastate even the largest city; a very few bombs properly delivered will destroy the sinews of a nation. Consequently a few bombs, certain to be delivered, will constitute a powerful enough deterrent.

The large variation in deterrent force size that may be tolerated with safety and the long time required to make significant changes in weaponry—these provide an environment in which it is possible to reduce armaments with considerable self-assurance.

A year ago, I chaired the panel on arms control and disarmament of the White House Conference on International Co-operation Year. Our recommendations to President Johnson placed emphasis on measures to strengthen the United Nations.

The panel also recommended a nonproliferation treaty to prevent more nations from becoming nuclear powers. This treaty, under discussion right now, is perhaps the most important single step we could take at the moment. Blocking it, however, is the United States' confusion on the issue of sharing control over its European nuclear weapons with NATO, and the Russian refusal to sign a nonproliferation treaty if Germany, as a NATO country, shares in this control.

It appears that recently, while Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko was in the United States, the gap between United States and Soviet positions was closed somewhat and some officials are now predicting that the two countries will soon come to an agreement on this matter.

OTHER STEPS ADVISED

Among the other initial steps recommended by the disarmament panel were:

Pledges by the nuclear powers not to attack, or threaten to attack any non-nuclear nation.

A treaty among the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to cease production of nuclear materials.

Creation of nuclear free zones in Latin America, Africa and the middle east.

A freeze on the construction of new missiles.

A one-third cut in the number of existing nuclear weapons by the major powers—leaving all of them far more than enough to serve as a deterrent against attack.

A moratorium, for at least three years, on developing and deploying antiballistic missile systems. The prime reason for this recommendation is that a United States or Soviet ABM system would almost surely induce both superpowers to step up their respective "deterrent" capabilities. There is also a serious question of the military value of such defense systems.

In addition to controlling the nuclear weapons race, the panel recommended measures to curb the conventional arms race among underdeveloped nations.

If we could take even half of these actions, it would be a fantastically large step in the right direction.

None of these proposals would pose a security problem for the United States, or for any other nation.

The real threat lies in continuing the arms race.

HALT ARMS RACE OR FACE THREAT OF CATASTROPHIC WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, science adviser to three Presidents, has given us some food for thought in a special article written for the Associated Press and published Sunday in the Washington Evening Star. The article has been placed in the Record by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] preceding my remarks.

Dr. Wiesner has written of the arms race and of mankind's need to halt it or

to face the threat, within the next two decades, surely, of a catastrophic war. His article deals with the steps which can and should be taken. Some are simple, as he says, and some more difficult. But none would threaten the security of the United States for, as Dr. Wiesner writes:

The real threat lies in continuing the arms race.

Dr. Wiesner's precise warning and careful analysis of the arms race and its solution deserves our careful attention.

CORRECTION OF THE CALENDAR OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, my people came to the United States from Europe a little less than a century and a half ago. My grandfather came to California during the gold rush. My late beloved father was born in San Francisco well over a century ago; and I was born in Anaheim, Calif. My name is a good American name, like those of all the other good Americans in this Chamber—although I freely concede that many may mispronounce my name.

At any rate, Mr. President, I observe that under General Orders on the Calendar, Senate Resolution 7, which I introduced last week, purports to have been introduced by somebody whose name is spelled M-I-C-H-E-L.

Mr. President, I regret that an error may have crept into an official record of the Senate, particularly when I am quite proud that, together with some of my fellow Senators, Republican and Democrat, I sponsored Senate Resolution 7.

I therefore simply ask unanimous consent that the strange and singular name "Michel" be stricken, and that the name of the senior Senator from California be inserted in its place.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S ROLE IN CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have always been impressed by the wisdom of those philosophers who argue that isolated illogic is best left uncontested.

Reasonable people who have heard the offending remarks will already have dismissed them, and unreasonable people will not be impressed by even the most irrefutable rebuttal.

But recently a voice from the other side of the aisle suggested in a speech outside this Chamber that the President needs a stern lecture on civil rights.

The President was accused of giving this issue the "once-over-lightly" treatment in his state of the Union address. It was implied that he might be abandoning leadership in this field.

And the speaker's Republican colleagues were urged to seize leadership of the civil rights movement.

The last statement is certainly not an inappropriate one. There is certainly, the record will indicate, plenty of room for expansion of the Republican effort.

But to suggest that the President's role has been an inadequate one is to ignore some significant facts.

Any examination of Republican and Democratic efforts will reveal that a Shetland and a Percheron have been in double harness on this issue and now the pony is accusing the horse of not pulling its share of the load.

That is a rather flat statement, but I think the arithmetic of the rollcalls for the past 6 years here will indicate that he was quite restrained.

Those of us in politics grow used to criticism and learn after a time not to kick about it, but in this case a well-aimed hoof seems not inappropriate.

President Johnson probably does not need my rhetoric to establish his concern for human dignity and human rights.

His record speaks far more eloquently than mere words ever could. James Howell once said:

An acre of performance is worth a whole land of promise.

And President Johnson's leadership is based not on 1 acre, but many acres of performance.

The 1957 Civil Rights Act—the first major civil rights law in 82 years—was enacted by a Democratic Congress under Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson.

The 1960 Civil Rights Act was enacted by a Democratic Congress under the leadership of Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson.

The 24th amendment, which outlawed the poll tax in Federal elections, became part of the U.S. Constitution under President Lyndon Johnson.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson.

And just a year later, it was President Lyndon Johnson who signed the historic Voting Rights Act of 1965 into law.

The significance of these acts—and the diligence of their enforcement—is a matter of record. In the 17 months since the Voting Rights Act was passed, for example, Negro voter registration has risen 68 percent—from 687,000 to 1.17 million—in the five States where the act had its principal impact.

But these laws, as far reaching as they are, represent only the top of the iceberg. In every area of human welfare, Negroes have benefited from the leadership of the President: in housing, in education, in poverty programs, in health care, and in manpower retraining.

Wherever there is misery, wherever there is injustice, wherever there is despair, the Johnson administration and a Democratic Congress have acted—and acted boldly.

But now at least one Republican says we are abandoning the cause. He suggests that Democrats are drifting from the battlefield and suggests the Republicans now must take up the banner.

Well, there are enough banners to go around. We have extras we are willing and eager to issue any Republicans who want to join the skirmish line.

True, they are late on the field but they are welcome. I would be interested in knowing the numbers of reinforcements we can expect from that quarter.

I invite the critic's attention to the record—even at the risk that it will turn his exuberance into melancholia.

Four months ago, an influx of Repub-

lican troops could have saved a major civil rights bill right in this Chamber.

They could have helped us end discrimination in our jury system. They could have helped complete the desegregation of our schools. They could have helped end compulsory segregation in housing.

All these were part of the President's program in 1966. All these were in the bill that was defeated by filibuster. I am perhaps especially aware of these facts because I was floor manager of the bill, just as I was floor manager of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and an assistant floor manager of the 1964 bill.

I would like to offer the reminder that the key vote on the 1966 bill was on a cloture motion. At that time, 67 percent of Senate Democrats voted to bring the bill to the floor and 34 percent of the Republicans joined them.

The majority of Republicans voted to kill the bill and then went home to boast about it.

When it was time for action, civil rights indeed got the "once-over-lightly treatment"—but by the Republican Party, not the Democrats.

Have they had a change of heart? Great.

There will be ample chance to demonstrate it.

The Presidential state of the Union message included a call for the continuation of the struggle against inequality, and there will be a new civil rights bill this session.

We will listen carefully then to the ayes and nays.

There have always been a few courageous fighters for civil rights on the Republican side of the aisle—but they have been few in number among their colleagues.

Are the prorights troops swelling? Are reinforcements on the way? I would be delighted to see it. And if they join the field, they will not have to stoop to pick up the banners. Because no banners have fallen.

But we have plenty of new ones ready to be handed out.

OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today the President of the United States sent to the Senate a message on older Americans.

I believe that history will credit President Johnson with many great achievements. Certainly the list is already long and impressive. I am certain, moreover, that one achievement that will honor his name will be his victory over the forces of national smugness in a time of great prosperity and well-being.

He has taught us to be suspicious of the averages that document our prosperity—because for every American who brings those averages up, there is another, less fortunate, who holds them down.

He has forced us to look beneath the shining surface of our prosperity, and to discover that there are still millions among us who remain untouched by its blessings.

He has made us understand that, despite all the great advances of the past

35 years, far too many Americans still live on the outskirts of hope.

And today, this great President has nudged our consciences again. He has reminded us that the so-called golden years represent a dream that has never been achieved for millions of our older Americans.

That is a lesson we should never forget. For there is nothing "golden" about being poor after a lifetime of honest and productive labor.

There is nothing "golden" about being alone and forgotten after a lifetime of rich companionship.

There is nothing "golden" about being too feeble to care for yourself after a lifetime of caring for others.

There is nothing "golden" about being bored after a lifetime of meaningful activity.

Mr. President, the fact is that, after more than 30 years of social security benefits and after the passage of medicare, the plight of our senior citizens remains one of the most serious problems of our generation. And I congratulate President Johnson on his stirring and comprehensive call to action.

His message on older Americans is a major social document: original, perceptive, compassionate, and bold.

It calls for the most sweeping revisions of our social security laws since they were first enacted in 1935:

For larger cash benefits which—in a single stroke—will lift nearly a million and a half Americans above the poverty line.

For extended coverage, to include farmworkers, disabled widows under 62, and Government workers not eligible for civil service retirement benefits.

For an increase in the amount of exempted earnings allowed retirees.

And for an extension of medicare to include the million and a half disabled Americans under 65 who are now covered by social security and railroad retirement.

But the President's message calls for much more, besides.

It calls for improved nursing care, for improved housing programs, for increased job opportunities, and for vastly improved services for the elderly which will do so much to help enrich their lives.

Mr. President, President Johnson has clearly demonstrated to us why, even after all the progress we have made, we must not end our quest, as a nation, for a better life for these citizens. For, as he has so eloquently stated:

One of the tests of a great civilization is the compassion and respect shown to its elders.

I endorse the President's proposals as the best means to show that compassion and that respect. And I am confident that my colleagues will respond to those proposals in a way that will do honor to this Congress for generations to come.

THE CRISIS OF OUR CITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, no problem appears so massive and intractable for the 90th Congress as the need to find ways to deal with the crisis of our cities. The challenge, however, has begun to evoke its appropriate response.

New ideas, new concepts, new approaches are being discussed and debated both outside and inside the Congress.

The contributions of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, of New York, to this ongoing debate have been particularly noteworthy. His comments have consistently been informed and incisive; his proposals, imaginative but not unrealistic. Speaking as one who has been deeply involved in urban affairs for a good many years—and as one who had the good fortune to be the chief executive of a great city, Philadelphia, during its period of renaissance—I would hope that Senator KENNEDY's comments would be read and considered by the widest possible audience.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of Senator KENNEDY's statement of August 15, 1966, before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Senate, and the text of his remarks of December 10, 1966, at Bedford Stuyvesant, New York.

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

FEDERAL ROLE IN URBAN AFFAIRS—STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before your Subcommittee today. And I congratulate you for having undertaken to hold these hearings. An inquiry of this kind, in my judgment, is long overdue. I look forward to participating over the next three weeks in the hearings, but this morning I want to place a number of thoughts before the Subcommittee as it begins its study.

To say that the city is a central problem of American life is simply to know that increasingly the cities are American life; just as urban living is becoming the condition of man across the world. Everywhere men and women crowd into cities in search of employment, a decent living, the company of their fellows, and the excitement and stimulation of urban life.

Within a very few years, 80% of all Americans will live in cities—the great majority of them in concentrations like those which stretch from Boston to Washington, and outward from Chicago and Los Angeles and San Francisco and St. Louis. The cities are the nerve system of economic life for the entire nation, and for much of the world.

And each of our cities is now the seat of nearly all the problems of American life: poverty and race hatred, interrupted education and stunted lives, and the other ills of the new urban nation—congestion and filth, danger and purposelessness, which afflict all but the very rich and the very lucky.

To speak of the urban condition, therefore, is to speak of the condition of American life. To improve the cities means to improve the life of the American people. This is not to slight the importance of rural development. The very catalogue of problems that has accompanied the increasing urbanization of our nation bespeaks a need for renewed concentration on development outside the cities—both to ease the pressure of population growth on the cities, and to preserve the ability of our small towns and farms to contribute as they have in the past to our country's healthy growth. Rural development, then, must have a place on the national agenda; today, however, I would concentrate directly on the problems of the cities themselves and on the issues which the urban explosion has thrust before us.

What should we expect from our cities? A

great historian of urban life, Lewis Mumford, has written: "What makes the city in fact one is the common interest in justice and the common aim, that of pursuing the good life." He drew in turn upon Aristotle, who wrote that the city "should be such as may enable the inhabitants to live at once temperately and liberally in the enjoyment of leisure." If we add the objective of rewarding and satisfying work, we have a goal worthy of the efforts and work of this entire generation of Americans.

Therefore the city is not just housing and stores. It is not just education and employment, parks and theaters, banks and shops. It is a place where men should be able to live in dignity and security and harmony, where the great achievements of modern civilization and the ageless pleasures afforded by natural beauty should be available to all.

If this is what we want—and this is what we must want if men are to be free for that "pursuit of happiness" which was the earliest promise of the American nation—we will need more than poverty programs, housing programs and employment programs, although we will need all of these. We will need an outpouring of imagination, ingenuity, discipline and hard work unmatched since the first adventurers set out to conquer the wilderness. For the problem is the largest we have ever known. And we confront an urban wilderness more formidable and resistant and in some ways more frightening than the wilderness faced by the pilgrims or the pioneers.

The beginning of action is to understand the problem. We know riots are a problem. We know that poverty is a problem. But underneath these problems and all the others are a series of converging forces which rip at the fabric of life in the American city.

By city we mean not just downtown, or the central city, but the whole vast sprawling organism—covering dozens of communities and crossing state lines. It is not a political unit, but a living social and economic body—extending into suburbs and beyond into tens of thousands of outlying acres, to be covered all too soon with homes and shops and factories.

One great problem is sheer growth—growth which crowds people into slums, thrusts suburbs out over the countryside, burdens to the breaking point all our old ways of thought and action—our systems of transport and water supply and education, and our means of raising money to finance these vital services.

A second is destruction of the physical environment, stripping people of contact with sun and fresh air, clean rivers, grass and trees—condemning them to a life among stone and concrete, neon lights and an endless flow of automobiles. This happens not only in the central city, but in the very suburbs where people once fed to find nature. "There is no police so effective," said Emerson, "as a good hill and a wide pasture . . . where the boys . . . can dispose of their superfluous strength and spirits." We cannot restore the pastures; but we must provide a chance to enjoy nature, a chance for recreation, for pleasure and for some restoration of that essential dimension of human existence which flows only from man's contact with the natural world around him.

A third is the increasing difficulty of transportation—adding concealed, unpaid hours to the workweek; removing men from the social and cultural amenities that are the heart of the city; sending destructive swarms of automobiles across the city, leaving behind them a band of concrete and a poisoned atmosphere. And sometimes—as in Watts—our surrender to the automobile has so crippled public transport that thousands literally cannot afford to go to work elsewhere in the city.

A fourth destructive force is the concentrated poverty and racial tension of the urban ghetto—a problem so vast that the

barest recital of its symptoms is profoundly shocking:

Segregation is becoming the governing rule: Washington is only the most prominent example of a city which has become overwhelmingly Negro as whites move to the suburbs; many other cities are moving along the same road—for example, Chicago, which if present trends continue will be over 50 percent Negro by 1975. The ghettos of Harlem and Southside and Watts are cities in themselves, areas of as much as 350,000 people.

Poverty and Unemployment are endemic: from $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ of the families in these areas live in poverty; in some male unemployment may be as high as 40%; unemployment of Negro youths nationally is over 25%.

Welfare and dependency are pervasive: $\frac{1}{4}$ of the children in these ghettos, as in Harlem, may receive Federal Aid to Dependent Children; in New York City, ADC alone costs over \$20 million a month; in our five largest cities, the ADC bill is over \$500 million a year.

Housing is overcrowded, unhealthy and dilapidated: the last housing census found 43% of urban Negro housing to be substandard; in many of these ghettos, ten thousand children may be injured or infected by rat bites every year.

Education is segregated, unequal and inadequate: the high school dropout rate averages nearly 70%; there are academic high schools in which less than 3% of the entering students will graduate with an academic diploma.

Health is poor and care inadequate: infant mortality in the ghettos is more than twice the rate outside; mental retardation caused by inadequate prenatal care is more than seven times the white rate; $\frac{1}{2}$ of all babies born in Manhattan last year will have had no prenatal care at all; deaths from diseases like tuberculosis, influenza, and pneumonia are two to three times as common as elsewhere.

Fifth is both cause and consequence of all the rest. It is the destruction of the sense, and often the fact, of community, of human dialogue, the thousand invisible strands of common experience and purpose, affection and respect which tie men to their fellows. It is expressed in such words as community, neighborhood, civic pride, friendship. It provides the life-sustaining force of human warmth, of security among others, and a sense of one's own human significance in the accepted association and companionship of others.

We all share things as fellow citizens, fellow members of American nation.

As important as that sharing is, nations or great cities are too huge to provide the values of community. Community demands a place where people can see and know each other, where children can play and adults work together and join in the pleasures and responsibilities of the place where they live. The whole history of the human race, until today, has been the history of community. Yet this is disappearing, and disappearing at a time when its sustaining strength is badly needed. For other values which once gave strength for the daily battle of life are also being eroded. The widening gap between the experience of the generations in a rapidly changing world has weakened the ties of family; children grow up in a world of experience and culture their parents never knew. The world beyond the neighborhood has become more impersonal and abstract. Industry and great cities, conflicts between nations and the conquests of science move relentlessly forward, seemingly beyond the reach of individual control or even understanding. It is in this very period that the cities, in their tumbling spread, are obliterating neighborhoods and precincts. Housing units go up, but there is no place for people to walk, for women and their children to

meet, for common activities. The place of work is far away through blackened tunnels or over impersonal highways. The doctor and lawyer and government official is often somewhere else and hardly known. In far too many places—in pleasant suburbs as well as city streets—the home is a place to sleep and eat and watch television; but the community is not where we live. We live in many places and so we live nowhere. Long ago de Tocqueville foresaw the fate of people without community: "Each of them living apart is a stranger to the fate of all the rest—his children and his private friends constitute to him the whole of mankind; as for the rest of his fellow citizens, he is close to them, but he sees them not; he touches them but he feels them not . . . he may be said at any rate to have lost his country." To the extent this is happening it is the gravest ill of all. For loneliness breeds futility and desperation—and thus it cripples the life of each man and menaces the life of all his fellows.

But of all our problems, the most immediate and pressing, the one which threatens to paralyze our very capacity to act, to obliterate our vision of the future, is the plight of the Negro of the center city. For this plight—and the riots which are its product and symptom—threaten to divide Americans for generations to come; to add to the ever-present difficulties of race and class the bitter legacy of violence and destruction and fear.

The riots which have taken place—and the riots which we know may all too easily take place in the future—are therefore an intolerable threat to the most essential interests of every American, black or white,—to the mind's peace and the body's safety and the community's order, to all that makes life worthwhile. None of us should look at this violence as anything but destructive of self, community and nation. But we should not delude ourselves. The riots are not crises which can be resolved as suddenly as they arose. They are a condition which has been with us for 100 years and will be with us for many years more. We can deal with the crises without dealing with the underlying condition—just as we can give novocain to a man with a broken arm, without setting that arm in a splint; but the end result will only be more pain, pain beyond temporary relief, and permanent crippling of our urban society.

It is therefore of the utmost importance that these hearings go beyond the temporary measures thus far adopted to deal with riots—beyond the fire hoses and the billy-clubs; and beyond even sprinklers on fire-hydrants and new swimming pools as well. These hearings must start us along the road toward solutions to the underlying conditions which afflict our cities, so that they may become the places of fulfillment and ease, comfort and joy, the communities they were meant to be.

These hearings will of necessity examine the Federal Government's ability and will and determination to meet the domestic problems of this nation. That examination, I believe, will show that all of us have made many serious mistakes. It must nonetheless be faced with persistence and candor. For "there is no courage or discipline involved in following failure down the road to despair. Tragedy is a tool for the living to gain wisdom, not a guide by which to live."

First, it is clear that our present policies have been directed to particular aspects of our problems—and have often ignored or even harmed our larger purposes. For example, Federal housing and highway programs have accelerated the move of the middle-income families and business to the suburbs, while virtually ignoring the cities' needs for new revenue and declining tax base. Our welfare programs have helped people to subsist. But after thirty years of federal welfare programs, we have just begun our first effort to help these people

become independent of welfare. But this effort—the Work Experience Program of the Economic Opportunity Act—is so new and so meager that last year it managed to spend less than half of its \$160 million budget.

Our public housing has been built in the center cities, on our highest-cost land, further reinforcing the segregation of the city; in 1962, 80 percent of all Federally-assisted public housing projects were occupied solely by members of one race.

Public housing was once thought of as the answer to the problems of slums. Therefore it became another of those programs, addressed to some symptomatic shortcoming, which has ignored the wider problem, the other needed government action. Our housing projects were built largely without either reference or relevance to the underlying problems of poverty, unemployment, social disorganization and alienation which caused people to need assistance in the first place. Too many of the projects, as a result, become jungles—places of despair and danger for their residents, and for the cities they were designed to save. Many of them are preserved from this fate only by screening, such as is practiced in New York City, to keep the “problem” families—who of course are most in need of help—out of public housing projects, while families with incomes as high as \$9,000 a year may live there.

And therefore it has been, too often, a failure. For no single program, no attempted solution of any single element of the problem, can be the answer.

In recent years, education has come to be regarded as the answer; and last year, Congress enacted an historic program of education for the disadvantaged. But past efforts to improve life-conditions simply by the expenditure of more money on education have not been notably successful: a recent Brookings Institution study, I am advised, finds that in only five percent of all cases is there any observable correlation between increased expenditure on education in the ghetto and better jobs later in life. And the major study prepared for the Office of Education has also found that other factors—family, home, general environment and motivation—determine whether a child can benefit at all from the best schools we provide. Education has failed to motivate many of our young people because of what they could see around them: the sharply restricted opportunities open to the people of the ghetto, whatever their education. The Negro college graduate earns, in his lifetime, no more than a white man whose education ended at the eighth grade.

Now we have begun, with project Headstart, to reach further back toward infancy, in an effort to equalize educational opportunity where it counts most—at the beginning of life. But we have not carried that insight to its point of greatest importance; the family in which the child first finds itself, its vision of the world, shaping its response to all that follows for the full three-score and ten.

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 has 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”.

And here we come to an aspect of our cities' problems almost untouched by Federal action: the unemployment crisis of the Negro 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 . . . The gap between whites and nonwhites 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. . . .”

This Committee does not, in its usual jurisdiction, deal with problems of employment. But any attempt to discuss the problems of the cities, and the ghettos which presently threaten their future, cannot ignore the findings of the commission after commission, student after student, public official after public official. 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.

This should not be strange to us.

In an age of increasing complaints about the welfare state, it is well to remember that less than 25 percent of those living in poverty receive public assistance. We earn our living, support our families, purchase the comforts and ease of life with work. To be without it is to be less than a man—less than a citizen—hardly, in a real sense, to be a father or brother or son, to have any identity at all. To be without function, without use to our fellow citizens, is to be in truth the “invisible man” to whom Ralph Ellison wrote so eloquently—the man who John Adams said, a century and a half ago, suffers the greatest possible humiliation—“he is simply not seen.”

The crisis in Negro unemployment, therefore, is significant far beyond its economic effects—devastating as those are. For it is both measure and cause of the extent to which the Negro lives apart—the extent to which he is alienated from the general community. More than segregation in housing and schools, more than differences in attitudes or life-style, it is unemployment which marks the Negro of the urban ghetto off and apart from the rest of us—from Negroes who have jobs (including Negro leaders) almost as much as from whites. Unemployment is having nothing to do—which means having nothing to do with the rest of us.

It is a shocking fact—but it is a fact nonetheless—that we are literally unaware even of the existence of more than a million Negro Americans. Our census system—our Social Security system—and whole array of government computers which threaten to compile on some reel of tape every bit of information ever recorded on the people in this room—this system nowhere records the names or faces or identities of a million Negro men. Seventeen percent of Negro teenagers, thirteen percent of men in the prime working age of the thirties, are uncounted in our unemployment statistics, our housing statistics: simply drifting about our cities, living without families, as if they were of no greater concern to our daily lives than so many sparrows or spent matches.

Some are “found” in later life, when they may settle down. Some reappear in our statistics only at death. Others remind us of their presence when we read of rising crime rates. And some, undoubtedly, became visible in the riots which will be much dis- other program will be the extent to which

In my judgment, the question of employment and income is central to the solution of the problems of the city. But I do not stress it so strongly here because I believe it to be the only solution, or to be a solution by itself. There are and must be many other elements to any truly comprehensive defense (we are not in an attacking position) against the ills which afflict us. Rather I stress employment here for the following reasons:

First, it is the most direct and embarrassing—and therefore the most important—of our failures. Whatever people may feel about open housing or open schools—though I myself am deeply committed to both—still there can be no argument at all, no sense for even a committed segregationist, in the maintenance of Negro unemployment. Making sure men have jobs does not by itself mean that they will live with you, or that their children will go to school with you. It does not mean, in the long run, higher taxes or welfare costs; indeed, it means far less, and lessened costs of crime and crime prevention as well. It means the use of unused resources, and greater prosperity for all. Meeting the unemployment problem can only be to the benefit of every American of every shade of opinion.

But we have not done it.

Second, employment is the only true long-run solution; only if Negroes achieve full and equal employment will they be able to support themselves and their families, become active citizens and not passive objects of our action, become contributing members and not recipients of our charity. This is not to say that education, for example, is not critical to future employment and self-sufficiency; of course it is. But it is to say that unless we achieve employment, by whatever means or programs, we will never solve the problem. People with jobs can buy or rent their own housing; people with adequate incomes can see that their children are educated; people with jobs can mark out their own relationships with their fellows of whatever color. But without employment, without basic economic security and self-sufficiency, any other help we provide will be only temporary in effect.

Third, there are government programs which seem at least to have some promise of ameliorating, if not solving, some of the other problems of the Negro and the city. But no government program now operating gives any substantial promise of meeting the problem of Negro unemployment in the ghetto. The Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Economic Development Act—these and similar efforts have been going on for five years. Yet in those same five years, while family income nationwide was increasing 14 percent, and family income of Negroes nationwide was increasing 24 percent, family income in Watts dropped by 8 percent. Just from last June to this, says the Labor Department, 950,000 new jobs were created for young men—but only 33,000, about 3.7 percent, went to Negroes—so that Negro youth unemployment is still, at a very minimum, 26.9 percent. A Labor Department spokesman explained that Negro youth “just don't have the connections.”

That remark sums up what is wrong with our cities. It capsules as well the consequences of our past errors of omission and commission. And it sets the agenda for a program for the cities today.

The program must contain certain elements.

It must attack the fundamental pathology of the ghetto—for unless the deprivation and alienation of the ghetto are eliminated, there is no hope for the city. And it must attack these problems within a framework that coordinates action on the four central elements: employment, education, housing, and a sense of community.

This is not to say that other problems and

programs are not important—questions of police relations, recreation, health and other services, and the thousands of other factors that make life bearable or a thing of joy. It is to say that these other questions can only be properly dealt with in concert with action on the major problems. A police force, for example, can exert every possible effort, and imagination, and will to better relations with the community. But it still must enforce the law. And if the conditions of the ghetto produce stealing—for which people must be arrested—or non-payment of rent—for which people must be evicted, even if they have no place to go—then the police will inevitably bear the brunt of the ghetto's resentment at the conditions which the police, through no fault of their own, enforce. For another example, recreation is good and necessary for all of us. But a donated swimming pool will not replace an absent father; nor will it produce income for that father's son, who may have to steal a pair of swimming trunks to use the pool.

Libraries are for those who can read, and sports for those strong enough to participate in them. Each strand we pick up leads us further into the central web of life, coming closer to every other thread of thought and action. The web must be grasped whole.

Earlier this year I proposed one program which I believe combines the necessary elements, satisfies the essential criteria, and offers some hope of success, in dealing with our urban condition. Many of its elements are not new; almost every facet could be carried out under existing federal authority. It is a plan which is wholly consistent with the aims of the demonstration cities bill that will come to the Senate Floor this week, the enactment of which I strongly support. That bill, more than any other legislation which has come to the floor of the Senate, is based on the need to grasp the web whole, to attack all of the problems in a coordinated, interrelated way. My proposal is one of the ways in which the demonstration cities legislation and other federal authority now existing can be put to specific and detailed use, depending on the form which local initiative takes in applying these federal programs. It is by no means the only plan that will work, or the only plan worth trying; I believe it to be one of many which we must try in the hope that some will succeed, in greater or lesser degree. Still it is a plan which I believe is eminently worth trying, and which illustrates the kind of stimulating and coordinating effort which is required under any plan.

The plan begins with a perspective: that questions of technical or surface integration are far less important now than is the building of self-sufficiency and self-determination within the Negro community; in fact, that what is too often an undifferentiated mass must be helped to form a coherent and cohesive community. Thus it is important that Negroes who have achieved financial and social security should have complete freedom to choose where to live. But it is far more important that the vast majority of Negroes be enabled to achieve basic financial and social security where they live now. It will be the work of years, and of all Americans, white and black, to decide whether most people will live in substantially homogeneous neighborhoods. But there should be no question that black neighborhoods, as well as white, should be places of security and dignity and achievement and comfort.

The plan I have proposed, then, is as follows. I describe it to the Committee in detail because, with the demonstration cities legislation now before Congress, the Committee will no doubt want to consider the priorities among its potential applications, particularly as they relate to existing programs. The Committee, I would suggest, will want to consider not only the various approaches to the Federal role in helping to revitalize the ghetto—of which my proposal

is but one—but also the Federal role in dealing with the other, broader urban problems which I mentioned at the beginning of my testimony, and which I shall discuss briefly again at the conclusion. But I would concentrate now on my proposal for the ghetto.

It begins with a base of employment, in a vastly expanded and accelerated program of urban reconstruction. Our cities are in dire need of rebuilding, especially at the core: in spite of the largest slum clearance and rebuilding program in the United States, the number of unsound housing units in New York, for example, increased from 420,000 in 1960 to 520,000 in 1965. In most major cities, great stocks of housing built to accommodate the influx of migrants, from rural areas and abroad, in the early part of this century are long overdue for rehabilitation or replacement.

Our public facilities are in similar need of repair. In New York City, for example, the Commissioner of Hospitals said even before Medicare that the city-owned hospitals alone required \$50 million worth of renovation in each of the next ten years; and the dozens of private hospitals are in similar need. Center city schools and colleges are notorious for the physical deterioration of their physical plant.

Our cities' beaches are polluted and parklands eroded, parks and playgrounds inadequate to the minimum demands of our people.

And in the coming years, these needs will multiply almost beyond measure. Just in the next forty years, the urban population of the United States will double—which means we must build homes and hospitals, schools and shops and factories, roads and railways and airports, equal to everything we have managed to build in the two hundred years of this republic.

The Labor Department estimates that even without major government stimulation, employment in construction will expand more rapidly than in any other field in the next ten years. Given, then, the known needs of the next four decades, it is clear that if we begin now, with proper initiative and stimulation, to repair the decay of the past and meet the needs of the future, we can create hundreds of thousands of new jobs directly, and through the new demands stimulated by this addition, millions more indirectly.

But let us not make the mistake of regarding these just as jobs; and let us not erect buildings for their own sake. Our needs, and the programs we will now undertake to meet them, are in fact an opportunity to make every government program, and many private efforts, more effective than ever before. In any program of rebuilding now begun, therefore, I urge the following:

First. Priority in employment on these projects should go to residents of the areas in which they are undertaken. The fathers and young men of Harlem need work—and this is the best kind of work we could possibly offer them.

For this is man's work—work which is dignified, which is hard and exacting, which is at the same time rewarding to the man who does it and rewarding to the community around him. Much of it is work which can be done by unskilled workers, who now have the most difficult time finding jobs; but in such a program there would be jobs of all kinds, including those requiring administrative and managerial skills.

Creating these jobs would say to the residents of Harlem that there is hope—that there is a future—that all of us are truly determined to change the conditions under which they live. In my judgment, it is not too much to say that the ready availability of jobs in Harlem would make a major change in the entire environment in which its young people grow up.

Second. Public and private training programs should concentrate their funds and their efforts in on-the-job training on these

projects. Not only will job training be needed to make initial employment possible for many of the ghetto's residents; just as important, the availability of jobs will make many of our training programs more meaningful than they have been before. Construction work has traditionally been taught through a system of apprenticeship—which means a 1-to-1 teacher-student ratio, a system of learning by doing, a system in which learning has immediate rewards and the relationship of skill to increased earning power is clear. In a very real sense, these projects could be a vast new educational institution—teaching skills, but teaching pride of self and pride of craft as well.

Third. Our conventional educational system should be directly integrated with the rebuilding effort; for many of our most serious educational problems, there is real hope of solution within such a program.

The central problem of motivation, for example, would be directly confronted. Any high school student who so desired—whether for financial or other reasons—could be allowed to leave school to work on such a project. The schools would maintain jurisdiction over these students; and they would, as a condition of employment, be required to continue schooling at least part time until the requirements for graduation were met. In fact, all jobs on these projects should require part-time study to remedy educational deficiencies, and advancement on the job should be directly related to school credits gained, just as it is in the Armed Forces. Without the need to discipline unmotivated students, the schools would find it far easier to educate students who wish to learn. And the young men who work on these projects will learn that the ability to read a blueprint or a specification is worth returning to school to acquire.

Indeed, it would be possible to open up new opportunities for every level of education. A young man showing supervisory abilities, for example, should be encouraged to study business or public administration at the college level, either part time or full time. Strawbosses should be able to become superintendents, and perhaps receive engineering training. Appropriate branches of city and State universities could be established in the immediate neighborhood to allow maximum participation in this process.

Fourth. Present social service programs, particularly welfare, should be integrated with the rebuilding effort. The program I envision would make it possible for families to turn dependence into self-sufficiency; but we must work to make possibilities into fact—for example, by using a man's new employment as an aid to reuniting him with his family. For another example, the rebuilding program should focus in significant degree on unmet social needs—such as by constructing clinics and physicians' group practice facilities in the ghettos, which are notoriously short of medical services.

Using the building program as a base, occupational opportunities and training should be opened up in all related ways. As building takes place, for example, some should learn and then operate building-supplies businesses; small furniture manufacturing establishments; and other neighborhood shops. As health clinics are established young people should be trained as medical aids. Buildings should be decorated and embellished by art students; housing should contain facilities in which students of music and drama could put on entertainments.

It should be clear that the possibilities of such a program are limited only by our imagination and daring. For it does no more—and no less—than apply to the needs of the ghetto the same entrepreneurial vision which has brought the rest of us to our present state of comfort and strength.

And to fulfill that entrepreneurial vision—to bring the people of the ghetto into full participation in the economy which is

the lifeblood of America—it will be necessary to create new institutions of initiative and action, responding directly to the needs and wishes of these people themselves. This program will require government assistance, just as nearly all American growth has depended on some government assistance and support. But it cannot and should not be owned or managed by government, by the rules and regulations of bureaucracy, hundreds of miles away, responding to a different constituency.

The measure of the success of this or any other program will be the extent to which it helps the ghetto to become a community—a functioning unit, its people acting together on matters of mutual concern, with the power and resources to affect the conditions of their own lives. Therefore the heart of the program, I believe, should be the creation of Community Development Corporations, which would carry out the work of construction, the hiring and training of workers, the provision of services, the encouragement of associated enterprises.

Such corporations might be financed along these lines: they would receive an initial contribution of capital from the federal government; but for their ongoing activities, they should need and receive no significantly greater subsidy than is ordinarily available to nonprofit housing corporations under present law. As with all other housing and commercial construction, the bulk of the funds would come as loans from the great financial institutions—banks, insurance companies, corporations. Government would enter by way of the common devices of loan repayment insurance, some subsidization of the interest rate, and in some cases, assistance in the acquisition of land.

These Community Development Corporations, I believe, would find a fruitful partnership with American industry; many firms, of which U.S. Gypsum is perhaps the farthest along, have actively undertaken the search for ways to bring the ghetto into the national economic market. Loans and technical cooperation from industry and commerce; trained manpower and organization from labor unions; academic and educational partnership with the Universities; funds for education and training such as those provided under many present federal programs; these would be resources thus far unknown to the ghetto, resources sufficient to mount a real attack on the intertwined problems of housing and jobs, education and income.

But a further and critical element in the structure, financial and otherwise, of these corporations should be the full and dominant participation by the residents of the Community concerned. Through purchase of cooperative and condominium apartments; through subscription to equity shares; through receiving part of their pay on these projects in equity shares, such as has been done in farsighted private enterprises such as Sears, Roebuck—in these ways, residents of the ghettos could at once contribute to the betterment of their immediate conditions, and build a base for full participation in the economy—in the ownership and the savings and the self-sufficiency which the more fortunate in our nation already take for granted.

Such Corporations, each devoted to improving the conditions of a single community, could go far to changing, perhaps in revolutionary ways, our techniques for meeting urban needs—for developing and coordinating the many services and facilities, necessities and comforts, which community living requires. For example, there is in the entire area of Watts, not one movie theatre; and the notorious lack of public transportation between Watts and the rest of the city makes theatres elsewhere virtually unavailable to most of the area's residents. A corporation with minimal capital, engaged in and experienced in construction work, could build a theatre and either lease it out

for operation or operate it as a community venture, with revenues paying off the mortgage—thus creating, at once employment and recreation for the community. For another example, medical care is a more pressing need in many ghettos. But a Community Development Corporation could build the facilities—and carry the cost—of a physicians' group practice facility in a housing project, and rent the completely furnished offices to young, active practitioners.

The point is that—in the supposed interests of efficiency—we have thus far provided municipal services only on a city-wide basis: using the same kind of organizational structure whether the city had two thousand people or two million. This technique has proved unable to meet the special needs of the ghetto, and should now be replaced by a system which allows a recognizable community to organize and secure those services which meet its own unique needs. But we may well find that this system would have benefits for nondeprived neighborhoods within the city—allowing each to determine what kind of services, recreational facilities, perhaps even what kind of zoning and planning it will have. At least for matters of immediate neighborhood concern these Community Development Corporations might return us part way toward the ideals of community on a human scale which is so easily lost in metropolis; but as Jefferson said when describing a somewhat similar institution, "elementary republics of the wards," which he urged, "begin them only for a simple purpose; they will soon show for what others they are the best instruments."

One purpose for which they must be an instrument, however, and one purpose which must be served by every aspect of the program I have proposed, or any other program—is to try to meet the increasing alienation of Negro youth. In a sense, young urban Negroes are only a particular case of a situation which prevails all over the world—a gap between generations so broad and deep that it can lead to the most fundamental rejections of society by the young, or the most terrible revolutions in society, worked by the young. Here in America, white young people as well as Negroes are finding their own answers, their own paths to the future which is theirs. And this is as it should be; the future is theirs, though it may be very different from what we would wish for ourselves. But among Negro youth we can sense, in their alienation, a frustration so terrible, an energy and determination so great, that it must find constructive outlet or result in unknowable danger for us all. This alienation will be reduced to reasonable proportions, in the end, only by bringing the Negro into his rightful place in this nation. But we must work to try and understand, to speak and touch across the gap, and not leave their voices of protest to echo unheard in the ghetto of our ignorance.

I would here stress again that this plan holds no unique virtue; others have been and will be proposed, and all should be carefully and thoughtfully considered. I have gone into this one in detail because it is only in the careful delineation of a full program that we can begin to appreciate the infinite connections between what we are prone to think of as separate matters; and to appreciate as well the consequences of those connections for the organization of the federal government's approach to the problem. I have gone into this in detail, too, because I believe it indicates some components of the local initiative that will be required if the demonstration cities program is to have any substantial impact. And I would stress that even if my proposal were to be adopted, it would require other elements of many kinds to be successful—such as a major program of federal technical assistance to city police forces as they struggle with the critical problems of law enforcement under conditions created by a whole society.

For all these programs, of course, there is a question of cost. For if it is true that existing federal authority exists to carry out almost every part of this program, yet it is equally true that present levels of appropriations will cut back on existing programs, and leave little room for new demonstration projects. And certainly the present budget, and the shortage of building credit, contain no room for the implementation of such a program on the immediate and massive scale required. Can we then spend more?

The evidence is clear that we can—as it is clear that we must. Our gross national product, in the last year, increased by \$40 billion, soaring over \$720 billion. The demands of Viet Nam, purportedly responsible for the cutbacks in vital education, housing, and poverty programs, in fact still represent less than 3 percent of our national product; all military expenditures, even with the expected supplemental after the elections, still take less than 10 percent of the gross national product.

Our growth is so great that in two years, at present levels of taxation, federal tax revenues will be \$10 to \$14 billion greater than in 1966. By 1970, another \$11 to \$15 billion will be added, by 1975, a total of \$50 to \$75 billion over this year.

But with the growth in revenue, and even with the expenditures in Viet Nam, the federal government today is spending a smaller proportion of our gross national product than it did three years ago. If we did no more, made no greater proportional effort than we did in the early 1960's, we would add \$6 billion to our annual spending immediately.

We will spend this year, for the economic development of the 15 million people of South Viet Nam, \$600 million. But federal poverty, educational, and employment assistance to the same number of people in the metropolitan New York area will be less than one-sixth that amount. The people of South Viet Nam need this assistance. But so do people in the United States. And we can do both.

The financial question should be explored in this hearing, for it has the most direct and fundamental relevance to the problems of the city. Necessary as that exploration is, however, it should not be allowed to obscure the more fundamental question; do the agencies of government have the will and determination and ability to form and carry out programs which cut across departmental lines, which do not fit on organization charts, which are tailored to no administrative convenience but the overriding need to get things done? If we lack this central ability, then vast new sums will not help us. The demonstration cities proposal is a creative beginning, but it must be followed up by a demonstration of this critical ability to get things done, or the sums needed will not be forthcoming.

This has been a discussion primarily of the problems of the ghetto, since I believe that solution of those problems is essential to resolving the crisis of the cities. But the ghetto is by no means the only problem. An enormous range of action and imagination is urgently needed if we are to improve the life of urban America.

If Congress is to play its proper role in building and rebuilding the American city, we should know not only what must be done now but we must ascertain the requirements of the next decade and the years after that. And we must enact long-term legislation to give states, cities and the executive branch of the Federal government the chance to prepare long-range programs with some assurance of continued support and authority.

To prepare for this needed action, I propose that Congress request the Executive Branch, using its own resources and outside experts and scholars, to prepare a comprehensive report on urban problem areas. Senator Muskie has introduced legislation

which proposes to obtain some of the information that I would seek, and his bill deserves careful consideration. The report for which I call should explain what is now being done at every level in every branch of government, describe the planned activity of the national government over the next several years, and tell us what should be done if we are to mount an effort to improve life in the cities and maintain its quality for the future. It should examine as well the appropriate relationship and division of responsibility among Federal, State and local government, and private groups. Such a report should not be limited by budgetary consideration. Although such matters are important, rather it should describe the nature and scale of the program which can do the job that needs to be done so that the Congress may share in the choice among competing demands for our national effort and resources. I personally believe we can do what is needed. I know it is of the greatest urgency to our health as a nation that we try. But even if we cannot do all that is required, we must know where we are falling short. Such a report should be presented to the Congress within the next 12 months.

The report should cover, I think, the following problems:

First, we must find a way to deal with the city as it really is—a huge and sprawling organic unit—rather than as a collection of political jurisdictions whose boundaries bear little relation to either the problems or hopes for progress. We might well consider a Marshall Plan approach to the American city. Large amounts of assistance for metropolitan needs such as schools, water supply, homes and parks would be made available to those metropolitan areas which developed long-range programs for development reconstruction, community facilities, housing and future growth designed to serve the needs of the entire metropolitan area. This does not mean eliminating the existing structure of Government. It does mean cooperation and a broad sensible program as a condition of Federal assistance. Under such an approach the Federal Government might provide training and technical assistance to help cities prepare such programs.

We would hope to emerge with a program which would tie together innumerable scattered and fragmented efforts and direct them toward a coherent program for the redevelopment and growth of the modern city. Much of the resources and some basic standards would be federal. But initiative and effort would originate at the local level with ample freedom for experiment, difference and innovation. As the Marshall Plan helped to create modern Europe, we might in this way help to create the city of tomorrow. This, in broad outline, is the aim of the metropolitan development title of the demonstration cities bill, and its passage will be a good beginning in this area.

There may be other approaches. But it is clear that we must now try to deal with the city as a living, functioning whole if it is to be a place where all the citizens can live a good life.

Second, we must learn how to accomplish increased coordination of Federal programs. Our aim is not just to build homes or schools or hospitals. It is to construct neighborhoods and communities. All of our many programs scattered through several departments of Government should be focused on the central objective. Thus the organization of the program for the cities is of urgent concern.

Third, we must find methods of land use and development to deter the frantic speculation which encourages suburban blight and often the construction of new suburban slums. We should be sure there is space for recreation and for beauty, that the integrity of the recreation areas is preserved and that

transportation requirements are met. There are techniques of legislation and taxation which might well be effective in carrying out this purpose. For example, advance acquisition of undeveloped land by cities and states could be financed to insure open space as the city grows. And taxation might be keyed to real and future value so as to discourage soaring and unreal prices.

Fourth, we must discover how to coordinate and expand housing programs so that we build neighborhood communities rather than blocks and units. This may mean increased stress on rehabilitation of existing housing. It will mean that housing projects should be undertaken on a scale large enough to include facilities for recreation, health and community activities within the projects, so that much of daily life can be conducted within a circle of friends, associates and neighbors. This is one of the basic aims of the demonstration cities bill, and of the proposal for the ghetto which I outlined previously.

Fifth, we must find a way to keep our suburbs from becoming isolated and sterile islands within the larger city. It should be possible for people of every income level to choose suburban living, so these communities can be enriched by the association with some of the marvelous diversity of American life; and so that citizens are not walled off from the people and problems of their own city. This need not and should not diminish the pleasure people have found in suburban living. For if we move to assure adequate education and employment to all our people, no community could suffer by the addition of new groups of neighbors. Patterns of zoning which encourage such variety might well be part of a long-range program agreed upon by the metropolitan area.

Sixth, we should dramatically increase the scale of urban conservation, making parks and places to play freely available to all the citizens of the city, ending the ruinous poisoning of our air and water, and giving every citizen a chance for some contact with nature and beauty in his daily life. The open space program, and land and water conservation funds could be extended and expanded in their application to the cities. Whatever the approach, it should not be necessary to drive miles over congested highways to see natural beauty. Nature must be brought to the city dweller so that it is a part of his life, and not an occasional pleasure for the economic middle class.

Seventh, the proposed commission on codes, zoning, tax policy, and development standards should be activated immediately and its conclusions made a part of the report to Congress. Funds for this commission were included in the appropriation passed last week by the Senate; its work should proceed forthwith. The enormous, varied and often national pattern of housing codes, property taxes, and zoning restrictions is potentially—if both enforced and wisely drafted—one of the most powerful tools for remaking the face of urban America. Here, too, the decisions must be left, as they have historically been left, to local governments. But our cities should have a clear idea of the impact and occasional damage of existing laws on urban life, and they should receive the benefit of a thoughtful and thorough examination of how these laws can be designed to meet our common problems. It may even be possible to design a series of modern statutes—as we have done with commercial law and even with criminal codes—for the consideration of local governments which lack the resources to make such a vast study themselves.

Eighth, we must redesign our whole confused system of urban transportation so that people can travel to work, to theatres and places of recreation rapidly and efficiently. An important part of this should be revised patterns of the flow of automobiles into our

cities, a flow which creates congestion and danger, eats up enormous amounts of city land and poisons the air. Either the city will master the problem of the motor car or become its slave. Suburban highways and expressways also should be planned so as to maintain the physical integrity of the community and, at the very least, make it safe for children to go outdoors to play. This is a large and complex problem. New technology is offering new possibilities. But subways, streets, buses and trains must make up a coherent system which allows people to move in relative ease at a minimum cost in the quality of the urban environment. The expanded Mass Transit program which is before the Senate this week will make funds available for the first time for some of these planning and design efforts. But the scope of the problem quite obviously transcends even the \$225 million a year which that program will now be authorized to offer. The report for which I call would give us the magnitude of the entire problem as the basis for our future action.

Ninth, we should conduct research into urban problems on a scale equal to both the need and the possibilities. The Federal government has invested heavily in widening our scientific knowledge and human welfare. We have done very little to find new technologies and techniques for improving our cities. I would like to see a proposed program of research covering everything from new methods of home construction to the desirability of such bold ideas as the construction of entirely new satellite cities. We have done only a fraction of what we could do to bring the ingenuity and intelligence of this country to bear on our most vital domestic problems.

Tenth, we must find a way of coping with the severe shortage of professional urban development manpower at the local level. Without such personnel, our cities will be permanently limited in their ability to digest and utilize available federal aid. We need a permanent system to aid state and local government in training personnel. Such a program is authorized by law, but an attempt to provide adequate funds for it was defeated just last week in the Senate.

Nor should the Executive Branch be acting in a vacuum in preparing the report I have suggested. We in Congress should be prepared to consider the adequacy of our own organization to deal with urban problems. In the Senate, the matters which the New Department of Housing and Urban Development is supposed to coordinate are split among the Banking and Currency Committee, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and the Commerce Committee. It is time we had an Urban Affairs Committee—or at least an appropriate subcommittee—to which those who are concerned about our cities could look for Senate leadership in the development of a coordinated and rational approach to these matters. In these circumstances I believe it was particularly constructive of you, Mr. Chairman, to undertake these hearings. You have stepped into what really amounts to an organizational vacuum here in the Senate, and I congratulate you once again for your imagination and courage in having done so.

These are but a few suggestions. They are neither complete nor comprehensive, but they do give, I believe, some idea of the staggering complexity and scope of the effort needed not merely to attack the obvious afflictions but also the entire urban condition. We do not only want to remedy the ills of the poor and oppressed—though that is a huge and necessary task—but to improve the quality of life for every citizen of the city, and in this way to advance and enrich American civilization itself. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the committee this morning, and I hope these remarks will be helpful to it as it proceeds.

TEXT OF REMARKS OF SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1966, BEDFORD STUYVESANT

"If men do not build," asks the poet, "how shall they live?"

That is the question millions of men and women all over America ask themselves—ask us—every day: every day of idleness, of uselessness, every "day that follows day, with death the only goal."

That is the question, indeed, of life in the American city in years to come. In city after city, we have felt the pain of infections too long left festering—idleness and ignorance, rats and disease and hopelessness. Yet even as we become more aware of the injustice, indeed the danger of serious convulsion in our urban order, our efforts to right injustice, to open opportunity, to build better lives for all our people—all these efforts have faltered and slowed.

For our past efforts to deal with the problems of our cities have not worked; their promise failed, their purpose flagged.

We have seen families on welfare rolls, their husbands and fathers and sons idle, when we knew they should be at work—but our job-training programs too often have not resulted in jobs, and the unemployment rolls have gone up, not down, in Harlem and Watts and Southside Chicago.

We have seen housing dilapidated and deteriorating, and we knew children should not grow up in such conditions—but too often our public housing projects have turned into slums, and urban renewal relocated families into deeper misery elsewhere.

We have seen children three years behind in reading, and known that lack of education would blight the whole course of their lives—but our education bills, passed with great fanfare and hope, have not educated the children.

The Economic Opportunity Act, the War on Poverty, for all its major accomplishments, has sometimes been mired in the guerilla skirmishes of local politics, and not always relevant to the greatest needs of those it aimed to serve.

And failure and disillusionment have fed on themselves, bringing further discontent and dissatisfaction to large numbers of people throughout the country.

But even in the face of discouragement and disillusion, we must maintain our commitment to act—to dare—to try again. The plight of the cities—the physical decay and human despair that pervades them—is the great internal problem of the American nation, a challenge which must be met. The peculiar genius of America has been its ability, in the face of such challenges, to summon all our resources of mind and body, to focus these resources, and our attention and effort, in whatever amount is necessary to solve the deepest and most resistant problems. That is the commitment and the spirit required in our cities today.

And that is the spirit of this community, the spirit that is here today. Bedford-Stuyvesant, like other areas in the great cities all over America, has serious problems. This is a community in which thousands of heads of families, and uncounted numbers of young people, sit in idleness and despair; a community with the highest infant mortality rate in the city, one of the highest in the nation; in which hundreds of buildings are abandoned to decay, while thousands of families crowd into inadequate apartments. This is also a community long by-passed and neglected by government—receiving almost nothing out of the hundreds of millions of dollars the federal government gave to the city over two decades, unable to secure a single urban renewal grant in ten years of trying.

But for all these difficulties, the spirit of Bedford-Stuyvesant has lived, the community has survived.

These are not people who give up, even through years and decades of outside neglect

and unconcern. People like Pop Stewart, who has meant so much to generations of children; or Arthur Dummeyer, who testified so brilliantly before the Senate of the United States; or Claude Cain and Edith Sealy or Alfred and Pearl Pain, who sat through long hours of meetings working for urban renewal; or men like Zeke Clements, creating a community of sport here—with their spirit, any material poverty can be overcome. Here is the strength of Bedford-Stuyvesant, strength on which all of us will rely in the months and years to come.

For the last eight months, I have had the privilege of seeing and working with people like this at first hand.

Eight months ago, we found our views on the crisis before us to be in close correspondence. You through a manifesto of the Central Brooklyn Coordinating Council, and I in a series of speeches on the urban crisis, each proposed programs to meet this crisis in a comprehensive and coordinated effort, involving the resources and energies of government, of private industry, and of the community itself.

We urged that the necessary program begin with physical reconstruction—because it is needed for its own sake, to provide decent and pleasant homes and neighborhoods; but more importantly as a base and focus for the creation of jobs—well-paying, dignified work, trades and skills which will be useful for a lifetime. Indeed, we set our aim as a vital, expanding economy throughout the community—creating jobs in manufacturing and commerce and service industries.

On this basis of employment, we proposed the creation of new educational opportunities of many kinds:

Special supplementary education for workers, to help them raise their skill levels, and move into advanced career fields;

Extension courses in the area, from basic reading to college credit, so that every member of the community could reach his full potential;

And education in the basic skills of urban living—dealing with government agencies, or furniture stores, or the corner grocery.

And we urged the reconstruction of social services, and their integration with the rebuilding effort—for example, reorganizing medical services around neighborhood clinics built and managed by the people of the neighborhoods.

Through the fabric of all program components, as I emphasized in all my statements, run three critical threads:

Cooperation with the private business community in self-sustaining, economically viable enterprises;

Integration of programs for education, employment and community developments under a coordinated overall plan;

And impetus and direction to be given in these efforts by the united strength of the community, working with private foundations, labor unions, and universities, in Community Development Corporations organized for this purpose.

These, in brief, were the programs we proposed. But more important than any material component, you were determined that all this would come, these changes would happen, not by fiat from Washington; not from the offices of a President or a Senator or a Mayor; but from the work and effort of the Bedford-Stuyvesant community. You knew that what is given or granted can be taken away, that what is begged can be refused; but that what is earned is kept, that what is self-made is inalienable, that what you do for yourselves and for your children can never be taken away.

But how was all this to come about? How were the dreams and the fine plans to become reality?

That was the question we asked eight months ago—and it was the question we set out to answer. For these long months, we have met and planned and worked together, in our offices and in our homes and in the

YMCA. Members of my staff, officials of government departments, university professors and dedicated volunteers—all these have come to Bedford-Stuyvesant, have gone away with new awareness of the problems we face, and have come back with constructive suggestions for plans and programs. More important, there has been a commitment by the men and women of Bedford-Stuyvesant; spending their nights and weekends and vacations working toward the revival and regeneration of this community. Outstanding in this effort, and deserving of special mention, has been Judge Thomas R. Jones, who not only furnished great leadership at every turn, but took precious time even from his own campaign for election as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention to meet and study and work on your plans.

As a result of all this—the fruit of eight months of planning and argument and exchange of views, and of ceaseless, untiring effort by many of you here today, I have the honor to announce:

First. The formation of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Renewal and Rehabilitation Corporation, under the Chairmanship of Judge Jones, and with a distinguished Board representing many elements of the community. This Corporation will assume a major role in the physical, social and economic development of the community. We expect that it will, directly and indirectly:

Act as sponsor of programs for housing rehabilitation and renewal; and community development, including the creation and management of community cultural and recreational facilities;

Work with relevant government and community agencies, ensuring that jobs created here will be filled predominantly by residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant, and that programs are created to train them for the jobs;

Facilitate the economic development of the community by providing, under appropriate contracts and agreements, necessary inducements to, and cooperation with private industry;

Sponsor, encourage, and assist all efforts for improvement of education in Bedford-Stuyvesant; and furnish such other initiative or assistance to community enterprise and efforts as is necessary or feasible.

Second. To work in closest partnership with the Renewal and Rehabilitation Corporation, there is being formed a Bedford-Stuyvesant Development and Services Corporation. This Corporation will involve, and draw on the talents and energies and knowledge of some of the foremost members of the American business community, such as:

Mr. Douglas Dillon, Former Secretary of the Treasury;

Mr. J. M. Kaplan, of the J. M. Kaplan Fund;

Mr. David Lilienthal, of the Development Resources Corporation;

Mr. Andre Meyer, of Lazard Freres & Co.

Mr. William Paley, of the Columbia Broadcasting System;

Mr. Thomas Watson, Jr., of the International Business Machines Corporation.

This Corporation will play a major role in the entire overall program, with particular attention to planning and facilitation of economic development.

Third. The Development and Services Corporation has been fortunate to secure the services on a part-time basis of Mr. Edward J. Logue, Development Administrator of the City of Boston, to take on the responsibility for its initial planning and programming activities. Mr. Logue, recently the Chairman of the study group on New York City Housing and Neighborhood Improvement, will take on a principal responsibility for the overall development effort, recruitment of staff, and preparation and execution of program.

Fourth. Major private foundations have committed support to the development of

Bedford-Stuyvesant. Already, the Taconic Foundation and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund are making an important contribution through their support of community development and planning work at the Pratt Institute. Now, the Edgar M. Stern Family Fund, and the Ford Foundation have joined in an initial grant to Mr. Logue, to be administered through the Pratt Institute pending the formal incorporation of the Development and Services Corporation, to support the detailed planning and initial implementation of the development program.

Fifth. The Mayor of the City of New York, who is here today, and some of the extremely able members of his administration, notably Mr. Mitchell Sviridoff and Mr. Samuel Gans, have committed themselves and the City to doing everything possible to assure the success of this effort. We are looking forward to working with Mr. George Nicolau, Community Development Agency Commissioner, Mr. Carl McCall, Chairman of the Council Against Poverty, and with the anti-poverty agency soon to be designated for Bedford-Stuyvesant. Mr. Robert Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has indicated interest and cooperation; and we are particularly thankful to Mr. Robert Wood, Undersecretary of the Department, who did so much to assure the passage of President Johnson's imaginative Demonstration Cities Bill, which can do so much for the nation's urban areas, for coming from Washington to be with us today. Mr. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, and Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Mr. Stanley Ruttenberg, have worked closely and cooperatively with this project, and have pledged continued effort for its success. Mr. James Allen, the distinguished Commissioner of Education in New York State, has pledged the full cooperation of his Department in developing a truly outstanding and innovating system of education at all levels in this community. And Senator Jacob Javits, who has a deep interest in the problems of Bedford-Stuyvesant, has also been most helpful and cooperative.

Sixth. Many other organizations and individuals are contributing their energy and talent to Bedford-Stuyvesant. The Pratt Institute, under the leadership of George Raymond, is further extending its already important work. Mr. I. M. Pei, one of America's foremost architects, is working on a series of plans for physical design of the community—including plans for eliminating or reducing the intrusion and noise of the Long Island Railroad tracks. Funds and personnel from the labor union movement are already at work in the areas of medical services, development of employment in the medical field, and community organization. Thoughtful men in universities and organizations all over the country are submitting suggestions for plans and programs for the revitalization of Bedford-Stuyvesant.

Seventh. Efforts have begun to secure means of financing the necessary development. Use of government funds is being developed with relevant federal and city agencies, including those concerned with housing and urban matters, manpower development, and education. And major efforts to attract private capital are also projected.

Two months ago, Senator Javits and I were successful in one major action in this direction. (We secured an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act to provide incentive payments for private industry to carry out development operations in areas such as Bedford-Stuyvesant.) The amendment also provides funds for hiring and training residents of areas like this in neighborhood rehabilitation and reconstruction, industrial and commercial development, and improvement of social services. We can expect that Bedford-Stuyvesant would be an early application for incentive funds under this amendment. Senator Javits' work on

this provision deserves the thanks of all of us.

These are some of the steps that have been taken in the last eight months. This is, in Winston Churchill's phrase, "not the end—nor even the beginning of the end." Indeed, it is perhaps not even the end of the beginning. But it is a beginning. Bedford-Stuyvesant is on its way. That way, as I will stress again and again, is not easy. It is complex and complicated and fraught with difficulty. Ahead of us are not weeks or months of work, no quick or easy triumphs—but long years of painful effort, with many setbacks; with constant temptation to relax, to give up, to stop trying.

Still I believe that we will all persevere, that you will succeed. The members of the business community who are pledging their time and effort are doing so because they believe you can succeed. The Mayor and his administration have pledged their full and generous cooperation because they too believe in you. But if you are to succeed, we must begin, here today, to chart the steps ahead, to turn promise into performance, plan into reality.

To do this we must combine the best of community action with the best of the private enterprise system. Neither by itself is enough; but in their combination lies our hope for the future.

Community Action has been much maligned in recent months. Yet these last two years have demonstrated its essential rightness. For if there is to be any action, any true progress in a community, that community itself—men and women like you who are here today—must be prepared to take full and final responsibility for what happens—for the success or failure of any program. I have seen job-training programs, operated by the Department of Labor, in which two-thirds of the trainees dropped out before completion of a six-week course. But I have also seen, in Philadelphia, training programs run by Reverend Leon Sullivan's OIC, in which the people themselves take responsibility for the management and control of the programs—and see that the trainees understand their responsibility to the community, so that nine out of ten complete an arduous six-month training course. The people of Bedford-Stuyvesant will not blindly follow the leadership or accept the direction and control of outsiders—whether from government, or private industry, or foundations. They will follow and believe in their own leaders, their own neighbors, the people of respect in this community. And in this particular connection, we are all pleased and encouraged that Reverend Milton Galamison, Mr. Calvin Presley, and others, have taken the initiative in working for an OIC agency here in Bedford-Stuyvesant.

But for all that Community Action can do, for all the talent and energy it may liberate, still it is not enough. For it does not give the power to act: not just to petition for action, not to ask others to act—but itself to act to improve the lives of people. People can and should be trained for jobs; but after six years of job-training efforts, we know that we must do more—we must act to create jobs. People can petition for urban renewal or public housing—but they cannot petition for the money to pay the higher rentals that may result. People may ask or even protest for better community services or quality goods in the stores—but concessions wrung from an unwilling bureaucrat or absentee owner will never equal, in quality or permanence, the quality of service that can be created or bought by the united resources of a self-reliant community with the resources to act for itself.

The power to act is the power to command resources, of money and mind and skill: to build the housing, create the social and educational services, and buy the goods which this community wants and needs and de-

serves. The regeneration of the Bedford-Stuyvesant community must rest, therefore, not only on community action—but also on the acquisition and investment of substantial resources in this area.

That is the importance and function of the Renewal and Rehabilitation Corporation, and particularly of the Development and Services Corporation: to stimulate and facilitate the investment of resources from the private business community, in conjunction with foundation and government support, in Bedford-Stuyvesant. Such investment will have multiple benefits. It will help to build the housing and services which will make this a better place to live. And, by providing jobs for area residents, it will create a sound economic base—a foundation of self-government and dignity—for the entire community.

In the coming months, we must develop and refine specific program components: deciding what kinds of investment are required, what kinds of commercial development should be encouraged, what kind of housing we want to build. Your workshop sessions today can begin the necessary dialogue.

And as you deliberate, as you work there will be need for special attention to three guiding principles. These are: competence; internal cooperation within the community; and cooperation with others from outside the community.

The first of these—a rigid insistence on the most capable and efficient administration that can be provided—should be self-evident. Private enterprise will invest in Bedford-Stuyvesant only if it can be assured that this community, acting as a unit, is prepared to deal with private capital on a businesslike basis; that it will and can, acting through the Renewal and Rehabilitation Corporation and the Development and Services Corporation, offer: a place to locate; people willing to work and learn; programs to train the workers; and all other services necessary to operation.

Government and foundations will only provide the needed incentive and support money if they know that programs are soundly conceived and operated; that important positions are assigned on no grounds other than merit; that there is no room here for political dealing, or for jobs to be regarded as anything but the most sacred trust.

And if this is true for outside investment, it is even more true for the people of Bedford-Stuyvesant. The people of this area will be asked to make sacrifices—of time and convenience and effort. More importantly, Bedford-Stuyvesant wants to command its own destiny; and this will require direct investment by its own people. But if this is to take place, then the people must have faith in the programs and their leadership. The people of Bedford-Stuyvesant will be asked to pay their hard-earned money toward the purchase of cooperative or condominium apartments. They may be asked to buy shares in neighborhood cooperative grocery stores. They may be asked to invest in a local manufacturing company, or to send their children to a local private school, or to invest in a health clinic for their neighborhood. They will demand—they will be right to demand—that these enterprises, that the entire development structure in this community, be managed and operated on a thoroughly businesslike basis; that their money will not be wasted, that they will get a dollar's worth for every dollar spent.

The second need, for cooperation within the community, is also clear—as would be the futility of allowing our common purpose, the hope of this hour, to dissolve in factional disputes, in quarrels over position or title or organizational precedence. The purpose of the Corporations announced today is not to supplant or eliminate any worthwhile, constructive community program; rather it is to assist and work with any and all forces in Bedford-Stuyvesant which are working for the regeneration of the area.

There is work and achievement and distinction enough for every organization, every individual, in this community. Youth in Action, TRY, CBCC, and all the other groups that are working for education and housing and jobs—all are needed, all should be welcomed. We are dealing with an area of over 300,000 people, directly affecting hundreds of thousands more, indirectly perhaps influencing the hopes of millions all across the country. There will be here, in the years ahead, hundred of plans and programs, thousands of opportunities for the vigorous and dedicated, the young in spirit of every age, to grab hold of responsibility and make their mark in this community and in the wider community of the city around us. If our purpose is one, we can recognize many roads to the goal; but if each looks first to personal or factional advantage, we can never succeed.

Third is the need for cooperation between the community and all those—the businessmen, and the public officials, and the experts—who are joined with you in this effort. This community, in the last analysis, must do the job itself. Only you can mobilize the workers, enlist young people in training programs, induce others to continue or resume their education, fire the imagination and the spirit of the community. And you know this community as no outsider can.

But at the same time, we will all have to listen to and consider most carefully the advice, and the recommendations, and sometimes the absolute requirements of others. If a government program requires a certain standard of operation, that standard must be maintained. If a businessman requires a certain kind of training program to help him offer jobs to people here, then that kind of training program must be devised. If banks require a certain kind of feature in a financing arrangement before they will make loans for housing, those arrangements must be satisfactorily made. If the city needs to coordinate efforts in Bedford-Stuyvesant with efforts elsewhere, then cooperation must be given. And if others—Mr. Meyer, or Mayor Lindsay, or Mr. Pei—urge that a course of action is best for the community, then we must all listen carefully, and remember that ideas and good will—and competence—know no bounds of color or neighborhood.

We are all in this together. If there is to be a better future here, we will all have to stay together. Today on this platform and in this room, there are Democrats and Republicans, white and black, businessmen and government officials, rich and poor, and people from every part of this varied community. This is a unique effort—the only one of its kind and scope in the country. We have to show that it can be done.

But let there be no mistake. It would be easy, at this moment, to relax in the enjoyment of such progress as we have achieved in these few months. But all that is past is prelude; and all the work remains to be done. The houses are not yet rebuilt, the unemployed not yet at work, the children not yet learning, the sick not yet healed. What remains is the heart of the matter; and fulfillment will be the hardest part of the task. There will be times when progress seems ephemeral and fleeting, times of great disappointment and discouragement. Always there will be work—ceaseless, untiring effort, by none as much as the people in this room.

For this is a task of unparalleled difficulty. This is not just a question of making Bedford-Stuyvesant "as good as" someplace else. We are striking out in new directions, on new courses, sometimes perhaps without map or compass to guide us. We are going to try, as few have tried before, not just to have programs like others have, but to create new kinds of systems for education and health and employment and housing. We here are going to see, in fact, whether the city and its people, with the cooperation of government

and private business and foundations, can meet the challenges of urban life in the last third of the twentieth century.

And it is Bedford-Stuyvesant that is in the vanguard—Bedford-Stuyvesant that can take the lead. If we here can meet and master our problems; if this community can become an avenue of opportunity and a place of pleasure and excitement for its people, then others will take heart from your example, and men all over the United States will remember your contribution with the deepest of gratitude. But if this effort—with your community leadership, with the advantages of participation by the business community, with full cooperation from the city administration, with the help of the outstanding men in so many fields of American life—if this community fails, then others will falter, and a noble dream of equality and dignity in our cities will be sorely tired.

But if the dangers are great, and the challenges are great, so are the possibilities of greatness. In the last months, we have come to know one another well; and I believe that we can succeed, that we can fulfill the commitment, and thereby help others to do so.

And so let us go forward: taking as our song the words of T. S. Elliot:

"In the vacant places
We will build with new bricks
There are hands and machines
And clay for new brick
And lime for new mortar
Where the bricks are fallen
We will build with new stone
Where the beams are rotten
We will build with new timbers
Where the word is unspoken
We will build with new speech
There is work together
A Church for all
And a job for each
Every man to his work."

A REPORT FROM VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a most enlightening article entitled, colloquially, "You Can Tell 'Em, Buddy," by Bernard B. Fall, reporting on conditions as he found them a week or two ago in Vietnam, appears in the current issue of New Republic magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Fall's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

YOU CAN TELL 'EM, BUDDY (By Bernard B. Fall)

SAIGON.—"Looks like Tan Son Nhut got it again," said the Navy driver, as we drove off for Saigon's Tan Son Nhut airbase—the busiest in the world, allegedly, after O'Hare Field in Chicago. The airbase, though hardly four miles from downtown Saigon, has been repeatedly hit by the Viet Cong, despite acres of barbed wire, minefields, infrared detectors, etc. In fact, the Viet Cong, in accordance with its overall change of tactics of sticking close to American units in the hope of avoiding heavy aerial bombardment, now has units in close contact with the Saigon perimeter. This compels the American forces progressively to take over the defense of the Saigon area—an initial force of three battalions, to be eventually augmented to six or even nine, is devoted to this—or to fly heavy airstrikes within easy earshot of the city, thus vividly driving home the close presence of the adversary. An ambitious operation dubbed *Hop Tac* (Cooperation) two years ago, which was to clear the provinces surrounding Saigon of all VC elements, was quietly closed down a few weeks ago, a

failure. But this time, the base was not hit: just a few infiltrators had been sighted.

The military waiting room at Tan Son Nhut looks like the modern version of the Great Migrations. The US Air Force runs a comprehensive airlines system throughout the country and to several "out-country" destinations (Bangkok, the Philippines, Taiwan, Okinawa). Not only do the American military travel on duty, as couriers, on leave, as replacements and what not, but the Vietnamese have caught on to the traveling frenzy and every plane load has its fair share of Vietnamese women (presumably, or hopefully, military dependents of one sort or another), traveling with tiny babies and indescribable packages. By a military subtlety which causes American Army Corps here to be known as "field forces" (reserving the word "corps" for the Vietnamese Army), these regular military flights are not known as "flights" but as "missions." The planes flying those routes usually are Lockheeds, C-123 "Providers" or C-130 "Hercules," brutes with magnificent short-takeoff characteristics but built by Lockheed in total and utter disregard of any possible human cargo. I have flown in military planes since 1944, but I believe that the C-123's internal noise level is far beyond the pain threshold. The maximum-density seating arrangement (back to back in the middle, and facing inward on the sides, with sagging cargo nets as seat backs), combined with the dismal lighting, give the whole interior an aspect of some incredible olive-drab slum. In the 99 percent humidity of the Vietnamese air, the cooling system of the aircraft gives off a dense acrid mist. "Must be *Zyklon-B*," said the man from *Time* squeezed in next to me, referring to the gas used by the Nazis in the gas chambers. It rains steadily inside the aircraft, and from all sides at once, it seems, thanks to the speed of the plane. Here you can tell the old-timers from the new arrivals: The former have their raincoats handy; the others grimly settle down to getting soaked. A new item of equipment has appeared: black insignia of rank and service. The gold-and-silver ranks and metal badges worn only a year ago have given way to black silhouettes of their former selves, a grim homage paid to the VC snipers. This has now become a fad-in-reverse, as garrison troops who never see combat also begin to wear the black combat insignia.

The first stop is Danang, the huge airbase in central Vietnam with what seems like miles of airplanes parked in reveted alcoves. "Out-country arrivals check with USAF Customs," says a big sign. In other words, the US Air Force, not the South Vietnamese government, exercises customs-inspection prerogatives here. If a Vietnamese official was involved at all, he was invisible. The steady downpour still beats down. Contrary to popular mythology, there are two rainy seasons in Vietnam: a summer one in the south of the country and the mountain areas and the other (a winter monsoon lasting until February) along the coast and in the north, where it seriously hampers US air operations. At Danang begins the zone of responsibility of the US Marines. Here also, the subtleties prevail: the Marine units were first known as the "Marine Expeditionary Force" until somebody discovered that the French troops in Indochina had been known as the *Corps Expéditionnaire*, and thus the 60,000 Marines (a two-division reinforced corps) were re-baptized as the "Marines Amphibious Force" (MAF).

Further northward, beyond Dong-Ha, lies the 17th parallel, with its no longer Demilitarized Zone (DMZ), its hapless inspection post of the Indian-Canadian-Polish International Control Commission (ICC), and more Marines. This is the realm of an all-pervasive red mud covering everything at least calf-deep. It is far colder here than in Saigon, for even in this tropical country

there are marked changes of temperature with rising latitudes. A road sign along National Road No. 1 is a clear reminder how different things are up here: "Saigon—1,138 km, Hanoi—582 km." Dong-Ha is the base of the American forces, mostly from the 3rd Marine Division, blocking the 17th parallel. They had borne the brunt of the year's heavy fighting in Operations "Hastings" and "Prairie," against People's Army Division 324-B and paid a heavy price for blocking its penetration into South Vietnam. That is, if it wanted to do that; for there are some military men here who think that the whole operation of the 324-B was a bit too overt, too blatant, for what the North Vietnamese or Viet Cong would usually do. What if the division simply had carried out a diversionary maneuver, deliberately designed to draw American troops and attention away from the more important areas deep in the South? The militarization of political thinking here (all lip service to "pacification" aside) makes it only too easy to decoy everybody and everything into a wild-goose chase after troops in the hope of yet another high "kill count." Whatever the reason, 324-B took serious losses.

ON THE ROOF

Marine headquarters in Dong-Ha is in an old French military post, with its ochre masonry walls, supplemented by American temporary barracks. "You're the guy who wants to meet all the Marines from Dallas?" says the Marine PIO (Public Information Officer). I assured him that I wasn't but that I wanted to go northward to a unit on the Demilitarized Zone for Christmas. The steady rain precluded the use even of helicopters—an interesting commentary on the foibles of airpower in this war—and the PIO suggested I try and hitch a ride with the Christmas mail truck. "But it's a hairy ride, I tell you." Before I left, I witnessed a brief ceremony in which Marines from the Reconnaissance Commandos (Recondos) were given medals. It was held in one of the French barracks which served as a chapel. In the back, vertically stacked mortar shell containers gave a striking imitation of organ pipes. The Recondos stood at attention in the darkness as the general read the citation for their work inside VC territory: "I am proud to be associated with you. . . . I know it's rough when we can't get to you as fast as we want to. . . ."

Out on the road at the checkpoint, two soggy MP's stood near a flimsy shelter covered with graffiti, one of which masterfully expressed the whole situation: "I can't relate to this environment." As flies assemble around exposed food, a handful of small Vietnamese children trooped around the checkpoint, begging. "Ho Chi Minh number 10," says a little boy in English, repeating an American-Vietnamese neologism according to which good things are "number one" and bad things scaled at 10. "Do you know where Ho Chi Minh is?" I say in Vietnamese. "No," says the child.

The mail truck. Red and yellow US mail bags. Two GI's, young, one a Negro. As we leave the checkpoint, the driver passes his rifle and ammo clips back to me. "Sir, would you mind covering my side?" It's an M-14, looking very much like its older brother, the M-1. Familiar gesture of pulling back breech, inserting the first round, learned two decades ago; of locking safety, of looking warily at jungle closing in on the road. On the right, side the other GI cradles his sub-machinegun on his legs propped up high on the dashboard as we pick up speed, rocking crazily on the washboard road. The roar of the engine does not entirely drown out the sound of Christmas caroling up front in the truck's cab:

Jingle bells
Mortar shells
VC in the grass
You can take your Merry Christmas
And shove it up your —.

In the mounting darkness, we begin to climb out of the bushes and trees into a flat expanse of shrubless ground completely churned up by the tracks of tires and tank treads. The sharp outline of a tank hull mounting twin guns whizzes by.

"Home," says a voice in the truck cab. "We done made it again."

As I climb out of the truck with my pack and hand back the M-14, the voice in the truck says: "And you can tell 'em, buddy. War is —."

This was Camp J. J. Carroll, also known as "Artillery Plateau," probably the most incredible single assemblage of groundborne firepower anywhere in the country. Commanded by the Marines, but also including Army artillery outfits, it boasts having in its inventory every ground weapon deployed in the armed forces, from infantry weapons upward to the Marine "Ontos" with its six deadly 106mm recoilless cannon, the self-propelled and brand-new 175's with their 35-foot-long tubes, and even an eight-inch gun just a shade shy of the howitzers deployed in Europe which fire atomic shells.

Sandbag bunkers and acres of barbed-wire systems (even interior positions are sealed off with barbed wire to limit any possible penetration to one position) surmounted by the menacing tubes pointing in all directions for all-around support give the whole place a weird air of *déjà-vu*: that is the way the battlefield must have looked in World War I, and that was what some of the French strongpoints in North Vietnam looked like 12 years ago, minus the immense firepower. A Dien Bien Phu with solid American teeth.

ON A CLEAR DAY

The briefing officer, in his soft Southern drawl, soon reveals the essential feature of Artillery Plateau: "On a clear day you can see the South China Sea on your right and the Laotian border on your left." The concentric circles on the acetate map overlay, indicating the artillery's maximum "reach" for each caliber, show what is meant—not only is much of the whole South Vietnamese border zone within their range, but the DMZ and parts of North Vietnam as well. Did they shoot into North Vietnam?

"No. That's left to the bombers of the Navy and Air Force. A strange distinction, if you ask me."

But tonight, Christmas Eve, the truce had begun, and Camp J. J. Carroll (a Marine captain killed accidentally by American tanks last summer during "Hastings") was humming with its own Christmas activities in a subdued way, further emphasized by the fog-laden rain. At the mess tent, the menu was the standard hash potatoes and hamburgers known to army messes the world over. But outside, a Marine choir sang carols—most of the voices were very boyish. A Santa Claus in full rig, ho-ho-ing through a loudspeaker, rode by on a Mechanical Mule (a sort of Marine minijep), wishing all units a Merry Christmas.

"You know," said the officer next to me, "we're going to have a helluva time sleeping tonight without the gunfire. We fire most of our H-and-I [Harassment-and-Interdiction] missions at night and we haven't known a quiet night since we arrived here last September."

Then a single cannon shot rang out thunderously.

"Oh, that. That's nothing. Since we don't include reconnaissance among the missions prohibited by the truce, we keep firing illuminating flare shells to be sure nothing crawls around out there." The single shots would keep on ringing out at irregular intervals throughout the two nights of the truce.

On the perimeter, where the bunkers stand intermingled with the tanks, the men on watch talked more easily than usual and were more relaxed. "On other days they can get darn trigger-happy if you don't happen to have the password ready when they chal-

lenge you," said the platoon commander of one of the posts. But they were also pensive. "Here, we tell Sundays from the other days because that's the day we take our weekly malaria pills," a lance corporal said quietly. "It's not like Christmas at all, is it?"

The soldiers had built a stage with whatever materials could be scrounged, in the forlorn hope that one of the big touring attractions would come their way for Christmas. It did not, and the letdown could be clearly felt.

"The only guy who came to see us recently was one of those big-name writers that's touring the country, and he only stayed for about a half-hour. And, boy, he looked like he needed a fifth real bad."

By the morning of Christmas Day, the mud had deepened by another few inches, and the walk to the latrine, in combat boots and rain poncho, was exquisite agony. In the tent there was a mail call—the mail we had brought up the evening before—and our squad was entitled to one of those parcels made up by thousands of schools throughout the country. It contained nine sets of playing cards and about all the salacious pocket books that the neighborhood had been able to come up with. The accompanying form letter, signed by the mothers of Rosemont Elementary School in Minnesota, stated: "We hope that your effort will help the cause of democracy and help stamp out Communist aggression. . . ."

Sick call in the aid station tent. An earnest young doctor is closing a deep gash over an eye. The patient lies on a narrow table covered with an Army blanket, his boots still on his feet, under local anesthesia, as the doctor calmly stitches away under the light of a single, bare 40-watt bulb. "If they only could see me at medical school in Richmond," he says as he strips off his gloves a few minutes later.

But beyond Artillery Plateau which, with its various units, still gives the impression of spaciousness, here are other, more nightmarish places like The Rockpile and Khé Sanh. The Rockpile is a 1,200-foot near-pyramid which, though overtowered by nearby mountains, commands a view of five valleys and cost the Marines dearly last summer when they had to dislodge determined VC machinegunners from it. Its top has enough flat space for two medium-sized dinner tables. Twenty Marines and two artillery FO's (Forward Observers) live on it for weeks at a time. Its helicopter platform is composed of a series of loose planks jutting out over a 900-foot sheer drop, and through what can only be called idiotic pride, the Marines insist on using their unwieldy H-34 choppers, whose tricycle landing gear prohibits settling down on the platform; rather than using the Army's "Hueys" whose landing skids accommodate themselves easily to it. On the day I went there, a Marine returnee nearly lost his grip as a gust of wind pushed the H-34 from its landing-hover stance. For some mad seconds the man hung on by his fingertips until the door gunner and I dragged him in by his clothes. Yet this was a "good" day, because the weather permitted the landing of a chopper.

"One of the FO's once stayed for 43 solid days on The Rockpile. By the time they picked him off, he was throwing rocks at the passing jets."

Throwing rocks is a favorite pastime on The Rockpile. Sometimes the VC crawls right past the sentries of Lima Company at the base of the mountain and throws rocks at the Marines. They, in turn, throw them back. "Finally, we threw a grenade every fifth time. That stopped them."

SOME OTHER PROBLEMS

On so small an area, claustrophobia as well as boredom or the equally merciless sun or rain are real problems. The problem of what to do with the human excrement was

almost insurmountable until a deep chimney was found to one of the uninhabited grottoes below. And then there are the monkeys, a thieving lot who often pilfer the meager rations. When the Marines routinely informed Lima Company below that they were going to shoot some of them, the reply came just as routinely: "Are they VC apes or friendlies?" Just before the truce, on December 22, the VC had made a determined probe against The Rockpile. It would not be the last.

Beyond The Rockpile lay Khé Sanh, another former French fort which had grown from a small Special Forces camp to a dug-in position with Marines and artillery. Sealed off from the outside world except for air transport, Khé Sanh had been isolated for five days around Christmas.

"Now there's real jungle," said a young artillery captain patiently awaiting a moment's clear weather to return to his outfit there. "On one patrol we had a man who had collected 80 leeches on his body. He died later from exhaustion and loss of blood. Another had a leech crawl through his penis into his bladder. Most of us are wearing prophylactics on patrol to prevent that, because it's painful as hell. How the VC can stay in there year in, year out, just beats me."

Hanoi Hannah, the North Vietnamese English-language radio announcer, recently informed the Khé Sanh garrison (naming units by name) that it would be destroyed. Recent intelligence reports show that elements of the 341st People's Army Division were on the move and that 17 elephants, possibly carrying heavy Soviet mortars, were somewhere near there in the deep jungle.

"All they need is a few days of bad weather when we cannot use our air power, and we're in real trouble."

Christmas dinner included all the trimmings, but no turkey. Bad weather had upset that part of the logistics, apparently. Short Christmas services were held here and there by the chaplains before small audiences. A group of GI's was lustily singing:

On the first hour of Christmas
The VC came at me
In one ambush
With two hand grenades
Three bugles blowing
Four flags a-flying
Five mortar rounds . . .

A few officers were discussing the war. Like the proverbial atheists who aren't supposed to be in frontline trenches, there wasn't a "hawk" among them. At 11 p.m. the message center brought a last "Merry Christmas" message from a parent unit further down along the coast. The drumming of the rain on the tents became louder as one by one the power generators closed down for the night.

At 7:15 a.m. on Monday morning, the ground started to shake as the heavy guns began to fire their first post-truce mission, unobserved H-and-I fire on targets deeply shrouded in fog, at \$168 a shell.

One hour later, an enormous dull roar echoed back from the mountains to the north of us: the giant B-52 bombers from Guam had unloaded hundreds of tons of bombs on the Demilitarized Zone.

They had taken off for their mission five hours before the truce had expired.

ARCHBISHOP LUCEY GIVES CONDITIONAL APPROVAL TO PLANNED PARENTHOOD PROJECT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 17 Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, one of the outstanding churchmen of our time, gave his approval to a proposed planned par-

enthod program for San Antonio and Bexar County. The archbishop's approval was conditioned on the understanding that no teachings that are opposed by the church should be forced upon Catholics.

Realizing that it is the duty of the Church not only to instruct its members on what is sinful but also on what is good and decent, we acknowledge our obligation to give necessary instruction to our people and to offer cooperation to men of good will for the well-being of our community and for the peace of conscience of our people—

Archbishop Lucey said.

Therefore I approve of a grant of Federal funds to this (Planned Parenthood) Association.

Archbishop Lucey's action is an event of major importance, and I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt of an article from the January 18 San Antonio Light and an article from the January 20, 1967, New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1967]

CATHOLIC PRELATE CONDITIONALLY BACKS FAMILY PLANNING PROJECTS

SAN ANTONIO, Tex., January 19 (UPI).—The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Antonio approved a proposed community Planned Parenthood program yesterday on the condition that no teachings that are opposed by the church be forced on Catholics.

The Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey said:

"Human beings should be judiciously informed of scientific advances and exploration by methods by which spouses can be helped in arranging the number of their children."

A \$209,000 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity will be used to set up 12 family planning clinics in San Antonio and Bexar County.

"Planned Parenthood shares with us a desire to inform married parents of their responsibility to society in bearing children," the Archbishop said.

"We have the assurance of the officers of the association that they welcome our collaboration in their expenditure of public funds in this field of delicate human relations and that the religious convictions of their clients will be scrupulously respected."

Archbishop Lucey said he had been told that the clinics would be educational and would not force any beliefs or methods on the participants.

COUNCIL IS CITED

The Archbishop said the last Ecumenical Council in Rome had condemned "unnatural methods of family regulation" and said members of the Roman Catholic Church could not undertake methods regulating procreation that are contrary to the teachings of the church.

But Archbishop Lucey also quoted the Council as saying:

"In view of the inalienable right to marry and beget children, the question of how many children should be born belongs to the honest judgment of the parents."

The Archbishop said he hoped the clinics would help parents in this decision.

William Clark, president of Planned Parenthood, said the services and counseling would be offered exclusively to married women on a voluntary basis.

"The objectives of Planned Parenthood are to see that all families in San Antonio are extended the best medical care," he said.

Dr. William Strozler, member of the

Planned Parenthood board, said all aspects offered by the clinics had been found safe.

The program will be administered by a special managing committee made up of board members, representatives of the different neighborhoods and medical and welfare delegates.

[From the San Antonio Light, Jan. 18, 1967]

TWO-MILLION DOLLARS IN EODC PROJECTS INCLUDES FAMILY PLANNING ACTION—LUCEY APPROVES

The EODC approved nearly \$2 million worth of community action programs Tuesday night, including a \$209,888 planned parenthood proposal, for submission to the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington.

The planned parenthood proposal carried the endorsement of Archbishop Robert E. Lucey.

A statement from the archbishop was distributed to members of the EODC board of directors meeting at the Alamo National Bank assembly room.

In reference to what it called a belief by some that the Catholic Church advocates irresponsible parenthood, the statement declared, "This is not true . . . the church teaches that parents have the freedom and responsibility ultimately to pass judgment in the sight of God as to the size of their family."

The statement quoted excerpts from Vatican II in its Decree on the Church in the Modern World to support the archdiocese's position regarding "the problem of family planning."

The Lucey statement said: "The Planned Parenthood Association (sponsor of the proposal) shares with us a desire to inform married parents of their responsibility to society in bearing children. Our agreement as to how this may best be done is only partial, but we have an assurance from the officers of the association that they welcome our collaboration in their expenditure of public funds in this field of delicate human relations, and that the religious convictions of their clients will be scrupulously respected."

"A divine mandate has not been bestowed on Catholic citizens to prevent non-Catholics from receiving certain privileges approved by civil law. If these privileges are contrary to divine law, we may not compel our fellow Americans to renounce them."

"Realizing that it is the duty of the church not only to instruct its members on what is sinful but also on what is good and decent, we acknowledge our obligation to give necessary instruction to our people and to offer cooperation to men of good will for the well-being of our community and for the peace of conscience of our people."

"Therefore, I approve of a grant of federal funds to this (Planned Parenthood) association."

The proposal, which provides for family planning counseling and materials to be provided by the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District, stipulates only married women may be served.

An EODC priorities committee had first recommended adoption of the proposal to be financed through funds "earmarked."

Of the committee of 11 members, two did not recommend approval and rendered minority reports.

However, a ruling by OEO after the priorities committee last met withdrew the earmarked funds designation from family planning proposals, and the EODC board had to vote Tuesday on whether to place planned parenthood among the community action proposals it was submitting to Washington for funding.

The motion placing planned parenthood in the "package" carried, but the board members voted a higher priority number for other programs.

PHILANTHROPIST CURRIERS MISSING AT SEA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the world's best-known philanthropic couples is missing at sea on a chartered airplane flight over the Caribbean, Mr. and Mrs. Stephen R. Currier.

Mr. and Mrs. Currier set up the Taconic Foundation in 1958 to finance the civil rights movement, child welfare, race relations and youth work. Their activities on the behalf of the people of this Nation are known around the world.

Mrs. Currier is a granddaughter of the late Andrew W. Mellon, the former Secretary of the Treasury, and a daughter of the U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, David K. E. Bruce.

Mr. Currier is president of Urban America, a nonprofit organization to improve life in American cities, and a member of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations as well as a member of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's beautification committee.

The U.S. Coast Guard is now conducting a search for the plane that carried the Curriers. It is my fervent hope that this search will end successfully in discovering and rescuing this outstanding couple, who have given so much of themselves to the best interests of their country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the account from the Washington Post of Thursday, January 19, 1967, on page A3, of this tragic event.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1967]
MELTON HEIRESS, HUSBAND, LOST AT SEA

Coast Guard ships and planes conducted an intensive search of a wide area of the Caribbean last night for Mr. and Mrs. Stephen R. Currier, internationally known philanthropists, whose chartered plane disappeared Tuesday night on a flight from San Juan to St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands.

Mrs. Currier, the former Audrey Bruce, is a granddaughter of the late Andrew W. Mellon, the former Secretary of the Treasury who gave Washington the National Gallery of Art, and a daughter of the U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, David K. E. Bruce.

Wire services reported that the couple who maintain homes in New York City and The Plains, Va., were flying to St. Thomas where they were to begin a 10-day vacation cruise in the West Indies.

Mrs. Currier, 33, is a niece of Paul Mellon, of Upperville, Va., president of the National Gallery.

Her husband Stephen, 36, is president of Urban America, a non-profit foundation to improve living in American cities, a member of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations and a member of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's beautification committee.

He and his wife set up the Taconic Foundation in 1958 to finance the civil rights movement, child welfare, race relations and youth work.

The wire services said the plane, a twin-engine Piper Apache piloted by John D. Watson, of Airplane Charters, Inc., was last heard from at 7:30 p.m. Tuesday about a half hour after it had taken off from San Juan. At that time it asked for permission to fly over Culebra Island, which is used by the Navy for maneuvers. The pilot was told to fly around the island.

The flight from San Juan to St. Thomas takes about an hour and is mostly over water.

The Federal Aviation Agency office in San Juan said there was no record that Watson had filed a flight plan and the search was not started until 5 a.m. yesterday after a report was made when the Curriers failed to join several yachting parties in St. Thomas as scheduled.

The Curriers were believed to be the only passengers aboard the plane, which was equipped with five life jackets and a two-passenger orange rubber raft.

The Curriers were married in Connecticut in 1955 while she was a student at Radcliffe College. He is a graduate of Harvard University. They have three children, Adria, 10; Lavinia, 9, and Michael, 6, who remained in New York.

WEBB COUNTY, TEX., EXPERIENCES FAVORABLE RESULTS WITH EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS THAT WOULD BE ASSISTED UNDER THE BILINGUAL AMERICAN EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 17, 1967, I introduced the Bilingual American Education Act, a bill to provide financial assistance to schools so they can deal more effectively with the educational problems of students whose mother tongue is Spanish and to whom English is a foreign language. The bill would assist schools in financing activities such as bilingual education programs, the teaching of English as a foreign language, the teaching of Spanish as a native language, and other programs designed to meet these special educational needs—mainly in five Southwestern States and also the State of New York and a few other States in the North, which have a large concentration of people of American-Mexican and Puerto Rican descent.

For the past 2 years the United Consolidated Independent School District in Webb County, Tex., has been carrying out some of the bilingual programs that would receive assistance under my bill. The initial results have been encouraging.

Two results are obvious—

Says the program's director, Victor Cruz-Aedo.

The Spanish-speaking pupil who formerly withdrew from the group due to his inability to understand or to be understood is now part of the class.

He feels that the English-speaking children have also benefited, not only in learning a second language but in grasping sounder English reading habits.

Many of the English-speaking students are far advanced in their reading levels and the Spanish-speaking students have improved comprehension in their reading.

The bill is open for cosponsors until Wednesday, January 25, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "He Is Handicapped If We Take Away His Language," by Ramon Garces, appearing in the December 9, 1966, Texas Observer, be printed in the RECORD. It is interesting to note that Mr. Garces said, in transmitting his article to the Observer:

A program such as this would have helped guys like me and others who were raised on the border in a bilingual environment. I

couldn't speak English until I was eight years old, and until I had struggled through first, second, and third grade without knowing why it was so hard.

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

"HE IS HANDICAPPED IF WE TAKE AWAY HIS LANGUAGE"

(By Ramon Garces)

LAREDO.—For years educators have believed that the best way to help Spanish-speaking students assimilate themselves into the Anglo culture is to discourage them from developing their Hispanic backgrounds. The first classroom edict that Mexican-American children hear when they enter the first grade in elementary schools, from Brownsville to El Paso, is "Don't speak Spanish." It is not unusual for a first grader to be fined a penny for every word the teacher hears him speak in Spanish. Texas has a state law prohibiting teaching in any language but English in the public schools, except in foreign language courses.

This approach has been frowned on by some educators, particularly teachers whose students are from home environments that have prevented them from learning a single word of English. In some South Texas communities there are teachers who violate the state law and teach bilingually whenever they can. "What are you going to do if you tell them 'two plus two is four' in English and they don't understand?" asked a teacher in a school near the small cattle-ranch community of Encinal in LaSalle county. "You tell them in Spanish and they get it."

Some Texas educators who became aware of the effectiveness of bilingualism in teaching English to Spanish-speaking children several years ago began to look around for a school district bold enough to experiment in this method. Two of those educators were Dr. Theodore Anderson and Dr. Joseph Michael, both of the University of Texas.

Three years ago they found the district they were searching for, located in a vast area of Webb County. The United Consolidated Independent School District's many miles embrace cattle ranches with their many Mexican-American ranch-hand families who barely speak English; a part of the Laredo Air Force Base area with numerous families transferred from the northern U.S., who speak only English; and a suburb called Del Mar Hills, made up of high income families, both Latin and Anglo.

The imaginative school administrators were willing to experiment. Concerned by the number of drop-outs in elementary school, particularly among the Spanish-speaking students, Superintendent Harold C. Brantley discussed the problem with Board President Joe Finley, Jr., manager of the huge Callaghan cattle ranch. They agreed that the children were having trouble staying in school because of language difficulties.

School Board members approached diminutive, greying school teacher Victor Cruz-Aedo, superintendent of Holding Institute, a private school which is attended by many students from Mexico. Cruz-Aedo's, program of bilingual teaching at Holding has taught English to many who are now Nuevo Laredo and Monterrey businessmen. Cruz-Aedo also had noted that most children who had received Spanish-language schooling in Mexico and who were later taught English bilingually at Holding advanced much faster than the Mexican-Americans who had been taught the three R's only in English from the beginning.

Brantley went to the Texas Education Agency and discussed the problem. He was referred to Drs. Andersson and Michael. Cruz-Aedo joined the United Consolidated District faculty and began the revolutionary bilingual program in September, 1964. It was agreed that it would be a continuing program, with bilingual teaching in the first

grade the first year, adding another grade each year after that until all six elementary grades are conducted bilingually. At the beginning there were 69 first grade pupils, 17 of them English-speaking and 52 Spanish-speaking in the program; now there are 239 students and eight teachers in the first three grades.

Mrs. Dolores Earles, originally from Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, but educated in the United States, conducts one of the bilingual classes, she is one of the three original teachers in the program. The class starts with the pledging of allegiance to the flag—first in English then in Spanish. "*Esta es mi mano derecha, esta es mi mano izquierda*" (This is my right hand this is my left hand), the first graders begin in sing-song. "*Me pongo la mano derecha sobre mi corazón*" (I place my right hand over my heart). The pledge of allegiance comes out in Spanish "*Le doy mi lealtad a la bandera de los Estados Unidos de America y a la Republica que representa; una nación, bajo Dios, indivisible, con libertad y justicia para todos.*"

As the class progresses, Mrs. Earles will tell a story about a lost dog. Two dark-eyed tots called to the front of the class sing, "Oh, where, oh where can my little dog be; oh, where, oh, where can he be?" But what if you're looking for the dog in Mexico? asks Mrs. Earles. Then two little blonde first graders take over in almost perfect Spanish: "*A dónde, a dónde se fue mi perrito; a dónde, a dónde se fue?*"

Mrs. Earles explains that there is no grouping of students on the basis of how much Spanish or English they know. She says that the young children have no trouble learning the alphabet in both languages. They are taught it first in English, then in Spanish. All the consonants, she points out, have the same sound in English, except some, like the "h," which is silent in Spanish, and the "j," which has an English "h" sound. The vowels are pronounced differently, and as the children learn the changes, Mrs. Earles says, they learn to put letters together to make sounds. Everything is taught bilingually, from geography to arithmetic.

What have been the results? "Two results are obvious," said Cruz-Aedo. "The Spanish-speaking pupil who formerly withdrew from the group due to his inability to understand or to be understood is now part of the class." The English-speaking children have also benefited, he says, not only in learning a second language, but in grasping sounder English reading habits.

Mrs. Earles tells of an English-speaking child with a speech impediment. He could not pronounce an "r" in English. But when he read a word in Spanish with an "r" sound, he had no difficulty. He could even roll the "r" with an extra effort. Eventually his "r" speech difficulty in English vanished. "His mother came down to ask if we were giving him speech therapy," Mrs. Earles recalls.

There are three types of pupils, Mrs. Earles says: those who speak only English, those who speak only Spanish, and those who speak a little of both, although they are not proficient in either. "The bilingual child is a helper to the other two types of students," she says. She calls the bilingual pupil the richest student. "But he is handicapped if we take away his language."

Cruz-Aedo says that some administrators who have heard of the Webb county experiment are cool towards it, "but most of the teachers are for it because they know the problem." One of the objections raised is that bilingual teaching will hold back the English-speaking pupil. Another is that it takes more time to conduct a class bilingually. In answer, Cruz-Aedo points out that all of the three grades now underway at United are up with their curriculum schedule, and not one student has been held back. In fact, he says, many of the English-speaking students are far advanced in their reading

levels. The Spanish-speaking students have a higher understanding ability in their reading. The same time is allotted to learning basic skills and concepts in bilingual teaching as in monolingual schools with the difference that in the bilingual program the time is divided between the two languages.

Cruz-Aedo said that in the beginning stages the basic skills and concepts are introduced in the mother language of each pupil. These skills and concepts are then reintroduced in the second language. "In this way the child will reinforce the concepts and skills and at the same time advance in his mastery of the second language," says Cruz-Aedo.

The importance of helping the Mexican-American schoolchild through bilingual teaching has already won the attention of state legislators and educators. Speaker of the House Ben Barnes last summer called a conference of principals and superintendents to discuss the programs for Texas. One of the first steps in beginning a bilingual program for Texas schools with predominantly Mexican-American children, many educators agree, would be to get rid of the state law which specifies that instruction should be only in English. Many school boards should also repeal policies which prohibit the speaking of Spanish in schools, the National Education Agency declares. The N.E.A. adds, in a report on bilingualism, that the Webb County program and "other similar programs that we observed in our survey—plus our own experiences and independent studies—have persuaded us beyond any doubts of the validity of bilingualism."

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the 49th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine was observed yesterday. This is an important event for all Americans and especially for those of Ukrainian descent. Many of these descendants are outstanding citizens of my State.

For more than four decades the people of the Ukraine have been fighting, by every available means, for the reestablishment of their independence. The main purpose of this event is clearly one with which every American should be concerned. By participating in it we are demonstrating to Ukrainians and all others living behind the Iron Curtain our unity and determination to uphold the cause of freedom.

In North Dakota a number of activities are being conducted as a part of the observance this year. The president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, indicated in a recent letter that these activities will include special church services, rallies, and radio programs. In addition, I believe he very effectively explains why this event is important to all of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Zukowsky's letter be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS,
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Steele, N. Dak., January 14, 1967.

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator of North Dakota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: January 22, 1967
will mark the 49th Anniversary of the Procla-

mation of Independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, and the 48th Anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian ethnic lands were united into one independent and sovereign state of the Ukrainian nation. The independence of Ukraine was proclaimed in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, on January 22, 1918 and the Act of Union took place a year later, on January 22, 1919, also in Kiev.

The young Ukrainian democratic republic was immediately recognized by a number of foreign governments, including that of Soviet Russia. The latter, however, almost simultaneously with recognition, declared war and began a large scale invasion of Ukraine. For 3½ years Ukrainian people waged a gallant struggle in defense of their country, alone and unaided. Eventually, in 1921 Ukraine succumbed to the superior forces of Communist Russia, and became part of the Russian Communist empire, known as the U.S.S.R.

The freedom-loving people of Ukraine have not accepted Soviet Russian domination and have been fighting for the re-establishment of their independence by all means accessible to them for the 46 years.

During World War II the Ukrainian people organized a powerful underground resistance movement, known as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which fought not only against the Nazi regime, but against the Soviet security troops as well. Stalin and Khrushchev unleashed bloody persecution and reprisals against the Ukrainian people in the late 1940's and it was Khrushchev himself who stated at the XX-th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February, 1956, that "Stalin had wanted to deport all Ukrainians, but there were too many of them and there was no place to which they could be deported".

Relentless and harsh persecutions of Ukrainians continued after the death of Stalin, and it continues now after the ouster of Khrushchev from the top leadership in the Kremlin, inasmuch as the Brezhnev-Kosygin duumvirate is bent on keeping the Soviet Russian empire intact and unified.

Briefly, the Kremlin rule in Ukraine can be described as follows:

Exploitation of Ukraine's economic resources for the benefit of Moscow and its imperialistic ventures in Asia, Africa and Latin America;

Systematic deportation of Ukrainians to Central Asia, replacing them with Russian settlers for the purpose of augmenting the Russian element in Ukraine;

Arrests and trials of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists," who, in fact, are Ukrainian patriots fighting for freedom of their country;

Terror and assassination of Ukrainian leaders outside Ukraine, as demonstrated by the assassination of Dr. Lev R. Rebet, a noted Ukrainian, and Stepan Bandera, head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), both of whom were slain by KGB agent Gogdan Stashynsky in Munich, in 1957 and 1959, respectively;

Persecution of all religions in Ukraine, despite the fact that Moscow claims that "religious freedom" is assured to all Soviet citizens;

Enforced Russification, aiming at the cultural and linguistic genocide of the Ukrainian people. Recently, a number of Ukrainian writers and literary critics were arrested and sentenced by the communist courts in Ukraine, most notable among them being Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dzyuba, who have been accused of writing anti-Soviet works and of smuggling to the West the anti-Russian work of another Ukrainian poet.

Both the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States have expressed their concern over the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR by enacting the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" in July, 1959.

The Ukrainian American community in

this State will observe the forthcoming 49th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence and the 48th Anniversary of the Act of Union in a fitting and solemn celebration. There will be special church services, rallies, and special Radio programs over several North Dakota network stations.

We believe that our fellow American Citizens, regardless of their ethnic or cultural backgrounds, should join with us in marking this important anniversary of the freedom of Ukraine. This will demonstrate to both the captive Ukrainians and their captors, our unity and determination in upholding the cause of freedom everywhere.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA, State Branch
of North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Sunday, January 22, 1967, marked the 49th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukrainian National Republic, and the 48th anniversary of the Act of Union, whereby all Ukrainian ethnic lands were united into one independent nation. The Act of Union took place on January 22, 1919, at Kiev.

I am opposed to the use of force, violence, coercion, persecution, or intimidation by any government or any individual. Struggles against oppression and for individual liberty underscore the most moving and beautiful chapters of the world's history, and provide us with the inspiration and purpose we need in our daily lives. I applaud the efforts of people anywhere to achieve these goals. The Ukrainian people have violently resisted tyranny and oppression from both the Soviet-Russian and Nazi-German Governments and are to be commended for their spirit of freedom.

Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State branch of North Dakota, upon the occasion of this anniversary said:

The Ukrainian American community in this State will observe the forthcoming 49th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence and the 48th Anniversary of the Act of Union in a fitting and solemn celebration. There will be special church services, rallies, and special radio programs over several North Dakota network stations. We believe that our fellow American citizens, regardless of their ethnic or cultural backgrounds, should join with us in marking this important anniversary of the freedom of Ukraine. This will demonstrate both to the captive Ukrainians and their captors our unity and determination in upholding the cause of freedom everywhere.

Mr. President, this states the case well for the Ukrainian-Americans in North Dakota.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 47th anniversary of the proclamation issued at Kiev declaring the Ukraine to be a free and independent republic. All across America our many citizens of Ukrainian descent celebrate this day as Ukrainian Independence Day.

After a struggle against Russian domination which began in the mid-17th century, the proud people of the Ukraine regained their freedom on January 22, 1918. But that freedom was short lived. By 1920 Red army troops, following the imperial path of their czarist predecessors,

crushed and enslaved the Ukraine. But despite more than four and one-half decades of Soviet tyranny, the minds and hearts of untold thousands of Ukrainians still burn with the passion and poetry of freedom.

Each year those of us in the free world who have called attention to this oppression have helped to keep their hope for eventual freedom alive. In recent years these expressions brought more and more violent replies from the Soviets. Indeed, I have been attacked in Pravda and in the Soviet-Ukrainian magazine Literaturna-Ukraine for my advocacy of a free and independent Ukraine. These reactions show that the Soviets are not at all secure in their hold on their vast colonial empire. It is up to us this year to declare once again that we in the United States will never recognize this oppression.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Rada proclaimed the Fourth Universal, declaring complete independence for the Ukrainian National Republic. Today, I am happy to join the Ukrainian Congress Committee in the commemoration of this proclamation.

For 3 all-too-brief years, Ukrainians enjoyed an independence to which they had aspired for centuries and which has been long remembered as a time of inspiration. Since 1920, Ukrainians have suffered tragically under the persecution of the Soviets, enduring cultural repression as well as economic tyranny.

During this time, Americans have always been inspired by the Ukrainian struggle and have expressed an active interest in the Ukraine. In 1959, the U.S. Congress demonstrated this interest by passing the captive nations resolution, calling upon Americans to rededicate themselves to the support of the aspirations of the captive nations. The Ukraine was among the first of the countries listed as a captive nation in this resolution.

In September 1960, Congress provided for the erection in the District of Columbia of a statue of Taras Shevchenko. To emphasize the real bond between the United States and the Ukraine, the resolution reads, in part:

Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine, was openly inspired by our great American tradition to fight against the imperialist and colonial occupation of his native land.

On June 27, 1964, Dwight Eisenhower unveiled the 14-foot-high bronze statue, which stands boldly among the monuments to Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, and George Washington.

Since 1940, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America has followed an undaunted path of education and inspiration. I congratulate them on their success in nurturing the cultural heritage and strengthening the global bonds of the Ukrainian people. I am proud to join many fellow Americans in support of this 49th commemoration of the declaration of Ukrainian independence.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY: A SYMBOL OF FREEDOM

Mr. PROXMIER. Sunday, January 22, 1967, marked the 49th anniversary of

Ukrainian independence, a day on which we honor the valiant Ukrainian people. They are a people who have struggled to maintain their national integrity for hundreds of years, and even now, under conditions which call for the utmost courage and faith, they persist in their fight.

This persistence is inspired by the ever-fresh memory of an independent Ukrainian state. That independence goes back to the Middle Ages, before the Ukrainians were subjected to the domination first of the Poles, and then of the Russians. Over the long centuries of subjugation, Ukrainians never lost that dream of independence, and never bowed to the yoke of oppression. Their fondest hopes were realized when, on January 22, 1918, an independent National Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed.

These hopes were soon to be dashed. The new Soviet Union, which at first recognized the Ukraine, turned on the fledgling state as soon as it felt strong enough to do so, and reconquered it. A Communist tyranny more grinding than even that of the czars, settled over this unhappy land. Many Ukrainians made their escape to more hospitable climes, but they never abandoned their love for their homeland, and their burning desire to see it free. Even today within the Ukraine itself, there are patriots who work for that freedom, and who know the significance of January 22, although they cannot celebrate it openly.

For us, in this free country, there is a particular significance on this anniversary. It reminds us forcefully that there are people in this world who cherish freedom, just as we do, and who do not cease to struggle for it under the most adverse conditions. It reminds us that the United States has always been the champion of freedom and self-determination. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, professes to believe in wars of national liberation, but refuses to liberate its own subject nationalities. I would hope there is an object lesson in this which is not lost on the newly independent countries of the world. I would further hope that our country can draw increased devotion to the spirit of freedom from the eloquent example furnished by the Ukrainian people, which is symbolized in their independence day.

TAX EXPERTS NEVER LACK FOR IDEAS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in many State legislatures, as here in the Congress, the subject of taxation is one of the most persistent and vexing of problems.

Nebraska's Legislature has recently approved a proposal that it would be briefed by a number of out-of-State tax experts.

This development moved Mr. Emil Reutzel, Jr., in an editorial in the Norfolk Daily News to comment on the role of experts in the tax field. His conclusion:

It should remain obvious that the spending, not collecting, is the principal tax problem.

Because I think an appreciation of the editorial is as much needed by Congress and the administration as by a State government, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Norfolk Daily News, Jan. 16, 1967]

EXPERTS NEVER LACK FOR IDEAS

In a decision notable for its unanimity, Nebraska's legislators decided they would go back to school on the tax issue. They voted 39-0 in favor of a proposal that several out-of-state tax experts be recruited for special briefing sessions. This search for knowledge is worthwhile, if a little confusing.

Tax experts long ago suggested that property levies were the fairest and most stable sources of income so that method was widely employed and extended to anything of value whether held for income or not. Experts later concluded that a small tax on income would be wise, because income, after all, determined the ability to pay. Experts later improved on this form of taxation because the better an individual's income, the more he could afford to pay, so graduated levies became popular.

Experts concluded that the federal government enjoyed so much success with income taxes that state governments should, too, and payroll deductions would make it easier to collect. Experts concluded that sales taxes were a desirable source of income, easy to impose and so broad in their scope that all would participate in defraying the costs of government. Other experts decided that taxes on gasoline, automobile tires, telephone calls, theatre admissions, or fur coats, jewelry and other luxury items were in order.

Some tax experts concluded that rural residents paid a disproportionate share of taxes; others that city dwellers were too hard hit. Some experts said that taxes were confiscatory when a third of the nation's income was spent to pay them; others proved that man will work and earn when a half or three-quarters of his income is siphoned off in taxation.

As a result of expert opinion, most forms of taxation ever conceived have been adopted, and very few repealed.

Legislators are obviously searching for a solution and need all the facts they can get. When they are done listening to the experts, however, it should still remain obvious that spending, not collecting, is the principal tax problem—a fact often overlooked by experts.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MUSKIE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in the January 22, 1967 issue of the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram there is a very incisive and revealing report by Donald R. Larrabee, who has proved himself a very worthy successor to the beloved May Craig as the Washington correspondent of the Guy Gannett papers and who is sustaining the tradition set by his predecessor.

The report is a documentary tribute to the great stature, position, and influence of my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine, in the Senate, and especially among the Democratic Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Larrabee's article on the junior Senator from Maine be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MUSKIE COULD HAVE MADE THIRD LEADERSHIP POSITION

(By Donald R. Larrabee)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Maine, could have been elected Jan. 10 to the third leadership position in the U.S. Senate's Democratic hierarchy.

The necessary votes were offered to him on the night before Congress convened. But Muskie refused to let his name be placed in nomination as secretary to the Democratic Conference.

He had given his word and pledged his support to a candidate who desperately wanted the post but who really never had a chance to win.

From various reliable Senate sources, it is now possible to piece together the tense struggle for the job that finally went to Sen. Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, a conservative, by a reported vote of 35 to 28, even though President Johnson and Senate Leader Mike Mansfield would have preferred Muskie.

The Maine senator lost the skirmish but friends, who know the story, say he may have enhanced his long-range chances to become Democratic leader in the Senate, if Mansfield should step aside for any reason. Muskie appears to have achieved added respect among his colleagues by sticking with a commitment even when he knew he was on the losing side.

Here is the story of Muskie's ordeal in the days prior to the opening of the new Congress:

The jockeying began last November when Sen. George Smathers of Florida announced he planned to resign as Conference secretary. Reporters began speculating on a successor and Muskie was a leading contender on everyone's list because he appeals to both liberals and conservatives and had shown leadership qualities in managing some of the most controversial Great Society bills on the Senate floor during the past two years.

Other names were bandied about: Phil Hart of Michigan, Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Daniel Inouye of Hawaii, principally. Muskie returned from Maine and sought to find out the extent of their interest.

He went to Mike Mansfield to see if the Montanan, a warm friend, knew of some reason he shouldn't go after the job. Muskie did not ask Mansfield for his endorsement.

During their talk, the Senate leader assumed his usual neutrality in such matters, told Muskie the position was wide open and the caucus would make its choice. Nothing Mansfield said persuaded Muskie to dismiss the idea and the Maine senator decided to talk it over with some of his closest friends.

Meantime, Sen. Fred Harris of Oklahoma was off and running. He sent word that he was a candidate and began soliciting support. At about the same time, Sen. Robert C. Byrd was quietly lining up his Southern colleagues. And before Muskie could explore his own position fully, he found out from Hart that Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, frequent critic of the Senate leadership "establishment", wanted the job in the worst way and felt he could get the votes.

Muskie and Hart had a long private session with Clark who asserted his seniority and pleaded that he could use the position to advantage in a tough re-election campaign next year in his home state. Clark, self-styled leader of a vocal but usually impotent ultra-liberal bloc in the Senate, insisted he could get all the support he needed to win.

At this juncture, Muskie had not gone far enough to see how much support might be his in any contest and both Muskie and Hart gave in to Clark's appeals although they had seen him miscount before and had strong private doubts that he could win a personality contest.

Muskie then stated publicly that he did not intend to campaign for the job. He noted the candidates of Clark, Harris and Byrd and said he was supporting Clark. Muskie no longer sought advice and made no effort to get pledges.

As the opening of Congress drew near, Harris withdrew his name from consideration. The word reached Muskie through friends that Clark, indeed, could not win and the Maine senator was under strong pressure to become a compromise choice at the eleventh-hour.

On the eve of the new Congress, four senators told Muskie they would support him in a contest with Byrd. He could have beaten Byrd 32-31 if they would let his name be placed in nomination. Muskie couldn't bring himself to go back on his word to Clark although he kicked himself for making the early commitment against his better judgment.

And so Muskie blamed himself when the results were tallied. He isn't fussing about Mansfield's neutrality or anything anyone else did. He knows that Mansfield, privately, was disappointed—and so was the man in the White House.

But Muskie doesn't seem to have lost any ground, in the process. He remains, with Hart, Inouye and Brewster of Maryland, one of the top floor assistants to Mansfield. These are the men the Senate leader calls on to take over when he can't be there. Not the Conference secretary, Byrd, or the assistant floor leader, Russell Long of Louisiana.

In the Senate cloakrooms, there is rarely any discussion of a successor to Mansfield which does not rate Muskie high on the list. The Montana senator is not up for re-election until 1970 and no one now knows whether he will run again. He could, of course, step down in the meantime, possibly in favor of the Foreign Relations Committee chairmanship, if that became available. He is next in line to Sen. Fulbright of Arkansas.

Of course, Sens. Long and Byrd may regard themselves as heirs to the throne—and there are other ambitious men in the chamber. But Muskie has strong personal supporters who were ready to go once—and probably will be the next time.

THE NEW JERSEY PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the members of the New Jersey Partners of the Alliance can indeed be proud of their recent efforts in securing and shipping approximately 7 tons of needed hospital equipment to their sister State of Alagoas in northeastern Brazil. Included in the shipment were sterilizers, operating-room lights, examining tables, a fluoroscope, a blood bank refrigerator, an electrocardiograph, infant cribs, and many other items.

The used but serviceable equipment was donated by 12 New Jersey hospitals in response to an appeal by the New Jersey Partners of the Alliance Committee. The appeal was made through the New Jersey Hospital Association earlier this year and the Partners committee subsequently arranged collection of the equipment with the help of donated moving services and donated temporary storage facilities in an industrial plant.

The hospital equipment is consigned to a counterpart committee of citizens in the State of Alagoas and is being handled directly to the port of Maceio, the capital and principal seaport for Alagoas,

aboard the Moore-McCormack Lines freighter *Mormacpine*.

Charles C. Phillips, chairman of the New Jersey committee, recently pointed out that additional equipment still is on hand and will be sent to Alagoas as soon as more funds, to cover the costs of crating and shipping, can be raised.

The institutions, individuals, and business concerns that participated directly in the hospital equipment project and who are to be commended for their efforts are:

Englewood Hospital, Englewood.
Jersey Shore Medical Center, Fitkin Hospital, Neptune.
Helene Fuld Hospital, Trenton.
Mercer Hospital, Trenton.
Middlesex General Hospital, New Brunswick.
Perth Amboy General Hospital, Perth Amboy.
Memorial Center for Women, West Orange.
Chilton Memorial Hospital, Pompton Plains.
Passaic General Hospital, Passaic.
Memorial General Hospital, Union.
Christian Sanatorium, Wycoff.
Bogue Electronics—dispensary—division of Bogue Electric Manufacturing Co., Paterson.
Regan Brothers Transfer & Storage Co.—Allied Van Lines—Montclair.
George B. Holman & Co., Inc.—United Van Lines—Hackensack.
Engel Brothers, Movers, Elizabeth.
Spencer-Kellogg Division, Textron, Inc., Edgewater.
Dr. J. L. Lerner, D.D.S., West New York.
Dr. Thomas J. Sperber, Teaneck.
Dr. B. Bregman, Edgewater.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the electric car is an old technology that is new. In years past, there were more electric cars than internal combustion vehicles. The day when the silent, smog-free electric returns is not far off. I recently introduced S. 453 to promote this development. The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] was cosponsor of that bill, as well as the author of his own bill, which I cosponsored. These bills show both a unanimity of opinion and the importance of the issues involved: Commerce, transportation, and air pollution. The House of Representatives is also acting on the subject of electric vehicles. Representative RICHARD OTTINGER has introduced electric car legislation and others will follow.

The January 28 Saturday Evening Post recently published an interesting article on electric vehicles. I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

IT CLICKS, IT HUMS—IT'S SUPERCAR!

(By Roy Bongartz)

For some reason I have always been daffy about electric cars. Maybe it's because they seem to move by magic. They don't steam, puff, roar, backfire, or spew out a jet stream. They just give a contented hum and an oc-

casional click. As a kid I rode to its end every trolley line in Dayton, Ohio; today, if I am set at liberty near the Dodge cars in an amusement park, I am a loss to the outside world until the current is shut off for the night. I'm thinking of taking golf lessons, so I can ride in an electric cart. I even like slot cars.

The lovable feature of the electric is what it hasn't got: It hasn't got troubles. There is hardly anything in it or on it to wear out or go on the blink. The absence of gas-line, for example, means no tank, no gas cap or lock, no gas line that can freeze. Gone with the engine itself are motor oil, filter, pumps and pressure gauge; pistons and rings; generator, distributor (with its timing adjustments and frill points), spark plugs, air filter, radiator, water pump, hoses, antifreeze, fan and fan belt. There is no driveshaft—thus no hump in the floor—no transmission, no starter motor, no exhaust pipe, and—of course—no exhaust.

When Ford and General Motors announced this fall that they were working on new electric cars, and Senator Warren G. Magnuson (D. Wash.) introduced a bill to spend \$10 million developing such a vehicle, I was galvanized into action and made Detroit my first stop. I have long wanted to buy one of these gentle smokeless carriages, but I could never find a good one. Now, I thought, my fortunes were changing.

Electric vehicles are used in various places in the United States and abroad; trucks, some of them vintage models, are used in stop-and-go delivery of many items; golf carts move such sportsmen as former President Eisenhower over the fairways. The state-owned French Renault company has an electric-car project; the city of Osaka, Japan, is converting its 1,900 buses to battery power. In England, which has 40,000 electric delivery trucks, the British Electricity Council foresees a million electric cars within 10 years—"given enterprise, courage and swift action." The Tennessee Valley Authority is testing an electric car as a potential market for electricity.

Of course, long before I got my first driver's license in 1938, the last of the old electrics had disappeared from my family's Ohio neighborhood. It wasn't until six years ago that I finally drove one myself—a Volkswagen Karmann-Ghia with its inside scooped out and replaced with half a ton of storage batteries and an electric motor. Its owner, another fanatic named H. Drake Harkins, a retired Atlantic City Electric Company executive, used to drive it tirelessly around a dirt track. He and I drove it in traffic, too, scoffing at the fuming gasoline cars, glancing haughtily at the anachronistic gas stations. The trouble was that you couldn't keep it up for long before the batteries died.

This was the trouble that killed the electric in the first place. There was little to be done about it; piling on more batteries doesn't help because a car fails to gain extra power when the weight of its batteries reaches more than 45 percent of its total weight, according to an empirically determined law of diminishing returns. Though standard lead-acid batteries are now 75 percent stronger than they were 25 years ago, they still can't give a car much range. No matter how much I loved that forthright get-away and that cheery hum, I had to face the fact that an electric just could not make it from my house to town and back—some 50 miles. Sadly I decided to forget it.

But now Ford and G.M., as well as Senator Magnuson, are talking about brand-new power sources. Fifteen Federal agencies are already paying for 86 different research projects on batteries, and Senator Magnuson wants the Government to build the electric cars to go with them.

The "glassed-in drawing room on wheels," as the electric used to be called, is waking

up like Sleeping Beauty. The magic kiss may be simply the ugly fact that tons of pollutants are streaming into the American air every year. Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D., Maine) and Representatives Richard L. Ottinger (D., N.Y.) and Paul G. Rogers (D., Fla.) have sponsored electric-car bills similar to Senator Magnuson's, and the power companies, battery firms and conservationists are also eager to bring back the electric car.

If the electric car makes a comeback, it won't be very much like the old one, which had so little power that a strong man could keep it from moving if he pushed on the hood with one hand. One olderster recalled, "It became identified with lady drivers and older people who were not concerned with dash and dreams of glory. Like its upholstery, its public image was dove gray." The first electric vehicle in the United States was a tricycle built by Philip W. Pratt in Boston in 1888. The first car was built by William Morrison of Des Moines in 1890, and within 10 years electrics outnumbered gasoline cars. They weren't all dove gray either; in 1902, Walter Baker's electric caused one of the world's first fatal car accidents: his oilcloth-and-basswood racer, the Torpedo, hit a row of spectators and killed two of them at a 1902 race on Staten Island. Undaunted, he later set the world's record of 120 miles per hour; the car hit top speed just once, and then the batteries failed.

When Senator Magnuson introduced his bill, he asked the automobile makers what, if anything, they were doing about developing the electric. First to reply was Ford president Arjay Miller, who announced a new battery "that we expect could offer tremendous improvements in range, performance and cost."

Hoping to be on hand for Sleeping Beauty's golden moment, I went to Detroit for the official presentation of Ford's sodium-sulfur battery, said to be 15 times more powerful than ordinary ones. Set up in a glass tube, a single cell made of sodium, sulfur and aluminum successfully spun a three-inch wheel on a stand. Ford scientists said all they had to do now was make a bigger one and put it into a car. Dr. Michael Ference Jr., vice president for scientific research, said, "The development of a feasible electrically powered vehicle will continue to be one of the primary assignments of our scientific research staff and indeed the entire Ford Motor Company." Ford has in mind a small City-Car to be designed by its British affiliate and tested with ordinary batteries next spring; a 500-pound sodium-sulfur battery should be ready for it within two years. Among the obstacles to be overcome is the danger of handling noxious sulfur and flammable sodium at 500 degrees F.

A bit let down at not having had an actual ride in an electric, I took my quest to the other automobile makers. A Chrysler spokesman said it wouldn't be worth the trouble to visit them, although they have a battery called a fuel cell, which runs a 10-inch car around a track. Their chief engineer for basic-sciences research, Dr. C. R. Lewis, said, "These present fuel cells are at the same stage of development as the piston engine was during the Wright brothers' first flight."

General Motors wasn't ready to talk when I called. Then, before a month had gone by, G.M. called me at my home in Foster, R.I., to say they had a new electric truck, an electric car, and a revolutionary battery to boot! Out to Detroit I went again. It turned out that G.M. had actually been working on electrics for two years. Executive Vice President Edward N. Cole described their display as a "milestone event." Dr. Craig Marks, assistant engineer-in-charge of the power-development department, told me about his early research on the new car: "The things we had taken for granted as advantages of an electric car became our major problems.

Smooth, quiet, and reliable! We had mechanical vibrations, and electrical noises, and electronic-circuit reliability problems such as we had never dreamed of."

Outside, a pretty blue Corvair called Electrovair II drew up alongside a lagoon, where fountains played in the wind. I got into it, and a voluble young engineer with a crew cut checked me out on the specifications—electronic controls, 115-horsepower motor weighing only 130 pounds, and parts unknown in more prosaic electrics: a cooling system of circulating oil with a pump, fan motor, fan and radiator. We pushed off in a fine swing of increasing speed, with that solid, low-keyed humming I like so much. We hit 60 in just 16 seconds—top speed is 80. Though it weighs 800 pounds more than the Corvair, the car was engineered to equal Corvair performance except in range: Electrovair II's range is only 80 miles. That would be enough to get me to town and back. But then we got out, and I looked at the batteries filling the front and rear compartments—silver-zinc batteries, worth \$15,000, that wouldn't last six months in regular use.

I inspected the new lithium-chloride battery that could turn out to be 10 to 20 times more powerful than standard batteries; it, too, is in an early stage. Then came the electric truck, called the Electrovon, "the most advanced electric automotive vehicle ever built," according to Marks. It is the first road vehicle to run on a fuel cell which, instead of storing power, makes current out of fuel as needed. Hydrogen and oxygen work best. It functions silently and efficiently, with no moving parts.

Inside the Electrovon were some 2,000 cells, developed for G.M. by Union Carbide. Each is like a thin battery, a sixth of an inch thick, with a hydrogen chamber on one side and an oxygen chamber on the other. They are fueled from three spheres, two for hydrogen and one for oxygen (the end product is H_2O). The van develops 125 horsepower, has a range of 150 miles, and can go 70 miles an hour. It can hit 60 in 30 seconds; like the car, it was built to equal the performance of its model, the G.M.C. Handi-Bus, though it weighs twice as much.

It will be "ten to fifteen years before there's any wide use of these power sources," Vice President Cole said. "We have to start with what we have today—electric golf carts that make eighteen holes if you're lucky. We're not contemplating building any low-power car, without a heater or air conditioning. A lot of things are going to come before the electric car: for example, better control of emissions from gasoline engines."

Even so, I felt that things were looking up. Ford's battery, though not very big, looked promising, and my appetite for another ride in an electric was sharp. I had once met an executive of the Electric Storage Battery Company in Philadelphia, an electric-truck enthusiast named Morrison McMullan. I called him, and it turned out that he drives his own electric car to work every day. He invited me down to see it.

McMullan—"Mac" to friends—is a tall, graying man whose blue eyes, peering over half-lensed glasses, light up when he talks about electrics. And it is not just because he works at a battery factory, either; he loves them. Seated in his ground-floor office, he gazed fondly at the roof of his car just outside; he had snaked a cable from the car through the window and plugged it into an outlet beside his desk.

The car is a refitted Renault Dauphine dubbed the Henney Kilowatt by its makers, the Eureka Williams Company of Bloomington, Ill. A colleague of Mac's, Jim Norberg, has bought one too (they cost \$3,500). The Kilowatt was the only electric car actually for sale to the public, but production is now suspended. Its makers say, "Tuneups are unnecessary, freezeups impossible, and motor

breakdowns virtually eliminated. A major overhaul amounts only to cleaning the contact points and replacing the brushes."

Mac opened trunk and engine compartments; six batteries sat in each. The rear also held a steel cylinder about the size of a water-cooler jug—the electric motor. This is geared into the rear axle. When it is turned on, the wheels go around. Its simplicity is its beauty. The dashboard has a speedometer, a voltmeter and a tiny switch, like one on a flashlight. When the switch is in the center position the car is off; up, the car is ready to go forward; down, backward. A pedal operates standard hydraulic brakes. Steering, lights and signals are all conventional. The only tricky item is the accelerator, which Mac said I'd learn about while driving.

I got behind the wheel, Mac got in beside me, and I pressed down on the pedal. As we moved out into the busy traffic of Rising Sun Avenue, the car click-clicked forward, going *boo-bee-baa-bo-buzz* like a circus-spect trolley car. (The metal-on-metal clicks come when electric relays close magnetic switches in sequence as the accelerator is pressed.) It had a kind of doughty strength as it pushed through its six power levels to a top speed of 40. We passed a car and drew no attention to ourselves; there is nothing about it to show it's an electric, except for the missing tail pipe. But Mac's wife is so proud of it that she put a sign in the rear window: **ELECTRIC**. The 900 pounds of batteries gave us plenty of momentum, and braking at a stoplight came a bit hard. Climbing a hill, Mac warned, "Keep it at full speed, but be sure you press the pedal slowly enough to click through each stage in order from a stop, or you'll blow the fuses."

We stopped again at a light, and everything was automatically off. Mac gave a superior look at a throbbing car beside us. The electric motor works at its very best from a dead stop; its hefty torque—power to the wheels—makes it ideal for stop-and-go use, especially now, when in the centers of large cities traffic moves no faster than the horsedrawn vehicles of another era. Going downhill the car used no power, and Mac says that electrics can be wired for "dynamic electric braking" that would very slightly recharge the batteries at every stop. At the very least this would make a nice phrase for an advertisement.

The speed kept it up with the traffic; going at full tilt is good for the electric.

Mac would like to hook up an electric drag racer with silver-zinc batteries—these are the expensive ones, but they're powerful—and run the car wide open. "I know we'd break 200 miles an hour within that quarter-mile," he says. "Then the batteries would die, but that dragster would be famous."

Mac figures he uses three quarters of a kilowatt-hour per mile, which can be more or less expensive than gasoline, depending upon local electric rates. He increases the 20-mile traffic-driving range by charging up during the day as well at night. As for repairs, in two years he has replaced two light bulbs and the contact points. The batteries cost \$500 and last about five years.

An odd feature of the electric is that its batteries gain back a little power when the car stands still. This is the same phenomenon that lets you run down a starting battery, wait an hour, and find it able to turn the motor over a few more times. When I asked Mac if he had ever run out of electricity, he said he had, but could use the recuperative power to get to a service station. When he gets there he asks for an outside electric outlet to "refuel my car." He offers a quarter for "a nickel's worth of current," then all business stops and everybody surrounds the car, stares at the batteries and asks questions.

Mac tells of a tougher challenge. In 1960

he demonstrated an electric truck to post-office officials in Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Cleveland Vehicle Company, which at the time was making electric trucks in co-operation with the Electric Storage Battery Company. When Mac took the truck out of the garage, he found that the mechanic had forgotten to plug it in overnight. It had only half a charge. Mac set out anyway, bravely clicking and humming his way to pick up a mailman and a load of mail for a test run over a hilly suburban delivery route. Carefully timing his stops, and resting at the crests of hills, Mac finished the route just as the batteries gave up. But it was still another mile back to the post office. "I'll never leave a truck; it's very bad, psychologically, with prospective customers," he says. He got out, made a show of scratching his head, kicked the tires, and peered under the truck, where there was nothing to be seen but the underside of the floor. He suggested that the mailman hike to the top of the next hill and wait. After a few precious minutes had gone by, the truck had recharged itself enough to move again. Mac picked up the mailman, coasted to the bottom of the hill, and came to within a half a block of the post office before the truck died again. "Drive her on in," the mailman said. Mac said no, he wanted to be sure there was a parking place. This ruse—walking over to the parking lot and back—killed another two minutes. The truck then obediently made it into the lot behind the post office. Mac rushed a cable to its starving connectors. And later, post-office officials ordered five electric trucks, which are in use today in Washington, New York and Miami; more are being considered.

Vintage electric trucks are still used in various cities; their big nickel-iron batteries often last a dozen years. The only manufacturer today in the United States is Paul Hafer, who has a body shop in the Pennsylvania Dutch country, where in partnership with the Electric Storage Battery Company, he makes Batronic trucks.

Electric companies themselves are naturally interested in the future of electrics. They would more than double their output if road vehicles went electric. This could cut the rates, but eventually they would have to go up by a quarter to a third for road taxes.

By now I was tempted to give up my odyssey in search of the perfect electric. These rare Henney Kilowatts and delivery vans did not quite fill the bill for a reawakening Sleeping Beauty.

But then I recalled a challenge to the Ford battery that I had seen in the papers. It came from Gulton Industries, of Metuchen, N.J., claiming a battery twice as good as Ford's. So I invited myself down to meet Dr. Leslie K. Gulton. At 65, Gulton is a big, expansive man with a broad smile and the trace of a Viennese accent. That silver-zinc battery, because of the high price of silver, is just a curiosity, he said. The Gulton entry, a lithium-nickel halide battery, will be light in weight—lithium is twenty times lighter than the lead used in present batteries. It could run a small car 150 miles on a charge, he said, and its materials are cheap and available. "With this battery we have vindicated Edison," Gulton boasts.

Thomas Edison once had a small laboratory here on what later became the Gulton firm's grounds. Edison, in 1905, told Walter Baker, "If you continue to produce your present quality of electric automobile, and I my present battery, the gas buggy won't stand a chance." Nine years later Edison tried to build an electric with Henry Ford, but they failed at it. If perhaps Gulton hasn't yet quite vindicated Edison, maybe the Ford Company will beat him to it and vindicate Henry.

Gulton says, "Don't talk about electric, it won't be electric, it will be the *electronic*

car." He has many ideas about this car but has no plan to build one—only the battery for it. He suggests that parking meters could be wired to recharge cars; his battery will take a quick charge. But it is still in the laboratory stage. Gulton adds, "If the Government took the interest in transportation on earth that it takes in space, we could have our electronic car, built from the ground up, in six months. There is one Government electric-car project—for travel on the moon!"

Many amateurs have built fairly successful electric-car prototypes. One, designed by an Illinois Institute of Technology graduate student named Marlie Averitt, is called "Sparky." Priced at \$900, it weighs 1,000 pounds and carries an 800-pound load, plus two persons. Six-volt "golfer" batteries run its five-horsepower motor (electric motors need only a fifth to a quarter the horsepower of gasoline engines to develop the same power). Its speed is 30, range 60 miles; the cab opens from the front like a clam.

In Bethesda, Md., scientist John Hoke has adapted a two-passenger King Midget car to run on six auto batteries. It goes 40 miles an hour and costs two-thirds of a cent a mile to run.

Rules can be broken with the electric, and my head is exploding with all kinds of possibilities: self-service taxi fleets, tiny cars bundled aboard trains for vacations, exchangeable battery packs ready at every corner, highways alive with power imbedded in the concrete. But somehow I'll have to cool my impatience because for today, anyway, I still cannot buy an electric that will get me to Providence and back.

I'll be the first one to my electric-car dealer when he opens, but meanwhile I'm killing the time by looking around elsewhere. And I found out there's this steam turbine no bigger than an office typewriter that could easily outpower a modern car engine. It's built by a man named Danny Bogni up in Montpelier, Vt., and all it needs is to have money put into it. Maybe I can get to like a nice sharp, steamy hiss just as well as that monotonous old electric hum. I'm heading north tomorrow.

MINNEAPOLIS AQUATENNIAL SUMMER FESTIVAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the annual Minneapolis aquatennial summer festival is more than a civic promotion aimed at touting community virtues. It is unique in its attempt to offer widely diverse ethnic, cultural, and national forms of entertainment to the citizens of Minnesota and the upper Midwest. In order that this noteworthy effort be brought to the consideration of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the event be printed in the RECORD.

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

MINNEAPOLIS AQUATENNIAL ASSOCIATION

Because of the specific theme emphasis of the festival being staged July 14 through the 22nd, it is especially appropriate for the participation of interested governments in our 1967 Minneapolis civic celebration. More than 2500 volunteers work all year to schedule, administer and execute the festival's 200-plus individual events. Some two million persons will participate in, or be spectators of, the United States' largest and best programmed civic celebration. During the past festival, representatives of 42 states and 22 foreign countries visited us.

Although the celebration retains its original image as a water festival, its events range the entertainment and cultural spectrum from water ski and boating competi-

tion, to soccer, polo and rugby matches, continuous downtown programming, two of the nation's top parades, to sculpture and art exhibitions and quality musical and entertainment features.

Aquatennial is the first major celebration to take as its objective "total festival programming with total metropolitan participation." The festival itself is staged both in the core city and in the suburban areas.

Aquatennial was also the first major civic celebration to embrace both the Festival-USA promotion sponsored by the U.S. Travel Service and Discover America, Inc. For a second year in 1967, Aquatennial will be one of five key celebrations featured in Festival-USA advertisements appearing in 42 magazines and newspapers throughout the world. Festival brochures, fact sheets and posters are supplied to U.S. Travel Service offices and to U.S. consulates around the world. In addition, informational material on Aquatennial is supplied to travel editors and writers of all major media. Particular promotional emphasis is provided in working with the media in Minnesota and the neighboring five-state area.

Our theme selection this year is an appropriate one in that 1967 has been proclaimed by the United Nations as International Travel Year. This decree has set in motion an opportunity to promote global travel on a scale never before possible. The emphasis will celebrate the international role of the tourist in the world's economy, in cultural exchanges, and in peaceful understanding among peoples and nations.

Travel is indeed a vast human enterprise and an exchange of peoples and cultures: a basic expression of international goodwill. It is appropriate that the United Nations, in proclaiming the ITY, has designated as the slogan for 1967, "Tourism, Passport to Peace."

The participation of various nations in Minneapolis' great civic celebration becomes even more valuable seen in the light of promotion of international understanding and goodwill. Minneapolis is located strategically in the heartland of our nation. This is a vital and progressive region, with an expanding cultural climate. It is also a vigorous industrial and commercial area, active both on the national and international economic scene.

Aquatennial has a unique appeal to the Minneapolis business community. The strong support of merchants and businessmen has placed Aquatennial in a select group of a few festivals which are not supported by city, county or state funds. Each year the festival stimulates the economy in terms of \$6 to \$80 million in new money to the Minneapolis area. Each year the festival generates local, state, national and international promotion valued at about a million and a quarter dollars.

The key to Aquatennial's role as a retail sales and business stimulus is its exciting and unique Aqua Downtown program. By way of extensive decorations, costuming, exhibits, entertainment and cultural features, Aqua Downtown in 1967 will capsule in a six-block area of downtown Minneapolis the cultural, social, ethnic and economic traditions and achievements of the countries featured. Aqua Downtown is centered along Minneapolis' fashion street, Nicollet Avenue, which this summer will be enhanced by a newly completed Mall. Aqua Downtown, then, is a festival within a festival, encompassing a panorama of the countries which include Portugal, Spain, Italy, France and Africa. The presentations will vary from block to block. The French Quarter will be presented in two blocks of Nicollet Avenue with the other participating countries being exploited in other blocks. The major retailer in each block will be the focal point of activity. The stores stand ready to implement this portion of Aqua Downtown to the best of their creative and financial

resources. Thus, a ready made platform for exploitation and utilization by the various governments exists.

In addition to in-store theme implementation, participating governments may join in other Aquatennial activities, such as presentation in Aquatennial's parades and in special features such as the art and sculpture exhibition. These will be situated on the downtown Nicollet Mall and will offer works by outstanding Minnesota and American artists and sculptors as well as works by artists of other nations. Native crafts and export products would be an obvious means of acquainting Aquatennial visitors with that aspect of life. Thus, participation in Aquatennial is a many faceted matter embracing business, cultural and educational aspects. There is no question that meaningful national identification can be accomplished by utilizing fully the platform offered by Aquatennial.

The level of the civic celebration has attracted the interest and participation of such dignitaries as Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, U.S. Cabinet Secretaries, and Mexican Ambassador Hugo Margain, among others. The Mayor of Minneapolis and Governor of Minnesota welcome this opportunity to host guests to our festival. We anticipate staging special activities which will acquaint overseas dignitaries with leaders in governmental, economic and educational affairs from the Midwest. Such programs offer an opportunity for an exchange of ideas on both an informal and formal basis. They allow for person-to-person communication with Minnesota editors and legislators as well as with business and thought leaders from the metropolitan area. Arrangements will also be made for dignitaries to meet with officials of the University of Minnesota and to observe first-hand the workings of this famed educational facility.

Mahatma Gandhi of India once said, in reference to his travels, "I have watched the cultures of all lands blow around my house, and these winds have blown the seeds of peace, for travel is the language of peace." Americans are great travelers. Both domestic and foreign travel continues to rise as Americans keep on the move. The people of Minnesota and the Upper Midwest are a friendly and inquisitive sort. They have a vast interest in world affairs and a great capacity for understanding. In this kind of climate, participation by interested African nations in the Minneapolis Aquatennial would have a dramatic impact. Hopefully, it would provide them with an unusual opportunity for exploitation for their unique contributions in a variety of fields.

U.S. POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, outcries of criticism against U.S. policy in southeast Asia continue to rise from many quarters—from the Secretary General of the U.N., from distinguished editorial writers, and from distinguished scholars. The critics, as Howard K. Smith recently wrote, "invent new arguments with fertile ingenuity or they cling to old ones with weedlike persistence." Mr. Smith, for his own part, does an effective job of disposing of the irrelevant arguments. He has answered some of the critics most effectively in a column published in the Washington Evening Star, in which he proclaims the belief, which I know I share, that the United States may proceed to do what is clearly right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Howard K. Smith column, answering critics of our Vietnam position, be printed in the RECORD.

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

ANSWERING CRITICS OF OUR VIETNAM POSITION

(By Howard K. Smith)

Critics of the American position in Vietnam manifest elemental virtues. They invent new arguments with fertile ingenuity or they cling to old ones with weed-like persistence. Their single vice is, their arguments both old and new get no closer to being relevant to the facts of life.

A new twist the other day was a columnist's plaint that we are offending the very basics of our own history: By rebuffing foreign dissenters we have discarded Jefferson's first imperative in the first sentence of our first state document—namely that we should show "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

The columnist misinterpreted Jefferson. In that famous declaration, he did not offer to change our course of action. He merely offered to explain it to those willing to listen, while we forged ahead regardless of how they reacted, which is what we are doing now.

U Thant the other day revived the old domino theory which, one had hoped, the critics had stopped propping up and knocking down. The Secretary General said the U.S. bases its policy on faith in the domino theory, and that the theory is wrong.

I don't know how much history it will take to make the point that our action is not based on theory but on fact; a year ago the Communists nearly took South Vietnam. They have seized two-thirds of Laos and about a fifth of Cambodia. They have attacked India twice to disable that potential focus of resistance. Little over a year ago they shipped 100,000 weapons to Indonesia to enable that Communist party to try to seize the government; the fact that they failed does not blur the clarity of their intention. They announced by radio, and began to fulfill, a plan to take over Thailand. No week passes without the newspapers of U Thant's own Burma recording Communist attacks in that country.

None of this is theoretical; it is what is happening. We must put a halt to it in Vietnam or see the world balance go so badly out of kilter that a big war will result.

U Thant also argued that U.S. interests are not involved in Vietnam. Secretary of State Rusk in response pointed out that the past four American Presidents disagreed. The Secretary might have added the name of a fifth President—Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1941, when Japan seized what is today Vietnam, Roosevelt deployed our war fleet, absorbed the Philippine army into the U.S. Army and cut off essential exports to Japan. He made all these warlike preparations—over what is today Vietnam—and according to the Gallup poll of the time 96 percent of the nation supported him. His action led directly to Pearl Harbor. So, Vietnam has been an American interest for quite a long time.

Perhaps the most ingenious recent argument is one invented by the editorialists of the New York Times. They have argued that we should make unilateral concessions (like stopping the bombing without reciprocal concessions from the Communists) because we are a big nation, and they are small.

The principle that effective military action must be related inversely to size is certainly something new under the sun. It would give a blank check to any client state, or client front, of every international aggressor. It would have been our undoing in Greece or Turkey or Korea. The relevant facts are that we escalated in Vietnam because they had escalated enough to take over the country. When we experimented twice in de-escalation, they used the lull to escalate faster. There is no way of measuring how many additional casualties we suffered be-

cause of ceasing the bombing twice. In any case, our present offer to stop the bombing if they will use the infinite channels and ways of diplomacy to promise some reciprocal de-escalation is both generous and sensible.

The hoariest of arguments now enjoying a revival in the academic community is that by thus hitting back at a small nation we are making ourselves the world's pariahs; we shall end up with the world refusing to associate with us and we shall hate ourselves.

We have heard that argument a dozen times, most loudly in 1956, when the Russians stifled rebellion in Hungary by brute force. Well, instead of being outcasts, the Russians are being sedulously courted by everybody including us. If the Russians got by with a bad case, we shall do all right with our excellent one.

It is a fact of life that sometimes a nation must brace itself against outcries of criticism and proceed to do what is clearly right. That is what we are doing.

RESCISSION OF 1954 TARIFF INCREASE ON WATCH MOVEMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I commend the President for his decision rescinding the 1954 tariff increase on watch movements.

Congress, in adopting the Trade Expansion Act, embraced the principle that an "escape clause" tariff increase should be regarded as a temporary measure to assist a suffering domestic industry to adjust to foreign competition.

Unless extended by the President on the basis of economic evidence supplied by the Tariff Commission and advice furnished by the Commerce and Labor Departments, all "escape clause" actions were to terminate after 4 years—or 5 years in the case of preexisting "escape clause" decisions.

The "escape clause" action on watch movements endured for 12½ years, in spite of the fact that the domestic watch industry has been enjoying record prosperity. It was far and away the oldest "escape clause" action in the history of the trade agreement program.

At a time when we are engaged in vital tariff negotiations in Geneva, the United States could not in good faith maintain high tariffs on watch movements when the domestic industry had plainly made the adjustments contemplated under the law.

The only remaining question was the feeling of some that the contributions which the domestic watch manufacturers make to national defense might be jeopardized by competitive imports of commercial watch movements and parts.

Following an intensive study to which the Defense Department, the Commerce Department, the Labor Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration all contributed, Director Farris Bryant, of the Office of Emergency Planning, advised the President as follows:

I have concluded that watches, watch movements, and watch parts are not being imported into the United States in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security. I have also concluded, based on the studies and judgments of the interested defense

agencies, that the domestic watch manufacturers will be likely to continue production of defense materials for the foreseeable future, that the non-horological industry now has and will continue to have a role in the production of essential military timing devices, and that horological-type defense items will continue to be available from one source or another without regard to the level of imports of watches, movements, and parts.

Although the domestic industry would prefer to retain the advantages provided by higher tariffs, the plain fact is that we cannot expect other countries to allow U.S. firms to compete on a footing of equality with their firms if we continue to give "escape clause" protection to an industry in this country after the injury which required such protection has disappeared.

The significance of the President's action from a trade policy standpoint has already been demonstrated by the reaction in international trade circles.

The Federal Council of the Swiss Government promptly said in an official statement that the elimination of the "escape clause" increases must be taken as an important contribution of the United States to the success of those far-reaching negotiations in which the United States and Switzerland are both vitally interested.

Officials of the European Economic Community were quoted by the New York Journal of Commerce as "very pleased," and one EEC official said:

This should enable the market to study the possibility of reciprocating on some American exports.

The watch decision is generally expected to provide a needed shot in the arm for the Kennedy round negotiations in Geneva. U.S. economic interests are vitally involved in these negotiations, and our stake in their success is very large.

The President's decision in the watch case should have practical and beneficial consequences of a very substantial character, and I commend the President for taking this important step.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the text of the White House press release announcing the President's decision.

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

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS
SECRETARY,

January 11, 1967.

The White House announced today that President Johnson has proclaimed the termination of escape-clause rates of duty on imports of watch movements. By restoring the rates of duty prevailing before escape-clause action was taken 12 years ago, the proclamation will have the immediate effect of reducing U.S. tariffs on watch movements by about one-third. The changes in the many particular rates of duty will vary according to the size and type of watch movement. The reductions in rates of duty from the escape-clause levels will apply to watch movements of pin-lever construction or of jewel-lever construction but containing not more than 17 jewels.

The escape-clause rates of duty that are being terminated have been in force since mid-1954. At that time, President Eisenhower increased the tariffs from the levels established in 1936 in the U.S. trade agreement with Switzerland. The 1954 increases were declared necessary to avoid serious injury to the domestic watch industry as the

result of increased imports attributable to the trade-agreement concessions.

The President's decision to terminate the 1954 increases was based on a recommendation by the late Christian A. Herter, his Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the heads of other Government agencies. Governor Herter submitted his recommendation to the President upon the completion of a review that his Office and other Government agencies had undertaken following the submission in March 1965 of a Tariff Commission report on the escape-clause case. In that report, the Tariff Commission gave its judgment as to the probably economic effects on the U.S. watch industry of a reduction or termination of the escape-clause rates of duty.

During the period of the interagency review of the escape-clause case, the Office of Emergency Planning, at the request of the President in April 1965 and with the assistance of government defense agencies and the Departments of Commerce and Labor, examined the national security aspects of trade and production in watch movements. As a result of OEP's investigation, under section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Farris Bryant, reported that watches, watch movements, and watch parts were not being imported in a manner which threatened to impair the national security and that horological-type defense items will continue to be available without regard to the level of imports of watches, movements, and parts.

THE POWER OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the New York Times this morning published an editorial entitled "Clear It With Hoover," which, I think, speaks for itself. But I do wish to draw the attention of Senators to it. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

CLEAR IT WITH HOOVER

Even after publication of the curious correspondence between Secretary of State Rusk and J. Edgar Hoover, it is far from certain that the Administration will be able to override the veto Mr. Hoover has hitherto exercised against the long-stalled Soviet-American consular treaty.

There can be few, if any, precedents for the spectacle that correspondence presents: the Secretary of State, in effect, asking a Federal police official of sub-Cabinet rank to stop blocking United States foreign policy, and then receiving a reply so cryptic and ungracious that it can only further encourage opponents of the Administration policy. It is a reminder of the magnitude of Mr. Hoover's power, with implications that go far beyond the immediate issue.

The fate of the consular treaty is crucial, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has acted wisely in altering its schedule to give priority to the treaty's consideration. Ratification means more than normalizing Soviet-American diplomatic relations and providing badly-needed additional protection to American citizens traveling in the Soviet Union. What happens to the treaty will foreshadow the probable outcome of the rest of the Administration's constructive program for trying to improve relations with Moscow.

If the consular pact cannot be ratified, then the East-West trade bill is probably dead and the space treaty may have been still-born. The entire direction of American foreign policy toward the Soviet Union at an extraordinarily critical moment in world history is at stake.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR COMMENDED FOR BRIEFINGS OF NEW MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, last Thursday, Hon. Bernard Boutin, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, conducted a unique seminar on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Boutin arranged for an intensive briefing on the work of his agency to be presented to the newly elected Members of the Senate. It is my understanding that he has arranged for a similar briefing for Members of the House of Representatives this week.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business, I attended a portion of last week's meeting. I was impressed by Mr. Boutin's evident desire to educate the newly elected Members of the Senate in the intricacies of the small business program. It is unusual for the head of any independent agency to feel a strong responsibility for maximum cooperation with Members of Congress, and it is more unusual and more commendable to offer such cooperation to freshmen Members of Congress.

I hope that in the months to come other agency heads will undertake similar briefings of Members of Congress on the activities of their agencies. I feel that Mr. Boutin's example is to be strongly commended as an outstanding example of executive branch willingness to cooperate with Congresses, and as one more example of the reasons for the fine reputation which Mr. Boutin has here as an outstanding Government administrator.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON "MEET THE PRESS"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday on "Meet the Press," the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] presented a cogent and penetrating analysis of the tragic situation which exists today in Vietnam because of the ever-escalating commitment by the United States to the conflict there.

As one of the two Senators who voted against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, I was particularly gratified in watching this program to hear what Senator FULBRIGHT had to say about the circumstances under which that resolution was rushed through Congress. I hope that if the occasion presents itself in the future, more Senators will join in "putting on the brakes" before voting to encourage or approve the further escalation of the tragic war in Vietnam.

Senator FULBRIGHT's invitation to appear coincides with the publication of his book on foreign policy entitled "The Arrogance of Power," which is published today.

The importance of Senator FULBRIGHT's appearance is that in this book he proposes a way to bring our war in southeast Asia to an end. As one who has opposed our military intervention in southeast Asia for some 3 years, and has repeatedly asserted his view that there was no justification for our invasion, that indeed it was and is the height of folly, I certainly welcome any solution

that promises to put an end to the senseless slaughter not merely of our own boys but of thousands of others, including civilians—men, women, and children—and to stop the tremendous drain on our resources, which is nullifying the fine domestic program enacted by the 89th Congress under the vigorous leadership of President Lyndon Johnson.

Senator FULBRIGHT's replies to the questioning make clear that some solution is necessary if our country is not to proceed further down the road to disaster and get deeper and deeper sunk in the southeast Asian quagmire.

The interview with Chairman FULBRIGHT on "Meet the Press" should be "must" reading for all those who want a realistic appraisal of the facts on Vietnam as they really are and not as so many would like them to be.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview with Senator FULBRIGHT on "Meet the Press" on January 22, 1967, be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Guest: Senator J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.), Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee.

Panel: John Hightower, Associated Press; James Robison, NBC News; Rowland Evans, Chicago Sun-Times; Lawrence E. Spivak, Permanent Panel Member.

Moderator: Nell Boggs, NBC News.

Mr. Boggs. Our guest today on Meet the Press is the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas. Senator Fulbright's Committee will soon begin a worldwide assessment of American foreign policies and commitments. The Senator's most recent book on foreign policy "The Arrogance of Power," will be published tomorrow.

Now we will have the first questions from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the Meet the Press Panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator Fulbright, according to report, President Johnson feels that you are now criticizing the very policy on Vietnam which you outlined in 1964 and which he is now following. Would you say that your own position today on Vietnam has pretty completely changed?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I think it has changed, my views about it, certainly, but I am not certain about '64 being the period. I tried for a number of months to persuade the President and the Administration to take a little different approach in Vietnam but failing that, it has changed. The character of the war has changed. It has escalated materially. It is much greater now than it was. Last year, as you well know, the number of people in Vietnam have doubled. We have nearly 500,000 people in and about Vietnam today.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you mentioned '64 but your book "Old Myths and New Realities" was published in March 1964 and you said then "It seems to me that we have no choice but to support the South Vietnamese government and army by the most effective means available."

Now, have you changed your position on that?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I have—well, the war itself has changed. I supported the effort then to support the South Vietnamese army. We had at that time I think roughly 15,000, not more than 15 or 18,000 people there. The whole concept was to assist a government, an indigenous government to defend itself. It was long before we had taken over

the war. I have made it quite clear both, I think, in the book and in public statements, that the way this has developed was quite a surprise to me. I had no conception that this war would develop as it has developed.

Mr. SPIVAK. Now Senator, on the fundamental question of the United States, America's vital interest, didn't you in '64 believe that we had to defend our vital interests there, and that we did have vital interests there? Have you changed your position on that?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I don't believe that I had any convictions that our interests were vital there, in the sense that we now speak of that when we justify as large an operation. I think what you have in mind perhaps is the Tonkin Bay Resolution which was submitted in the midst of the on-coming election between Mr. Goldwater and President Johnson. I then took the position that I was strongly for President Johnson and one of the principal reasons was his attitude toward the war. And when the Tonkin Bay Resolution came in, as I have said on numerous occasions, I clearly made a mistake in not recognizing the significance of it. I thought I was supporting a candidate who was strongly opposed to enlargement of the war, to the defoliation, as they used to say, of the forests and the destruction of the economy and the people of that area, and I thought that was what I was doing in supporting the Tonkin Bay Resolution. I also thought at that time that the fact of an unprovoked attack upon our people on the high seas was quite clear. Since that time I have reservations about that. There have been a number of developments since that time that have caused me to publicly state I was mistaken in not undertaking a thorough-going review of our policy then and in taking it much more seriously.

Mr. SPIVAK. Well, Senator, do you now think that we do or do not have vital interests in Vietnam?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I do not think that our interests there are commensurate with what we are presently doing in the way of conducting warfare and escalating it. I think our interests there are marginal, that we have never before considered that a land warfare in the land mass of Asia was justified or that a permanent position on the land mass was in our—was essential to our interests, as distinguished from our military power, our naval power on the oceans and in the island fringes along the periphery of Asia and particularly in our bases. I still think that is sound.

I may say—I mean, there is no particular excuse for it, I am not trying to excuse, I am trying to explain. I never took this war to be serious, expecting it to be as serious as it has developed. Our attention as you will recall, up until recently was more directed toward Europe as being the center of the difficulties with Russia and with the Communist bloc, and it has shifted.

Mr. SPIVAK. You are saying then that while our vital interests may have been involved at one time when war was small, now that there is danger of great and grave extension that our vital interests are not involved to the same extent?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I am sorry. My capacity of communication is very limited. I am saying that our vital interests in Southeast Asia have never been involved at any time. But having a very small operation there, I didn't take it very seriously because there was a very small commitment made there and I didn't become concerned about it, and I accepted the Resolution in 1954 which seems to be the basis for the enlargement of this war as a genuine demonstration of our solidarity in the fact of what was alleged to be a violent attack upon our ships on the high seas where they had a right to be.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. Senator, if you feel there are no vital United States interests involved

in the war in Vietnam, it seems to me the question arises: Could the United States afford to lose the war?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I don't recommend that it lose the war. What I try to recommend is that it extricate itself from a very difficult and dangerous situation. I do not think it is necessary to say you must either win or lose a war of this kind. I think I am trying to advocate a process of compromise, an honorable compromise in my view which would extricate us from this obligation—

Mr. HIGHTOWER. You have suggested an eight point peace plan in your new book to try to achieve that result. One of the points in that plan is that the United States should stop the bombing of North Vietnam. Do you feel that the United States should stop the bombing now without condition or qualification?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Yes, I do, for various reasons. One is that I don't think they are of very much importance now militarily. They have not decreased the number of infiltrations. In fact the infiltrations have increased. All they have done is cost the North Vietnamese a greater effort in order to maintain the supplies, but it has not done much more than that.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. I would like to ask you, Senator, your plan deals primarily with the first stage of peace making—that is how to get into a negotiation or how to get the other side interested in negotiation?

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. But what do you see as the substance of compromise? What kind of issues could be traded off against each other so that each side would get something out of a settlement?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, the real objective of the negotiation in my view is to return to the principles of the Geneva Conference which was agreed upon after Dien Bien Phu, and which would allow an election in South Vietnam for them to determine whatever the kind of government they can agree upon—without our dictation and under some reasonable supervision, I would presume, of the ICC.

Mr. EVANS. Senator Fulbright, do you really think, sir, that the government of South Vietnam would now negotiate with the Viet Cong? That is the National Liberation Front.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, we have the constituent assembly being created. There have been rumors recently that the civilian members of this are willing to talk. There was a rumor—it is a rumor only, in the press—that one of the men who was assassinated the other day may have been assassinated because he did desire to reach a settlement.

Mr. EVANS. Then what you really mean, Senator, is not the present government, but the government that may come into being after the elections?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, the present government if it will not do what we tell them to do—which they are very likely to do—then they can easily be changed. That government has no base. We put it in and they are our government.

Mr. EVANS. You think they would negotiate with the NLF?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Or get out.

Mr. EVANS. Or get out?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. I don't understand that, sir.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, if they refuse to do this, they could get a new government. We have had a number of new governments there.

Mr. EVANS. To turn to another point quickly, you say we should put no more forces into South Vietnam. Supposing the other side puts in two divisions?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I said to protect what we have there, and I don't think we need any more forces to protect what we have. We need more forces if we are going to escalate it.

Mr. EVANS. Is that an absolute, Senator, in the sense that we should not reinforce regardless of what the other does?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No, I wouldn't say any of those suggestions are absolute. If they started dropping nuclear bombs on us, we would have to respond in a different way. There are all kinds of possibilities. I don't think they are probabilities. I think the other side would like, would welcome an opportunity to bring this dreadful war to an end, if we could take the initiative to make it acceptable. I don't think either side wishes to acknowledge that it is the aggressor or that it has lost or won, by seeking a compromise.

Mr. ROBINSON. Senator, did you say that if the present government of Premier Ky doesn't do as we want it to do, that we should get it out?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think that is perfectly reasonable. He is there only because we put him in.

Mr. ROBINSON. He isn't exactly though, is he?

Senator FULBRIGHT. He is our government. I mean there are no delusions about that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Well, he came in under a military coup d'etat, but you can't say that we arranged the military coup d'etat.

Senator FULBRIGHT. With our support, and he couldn't last I don't think, two weeks without our support. Now they are creating a constituent assembly which I think would probably be more likely to negotiate with the other Vietnamese for some settlement, but I am not sure—I don't know what Mr. Ky would do. Mr. Ky is a Northerner, of course, from North Vietnam and he is a general and I would assume he would be subject to persuasion. If he isn't, I don't think he has much alternative because he has neither a political base of his own or any military independent support other than ours.

Mr. ROBINSON. Senator, you called for the essential neutralization of South Vietnam in your latest book, but for North Vietnam you merely said it would be desirable, and then you go on from that and say it is essential that all of Southeast Asia must be neutralized.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I would like to see all of it done, but I would like to take it bit by bit. I don't wish to contemplate perfection at the beginning. I think the first thing is to get over the hard place now of this continuing war. A cease fire is of course obviously the first thing I would like to see come about, as a result of a negotiation or a prospect of one, as a result of stopping our bombing.

Mr. ROBINSON. But don't you think, Senator, that you are imposing what you would like on these various Southeast Asian states? I should think a lot of Southeast Asian states perhaps might not want to be neutralized.

Senator FULBRIGHT. If they don't want to they won't be. That is what the negotiation is for. May I say this: I don't think all of these procedures are particularly important at this stage. What is really important is a change in attitude on the part of our government. I would like to see our Secretary of State take a little different attitude, that he would welcome a compromise settlement rather than a surrender. That is important.

The reason I try to set out in these eight points procedures, because I—I have made many speeches about this and always the critics, of which there are many, say "He gives no alternative, he never suggests any way to approach this matter, he just leaves it up in the air," and that is the reason for the eight points. The really essential thing is for our government to change what I believe is its attitude which is now to demand surrender, that the other side stop what it is doing, and to seek a compromise, because I think the war is unjustified in the beginning, that we never should have intervened in a civil war as we have, against our traditions. Therefore I am seeking a way to extricate, not to surrender, nor to win. I don't

think an outright military victory would be in our interests, contrary to what many of my colleagues think. I think a solution that might be durable is much more likely to result from a compromise settlement in which neither side is humiliated.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator on the matter of leaving your neighbors alone and stopping the aggression, I understand you are very critical of Secretary Rusk because he keeps repeating those words.

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. SPIVAK. But isn't that exactly what you said to us on Meet the Press in '65?

You said, "We wish ultimately to get a negotiation or settlement that will provide for the North Vietnamese or anyone else leaving their neighbors alone. I think this is a sound policy."

Now you once evidently thought that was a sound policy. What has led you to change your mind on the soundness of the policy? Is it the size of the war?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, yes that is partly it. The realization of what our policy is, there. There have been many things that have developed in the course of the last two or three years that are very involved. The statements of the Vice President in Bangkok, announcing a kind of an Asian Policy; statements that have come from various speeches by the President, the Secretary of State as well as the Vice President, indicating that: now we are undertaking what some papers have referred to as the "Johnson Doctrine." That we are becoming the paternal overseer of Asia.

I had no idea in the beginning that this could grow out of this involvement. This originally was an ordinary aid program not unlike some 60 or 70 or 80 other aid programs all over the world. I had no idea this was going to develop in the way it has. Quite different from what any of us, I think, in the Congress, thought.

Of course, I don't know what the Secretary thought but the Senators, as you know, don't give full time to this sort of thing. This is a thing where we respond in the first instance to the Executive's positions and suggestions. I don't think it is at all illogical to take quite a different view when you realize that we are embarked upon an ever-expanding, apparently, obligation, here, and with obligations not only military but economic, to remake all of Asia, which I think is beyond our capacity.

Mr. SPIVAK. But Senator, isn't our policy in Viet Nam based on the simple premise that if we stopped this aggression now we will stop a larger war, isn't that—

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think that premise is false. I think we became involved in a colonial war in 1950. A people who were seeking their independence from France. And this was a mistake, but it was so minor, at the time—and there was never any particular issue; I don't recall any action taken of any significance in Congress. We were preoccupied with the Marshall Plan, with the development of Europe, which was a major undertaking. And then later with the Korean war.

This matter went by the boards and then later, even in '54, it attracted very little attention. We didn't sign the Geneva Accords, although we were present. The Secretary of State refused to be present there and delegated it to an underling, and we were just there, we didn't sign it, and took, I thought, no responsibility. I hadn't the slightest idea that this government was instrumental in putting Mr. Diem in control of that government. In fact, I had no knowledge one way or the other. I wasn't interested.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, there are some people who come to the conclusion that you would be for withdrawal of our troops on almost any basis, that you really don't think our prestige is involved any more than the Russians' prestige was involved in many of the withdrawals that they made and that

you don't care how we withdraw as long as we do; it wouldn't hurt our stature, it wouldn't hurt our prestige.

Would you like us to withdraw no matter what?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No, I think it should be done in an orderly manner in accordance with the procedures that are followed in such cases. The President has said he desires to withdraw himself. No one seems to contest that in open discussions. He said that at Manila. I think it should be in accordance with the procedures I have outlined very sketchily in this book which has already been referred to.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. Senator, do you see, as some things you say suggest, a difference in policy view between President Johnson and Mr. Rusk?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think I do. It is very difficult to—it is certainly not clear-cut.

It seems to me that the President has gone much further in expressions that he is willing to reach a settlement, as he says, to negotiate without conditions and so on, without always adding the qualification "when they stop their aggression." Now sometimes he does and sometimes he doesn't. But this idea that the aggression of North Vietnam is the central—an essential characteristic of this war, which almost invariably occurs in the Secretary's statement, I think it is not always true in the President's statements and I think I have detected that the President wouldn't be quite as difficult to be persuaded to reach a compromise.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. The President's principal advisers in this field, I think most people understand, are the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense.

Senator FULBRIGHT. And Mr. Rostow.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. And Mr. Rostow.

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. Do you think the President should have some new advisers in this field?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Obviously we would like to see a new approach taken to this. I don't like to get into the personal side. That always overwhelms everybody's reason in Washington, because it becomes a personal vendetta.

I don't approve of the present policy, that is quite obvious, and I would like to see some new approach taken.

Mr. HIGHTOWER. May I ask it this way, sir: Do you see any possibility of a change in present policy unless, in your view, there is a change in personalities?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Probably not, but I think that the President, in my opinion, is a very competent public servant. I have supported most of his domestic programs, and most of his other programs, except Vietnam.

Now, when I become as conscious of the effect of this war on our domestic program—in my own state where small towns cannot get a sewer system or a water system because the program under which they were proceeding has been cut off under the Farmers Home Administration, I think the President is the kind of politician that will recognize the fallout of this war, and it isn't an isolated event in Europe. It is destroying our domestic program, it is allowing our cities to grow up with the most horrible conditions, as recently described by Haines Johnson here in Washington. And all over the world we are suffering I think from this. I think the President can change his mind with a little more advice.

Mr. BOGGS. Gentlemen, we have just under three minutes. Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. Senator Fulbright, again to go back to two years ago in this program, you said the present conditions in Vietnam were so critical that you would not consider a public debate advisable or you would not consider an investigation by your Committee.

Do you think conditions are now that much less critical that opening up this whole

question as you did last year—

Senator FULBRIGHT. I do indeed. When you consider the enormous increase in the manpower out there, the enormous increase in the money that is being spent. The request for \$73 billion just for defense, plus a large deficiency, this is getting to the point where it threatens, in my opinion, the future of this country and I certainly do think—

Mr. EVANS. Well, Senator, to follow that out why would you not then vote against appropriations, why would you not carry your dissent to the point where it would really count which is to vote against appropriations for money.

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is a very difficult problem, because the reason is that the armies are there not because they wish to be there, they are not responsible for being there, they are there because of a misguided policy and such a vote would clearly be misinterpreted and anyone who does that would be branded a traitor and it is emotionally and politically unacceptable to vote against supplies for the people in the field, the young men in the field who are there, not because they wish to be there. It would not be interpreted as simply a disagreement with the policy of the President.

This was all gone through last year in the long consideration given to the deficiency appropriation, and some 18 members of the Senate who considered that, decided it was unacceptable and unwise to do that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Senator, we have seen great changes especially in the Communist world with nationalism changing and eroding communism as a structure we knew it a decade ago. Under those circumstances then we set up various military alliances: NATO, SEATO, CENTO. Do you see these alliances still primarily necessary as a part of our foreign policy?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Many of them were mistakes. This was essentially Mr. John Foster Dulles' program and I think many of them were improvident and have been less than beneficial to our policy.

Mr. ROBINSON. Should we get rid of them?

Senator FULBRIGHT. We are going to look into those. We have already gotten rid of some of them. The Middle East one went by the board, as you know. SEATO isn't functioning. SEATO for all practical purposes is a shell. We are doing this unilaterally. We are not doing it really with SEATO members. The major members of SEATO do not agree with our policy.

One of the major things that has come clear to me lately, I mean, that I don't like, is that we seem to be going it alone instead of working through the United Nations. We are in effect ignoring the United Nations, which is contrary to what I thought was our major policy.

COMMENTS ON FOREIGN POLICY SECTION OF REPUBLICAN STATE OF UNION MESSAGE

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senate minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] has spoken in the bipartisan tradition that, since the end of World War II, has enabled the Nation to carry out an extraordinarily progressive foreign policy and to survive the most perilous era in history.

In a sense, he is serving the same role that a Democratic majority leader—Lyndon B. Johnson—served during the Eisenhower administration.

Both men put the national interest above politics.

Senator DIRKSEN did, however, express the view that the military effort in Vietnam should be intensified in the hope of bringing about an early termination of the war.

It should be noted that the Senator's position is still a good many degrees to the center of that held by Mr. Richard Nixon and some other Republican leaders and may perhaps be attributed to the need to take a position somewhat divergent from that of the administration.

For President Johnson, this is a matter that involves the most vital interests of the Nation, and therefore is entirely out of the realm of political debate.

He has established a firm and positive line calculated to thread a course between doing too little—encouraging the enemy to hope our resolve will weaken—and doing too much, inviting a perilous expansion of the engagement.

Such a course is difficult. It requires guts and determination, and mature patience by all of us in the face of extreme provocation and frustration. Let none among us lightly weaken that resolve.

SAO MIGUEL'S ROAD

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the construction of a short stretch of secondary road in central Brazil may not at first glance appear to be a major accomplishment. However, as a community development project, encouraged by field representatives of AID and CARITAS, it represents one of the most dynamic and rewarding aspects of the Alliance for Progress.

This road, and the attendant benefits of increased communication and trade, are highly important to the community that built it. Equally gratifying, as I learned from personal observations in Brazil and other South American nations, are the cooperative spirit and increased organization that results from self-help projects of this type.

It is with some pride that I point to the fact that 14 professors from Purdue University have been serving as advisers under an AID contract to the Rural University of Minas Gerais. An article describing this project and the role played by one of the professors, John R. Foley, appeared in the November 15 issue of *Front Lines*. I ask unanimous consent that this brief article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

SAO MIGUEL'S ROAD: IT'S A LESSON IN SELF-HELP

Sao Miguel is a county seat in the northeastern mountains of the central state of Minas Gerais in Brazil.

But it is not very big. It is really a small village and until recently, it had no road connecting it with other small towns of the area.

Not far away is Vicosia, population 10,000, but a world in itself. Vicosia hosts the Rural University of Minas Gerais, an outgrowth of an agricultural and veterinarian school started in 1926 by an American professor P. H. Rolfs.

The university's 1077 students come from every state in Brazil. Its faculty of 190 includes 14 American professors from Purdue University working as advisors under an AID contract.

Sao Miguel's Padre Vandick Elias Gomes is a local representative of CARITAS, the Catholic welfare voluntary agency registered with AID. He keeps track of the Food for Peace supplies and distribution.

It was his idea, coupled with the interest of a few villagers, to encourage the local people to build a road—their first—that would last through the rainy season and help farmers get their produce to market.

Padre Vandick is friends with one of the American professors at Vicosia, John R. Foley. Although he is an agriculture engineer and rural extension specialist, Foley is deeply interested in rural community development.

It was natural that he should be contacted for his advice on the Sao Miguel road plan. It was also natural that Foley accepted with enthusiasm.

Padre Vandick obtained permission from CARITAS to use his Food for Peace stores as "wages" for workers on the road. Then he called for volunteers. Foley helped plan the project, then trained the volunteers to build the road without heavy equipment, as there was none available.

"The response for volunteer workers was overwhelming," says Padre Vandick. Road gangs of 15 to 45 men varying in ages from 15 to 73 years, worked in eight-hour shifts two days each week. For this, they were given food rations to last their families about a week.

"The idea behind this arrangement," the Padre explains, "was for the men also to have ample time to attend to their own chores and, whenever possible, get other work payable in cash."

An old path began to take on a new appearance. Using their farm animals and sheer muscle power, the volunteer workers turned the path into a wide road. The mountain sides were graded and the weak spots secured against the ever-present threat of landslides during the rainy season.

Of equal or perhaps more importance, was the change that took place in the people of the community. Drawn together for the first time in an effort that would benefit everyone, the community experienced an almost immediate lift in spirits. "Community morale, because of prospects of a brighter future, was immeasurably higher in a scant few weeks," says Padre Vandick.

"Before long" says his trusted Lieutenant, Jose Paulino de Souza, father of nine, "we will get ourselves a truck and start collecting milk and other produce from all the small farms along THE ROAD. These we will deliver to Vicosia and—who knows—perhaps even all the way to Belo Horizonte, the state capital."

The activity has had other effects. A local agricultural cooperative is in the formative stage. The people are eating better—and learning new eating habits. And—who knows—the village of Sao Miguel may someday be put on the map, because its people have something more than isolation and hospitality to offer the world.

This is just one story of what's happening in rural Latin America, given some American advice and food. But it demonstrates the Alliance for Progress basic ingredient for development—self-help—and its practical, far-reaching effects.

Says Foley, "The initiative for many development projects in Brazil comes from the people in the local communities. That's what counts."

MANY MORE MAKE THEMSELVES HEARD AGAINST THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Vietnam, under the leadership of Prof. Hilary Putnam of Harvard as chairman and Prof. S. E. Luria of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as secretary-treasurer, published in the New York Times for January 22, 1967, a list of approximately 3,000 faculty members and other

professional men who have joined this ad hoc organization in a plea to President Johnson to "Stop the Bombing" of North Vietnam. This is in addition to the list of approximately the same number of persons published in the New York Times for January 15, 1967. I hope that the pleas by these 6,000 men and women from the learned professions will have some effect on the administration and that the bombings will be halted unconditionally forthwith.

In the same edition of the New York Times there was printed "An Open Letter to the President," signed by more than 300 architects, engineers, planners, and other members of the design professions in which they said in part:

When we see so many of our resources—men and materials—used for destruction in Vietnam, with the danger of the war being escalated to uncontrollable magnitude, we must join with the many legislators, members of the judiciary, scientists, educators, clergymen and others who have appealed for an immediate end to the conflict.

Among those listed are Albert B. Bauer, chief architect of the Department of Public Works of the city of New York; Thomas H. Creighton, former editor of *Progressive Architecture*; M. Paul Friedberg, who recently won a prize for his design for a playground at the Jacob Rlis housing project in New York City; Carl Koch, of Boston, designer of the Tech-Built House; and Christopher Tunnard, who is chairman of the department of city planning at Yale.

The honor roll of those who have joined in the fight to bring to an end the illegal and immoral overcommitment of the United States in the brutal war in Vietnam keeps growing, as it should.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisements by the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on Vietnam and the Committee of the Planning Professions to End the War in Vietnam, together with an article on the latter committees, all of which were published in the New York Times for January 2, 1967, be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1967]

MR. PRESIDENT: STOP THE BOMBING

MEDICAL PROFESSION

Alan Abrams, M.D., Sidney Alexander, M.D., Stanford W. Ascherman, M.D., Arnold Axelrod, M.D., Mildred Axelrod, M.D., Robert G. Axelrod, M.D., Katherine Baker, R.N., Eugene Balcanoff, M.D., Emil Barish, M.D., Robert B. Barm, M.D., Ellen C. Bell, M.D., Donald Boardman, M.D., Richard Braunstein, M.D., Caesar Briefer, M.D., Lawrence T. Browne, M.D., John Caldwell, M.D., Coleman Citret, M.D., Gerald Cogan, D.D.S., Jay L. Collins, M.D., Theodore B. Cohen, M.D., Ben Colloff, M.D., Lawrence Cooperman, M.D., Gertrude Copperman, M.D., Reuben Copperman, M.D., Klaus Dahlinger, M.D., Jeanne Dillard, R.N., Lawrence R. Ephron, Fred Epstein, M.D., Lawrence Feigenbaum, M.D.

Jay Feldman, M.D., Arnon Fortgang, M.D., Herman Frankel, M.D., Elizabeth French, Robert L. French, Ralph Gancher, M.D., Richard Gardner, M.D., Jay Gershaw, M.D., Jay Gershaw, M.D., James E. Gladstone, M.D., Robert M. Goldwyn, M.D., Asher Gordon, M.D., Julian Gorodsky, Max Gottesman, M.D., Ramon Greenberg, M.D., Jerome Gross, M.D., Charles Grossman, M.D., Norman Harris,

M.D., James Harrison, M.D., David H. Hausman, M.D., C. F. Humphrey, M.D., Hershel Jick, M.D., Ephraim Kahn, M.D., Harold A. Kazman, M.D., Richard Kegel, M.D., Bernard Kirshbaum, M.D., Oscar Klausenstock, M.D., Talman Kilngoffer, M.D., Arne J. Korstvedt, Mrs. Arne J. Korstvedt, David Kost, D.D.S., David J. Land, M.D.

Joseph Lanzo, M.D., Grant Levin, M.D., Sidney Levin, M.D., Norman D. Levine, M.D., Lem Lewis, M.D., Robert Lieberman, M.D., Samuel Lorman, M.D., Bernard Lown, M.D., Vera Malisoff, M.D., Sanford A. Marcas, M.D., Alan B. Metzger, M.D., Henry Mayer, M.D., Leo Melcher, M.D., Robert Marvin, M.D., Arlette Miller, David Miller, M.D., George Miller, M.D., John Miller, M.D., Betty D. Modley, Morrie Mink, M.D., Donald S. More, M.D., Gene Nemeche, Herbert Needleman, M.D., Herman Nussbaum, M.D., Robert Peck, M.D., Marjorie Peebles-Meyers, M.D.

Betty Pells, Psychologist, Robert Perlman, M.D., Charles Pollack, M.D., William F. Putnam, M.D., Stanley Rappoport, M.D., Michael K. Reese, M.D., Raphael Reider, M.D., George Reimer, M.D., Harold G. Reiss, M.D., Dwight Robinson, M.D., Anthony Robbins, M.D., George J. Roth, M.D., Harry Roth, M.D., David N. Rudo, D.D.S., Nathan Rudo, M.D., Rolf Scherman, M.D., Richard Schneer, D.D.S., Richard Selben, M.D., Eugene Shafannen, M.D., Phillips Shapiro, M.D., Raie Shifrin, Melvin I. Shoul, M.D., Victor W. Sidel, M.D., Daniel Simon, M.D., Louis Sokoloff, M.D., Fred Sondheimer, M.D., Harold J. Stein, M.D., Beverly Stewart, RN, Dennis Stone, M.D., Louisa Stigol, M.D., Robert Stone, M.D., Robert G. Templeton, Dale Tipton, M.D., Isidore Tolman, M.D., Philip R. Vandeman, M.D., Maurice Vanderpol, M.D., Clifford Walker, M.D., Raymond Welsberg, M.D., C. J. Wellington, M.D., Jocelyn M. Werry, RN, Harvey Whitfield, M.D., Harvey Widrow, M.D., John S. Weltner, M.D., Marlon Winterbottom, Ava J. Wolfe, M.D., Sidney M. Wolfe, M.D., James Wong, M.D., Francis E. Wood, M.D., John T. Wood, M.D., Lee Young, M.D., Isidor Zifferstein, M.D.

EDUCATORS

Maxine Acker, Olympia, Emily Anable, Wilton, Philip Barkan, Elise Beecher, Leonard Beecher, Beatrice Blumenfeld, Heinz Bondy, Richard Carpenter, Robert Crowley, Carolyn Darling, Jane P. Dexter, Cecile B. Dockser, Ellie Fernald, Lorraine J. Fine, Ruth Goodenough, Lee J. Gold, Helen Gordon, Ann Griffiths, David Griffiths, Kendrick Kapon, Amy Kass, Frank Kegel, Roseann Kerby, William Kerby, Eula R. Kietly, K. M. Kietzer, Lavanne Miller, Patricia Legg, Bernard Leopold, William McElwain, Betsey W. McGuire, Jean McKay, Hans Maeder, Alan W. Metcalf, Jeanne Molitor, Suzanne Pearce, Gerry Peck, Josephine H. Phillips, Dorothy M. Punderson, Margie P. Reeves, Meredith Reinhold, Norman Roseman, Grace Rotzel, Virginia Saibel, Margery Sayre, Nancy Seasholes, Van Seasholes, Frederick D. Sheppard, Esther Small, Mrs. James Smith, Lucy Stephens, James G. R. Steward, Kate Summey.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Ruth S. Aldrin, Jane S. Barnett, Margaret Bean, Charlotte Calif, Ann Campbell, Beatrice Chorover, Regima Cobb, Dorothy Cox, Eva Deykin, Emmy Ellert, Shirl Fay, Anne O. Freed, Arlene Goldberg, Roberta M. Goldwyn, William Gordon, Barbara Hanser, Rose Kaplan, Ida Kost, Theodore Levine, Louise C. Lown, Charles W. McCann, Dorothy McNells, Miles Mahoney, Carolyn Malone, Winifred R. Mason, Rachel Manda, Nina Melbin, Margrit Meyer Shampaign, Susanne Mosteller, Martin Norman, Delores Norton, Irene Okshea, Sol Peck, Joy Perlo, Anna B. Pollock, Marjorie Rankin, Barbara Hull Richardson, Bernard Saibel, Betty Scahergood, Rohna A. Shoul, Ruth Side, Nathalie Siegal, Nancy Staver, Sweena Tillis, Judith Towim, Mary Vanderman, Paula Veiner, Nancy V. Wallwork, Margaret Weiner, Agnes Werch.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES INCORPORATED

Nathaniel Burwash, Edith N. Churchill, William P. Hull, Frieda S. Ployer, Anthony Sharkey, Cornelia Voorhees.

OTHERS

Betty Aldington, Bruce Ames, Margaret Brummer, D. D. Bean, Jr., Liselotte Berliner, Robin Boucher, William Brandt, Edward Brummer, Mr. & Mrs. Rob't Cottre, Charles Garland Cox, Virginia Chorley, Marga S. Cooper, Pedro C. Cuatrecasas, Eugene S. Daniel, Jr., Sidney Dockser, Gerald Ehrenstein, Susan Erster, Barrie Freidman, Arthur Furst, Melinda S. Furche, Martin Gellert, Audrey Haschermeier, David J. Herzog, Mildred M. Hill, John Jacobs, Ernestine Kapon, Seymour Kaufman, Nancy Kaza, Werner Klee, Catherine Lauris, Rose Leopold, Alard K. Lowenstein, Maud McClasky, Michael Marcus, Murray Melbin, Brina Melemed, Charles Merton.

Ray L. Micklethun, Evelyn Morton, S. Hervey Mudd, Jane Nelson, Arlene R. Popkin, Kendrick W. Putnam, Janeal T. Raundal, Janice Robertson, Philip D. Ross, Charles Rosen, Max Samolar, Robert Scattergood, Gary Selsenseld, Harry Shalch, John H. Sloss, Marjorie H. Sibley, Mrs. Karl Slinger, Peter Slavin, Helen P. Sorokin, Bert Stone, Maxine Sweetman, K. C. Tanner, John M. Tormey, Margaret Terzaghi, Mr. & Mrs. Archie Velde, A. Young Woody, John K. Wright, Michael Yarmolinsky, C. G. Zaroulis.

ADELPHI UNIVERSITY

Harold Allen, Myron Blanchard, Richard Bodtke, Claire Collins, Sydney Davis, Gelia Deschin, Emil Dillard, Robert Endleman, Marion Forer, Beatrice Freeman, John Galton, Jean Graubart, Philip Greene, Helen Hacker, Thomas Heffernan, Stephen Klass, Thomas Knight, Donald Koster, Sidney Levenstein, David Levin, Mark Levine, Gerald Levy, Jerry March, Stanley Millet, Theresa Nathanson, Howard Paley, Catherine Papell, Harmon Putter, Gary Rosenberg, Beulah Rothman, Joseph Roth, Madeline Schwald, Rubin Starer, Stanley Windwer, Sophie Wolciechowski, Donald Wolf.

ALBERT EINSTEIN MEDICAL CENTER

Samuel, Ail, Daniel Boroff, Murray Cohen, David Ezekiel, I. Robert Fenichel, Samuel Horowitz, Albert Kaplan, Thomas Montie, Harold Persky, Robert Suhadolnik, Marvin Zucerman.

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE

Robert H. Bohlke, S. J. Buckwold, N. D. Cristodouleas, John Dickinson, Kathryn Gordon, Manfred Halberstadt, Lee E. Holt, David P. Leonard, Robert E. Lowrie, Michael C. Reynolds, William A. Tarenko, Ann Vilet, Kenneth Winetrou.

BOSTON COLLEGE

Robert Cheney, S.J., Robert Ferrick, S.J., H. Michael Mann, Jane Moosbrucker, Paul V. Moynihan, John Stauro.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCHOOL

Joseph Cochlin, Gladys Fiedler, Robert L. Herrmann, Conan Kornetsky, Allan F. Mirsky.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE

Robert K. Beckwith, Walter R. Boland, Myron W. Curtis, John C. Donovan, Edward J. Geary, Charles A. Grobe, Jr., Reginald L. Hannaford, Ernest C. Helmreich, Cecil T. Holmes, John L. Howland, Charles E. Huntington, Myron A. Jeppesen, Welis Johnson, Gerald Kamber, Daniel Levine, Robert C. Mellow, Barry M. Mitchell, Robert R. Nunn, George H. Quinby, John C. Rensenbrink, William C. Root, Burton Rubin, Marvin Sadik, Elliott S. Schwartz, Clifford R. Thompson, Robert A. Walkling, William B. Whiteside.

BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

Gilbert Abcarian, James C. Caughran, Robert R. Findlay, James Q. Graham, Jr., Theodore Groat, Robert M. Guion, Sheldon Halpern, Howard Hamilton, George Herman,

Gary R. Hess, William A. Kirby, Bernard Linden, George Massannat, Michael Moore, Arthur G. Neal, David S. Newman, James E. Odenkirk, Paul Parnell, Joseph B. Perry, Jr., Grover C. Platt, Virginia B. Platt, Bernard Rabin, L. Edward Shuck, Jr., Sanford Silverstein, John M. Stewart, Sandra Sutphen, Brian Sutton-Smith, Donald M. Winkelman.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

Rabbi Albert Axelrad, Lewis A. Coser, Robert Greenberg, Nathan O. Kaplan, Henry Linshitz, Roy Macridis, Arthur H. Richardson, Philip E. Slater, Leo Treitler, Caldwell Titcomb.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Seymour Benzer, Charles Biokaw, Norman Horowitz, William B. Wood.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

Thomas Allen, Max Bach, Bennett Berger, William Bigelow, Robert Block, Paul Castel-franco, Louellyn Cohan, Yehudi Cohen, Richard Cramer, William Dukes, Gerald Friedberg, Claude Garrod, Irving Geschwind, Richard Grau, Melvin Green, Bruce Hackett, Thomas Hanzo, Doris Herrscher, Roland Hoermann, J. L. Ingraham, Clyde Jacobs, Kenneth Kam-meyer, Robert Kelsey, Warren Kinzey, Dennis Livingston, Robert Maiseln, A. G. Marr, Daniel Mulholland, Denise O'Brien, Edward Painter, Bevalle Porten, D. M. Reynolds, Jerome Rosen, Julius Roth, Jay Ruby, Theodore Shank, William Smith, Robert Sommer, Al Sokolow, Ledyard Stebbins, Sherman Stein, Matthew Stolz, Theodore Strelkoff, Marvin Tartak.

Wayne Thiebault, Wesley Thompson, Stephen Tyler, Benjamin Wallacker, Edwin Williams, Barry Wilson, Frederick Altizer, Jan Altizer, Michael Anker, Piero Ariotti, Samuel Baron, James Bauerlein, Jack Behar, Adrian Birney, Alice Birney, Keith Bgueckner, Errett Bishop, R. Bouchard, D. Bouvier, Michael Boylson, Claudia Brugaletta, John Brugaletta, David Burke, Warren Butler, Marianne Carlson, B. Carol, C. Carol, Joaquin Casaldueiro A. Lincoln Castricone, Brad Cleaveland, Diane Darrow, G. DeLisle, J. Dmoss, Bruce Dexter, Jan Diepersloot, Bram Dijkstra, Russell Doolittle, Thomas Dunseath, Claude Dupuydenus, Robert Elliot, B. Escorcia, Jose Escorcia, F. Feher, G. Feher, James Felten.

G. R. Franco, Donald Fredkin, B. Gardiner, John Gooking, Diana Gordon, Fred Gordon, Robert Gould, Clifford Grobstein, Francis Halpern, Jeanne Halpern, Robert Hamburger, David Hamilton, Helga Harries, Roy Harvey, J. Heinrichs, Gabriel Jackson, Michael Keir, Evelyn King, Kaethe Kirkby, R. Kirkby, J. Korevaar, Michael M. Kreisberg, S. Kuroda, Arthur Lane, Margaret Langdon, Eugene Lee, Barry Lechtling, William Leiss, David Lesley, M. Levine, Leonard Liebermann, James Madill, K. Maki, Rudolph Makkreel, Herbert Marcuse, Peter Marlay, George Masek, B. Matthias, M. Monod, James Monroe, Julianne Monroe, Stanley W. Moore, L. Newmark, Xuong Nguyen-Huu.

Jose Nieto, David Norton, Irwin Oppenheim, Jack Ornstein, Pearce R. Philmuss, Garcia Pick, Robert Poe, E. Porcella, G. Press, Thomas Rado, David Reibel, Richard Reichmann, Elizabeth Richter, Helmut Rohrl, Joseph Rudnick, Jason Saunders, Barry Savin, Herbert Schulman, Howard Schwartz, George Senge, Michael Shaefer, Barry Shapiro, Erica Shover, Herbert Shore, S. Singer, Phillip Sloan, David Smith, Herbert Stern, Avrum Stroll, J. Sturtevant, Hans Suess, Frances Tanikawa, F. Thies, Wayne Vernon, B. Volcani, Donald Wesling, Eleanor Widner, Curtis Wilson, Andrew Wright, Jon Wright, J. Zittartz, Phyllis Zweig.

CASE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Paul O. Frederickson, Zakkula Govindarajulu, Louis J. Green, Stuart P. Hastings, Melvin Hendricksen, John R. Isbell, Marshall J. Leitman, Bernard W. Levinger, Allan Marcus, Philip Nazetta, Richard E. Vesley.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Lloyd Anderson, David Bakan, K. M. Baker, Carl Bangs, Jeanne Barnberger, Marguerite Barnett, Stephen Alan Barnett, Stanley Bates, Karl J. Bernesderfer, Wayne C. Booth, Robert Brewer, Howard Broisky, Merwin Bowen, Frieda S. Brow, Daniel C. Brown, James C. Bruce, Ann Burnet, Virgil Burnett, Anne P. Burnett, Marley Chapman, Vere C. Chappell, Samuel Cherniak, J. Scott Colley, Kenneth Andrew David, Marion Deckert, Michael V. Deporte, Michael J. Deran, Gregory Des Jardins, Trudy Ditmar, John M. Dolan, Charles Donahue, David Eisenbad, Randall Evans, Jr., Jeff Falk, Daniel Farrell, Eric Fenster, Arthur Friedman, Herbert C. Friedman.

Daniel Fife, William Frak, Daniel Fuchs, George Glauberman, Alan Gewirth, Beth Goldring, David M. Goldschmidt, James Grunebaum, Giles Gunn, Sami Hawi, Arthur Heiserman, John Heigeland, Nancy Pearce Helmbald, Roscoe Hill, Alfred Hildebeitz, Kim Hooper, Geoffrey F. Hoy, Burk Huey, Jerry Hyman, Kenichi Iyanaga, Frederic C. Jaher, A. Barton Jones, Gale Justin, Leonard Kaplan, Keith Keeling, David Kuby, Richard K. Lashoff, Roy F. Lawrence, Ben Lilves, Susan B. Little, Lester K. Little, Jesse Lemisch, Hans Lennep, Jarrett Leplin, Leonard Linsky, Earl Ludman, Jon L. Lutz, Richard Lyons, Joseph Alex Maxwell, Evelyn Marsh, David R. Mason, Martin B. Mathews, Donald R. Mazen, James McCawley, Suzanne McCormick, Jerome McGuann, Peter McGrath, Richard S. McMillin, R. Begin de Melogue, Sister Frances Mary Messer, Michael Messler, Marvin Minsky.

John C. Nelson, William O'Heara, John Ouck, John S. Peale, Kenneth W. Phider, Melba Phillips, William Pical, Robert Pinsky, J. Bruno Pritti, Randall Reid, G. H. Robinson, Janice Robinson, Merrill A. Rosenberg, Robert Ross, Melvin Rothenberg, David N. Rudall, J. Coert Rylaarsdam, Kenneth F. Schaffner, Claude Schochet, George Sessions, W. J. Settles, Dudley Shapere, Judith F. Siegel, Herman L. Sinalko, David Sookne, Richard Stern, Alan Stone, Charles Strain, David Street, Lars Svenonious, Mory Thale, Manley Thompson, Peter Tobias, Susan Tobias, Richard E. Trieb, Richard Virgil, Deiores Voorhees, Douglas Wallace, Howard Wartzein, Bonnie Waitzkin, Richard Wernick, Hugh Wilson, Gwynne R. Winsberg, Gibson Winter, Steve Zaffron, R. Zahler.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Jan Von Adimann, Hazel E. Barnes, A. O. Barut, W. Black, Bernard Bloom, Lyle Bourne, Robert G. Boyd, Wesley Brittin, William R. Brown, Myron L. Caspar, Glenn Chamberlain, Charles A. Chidsey III, Martin Cobin, Joseph W. Cohen, Edward U. Condon, Stuart W. Cook, Roy Craig, Joseph Dreitlein, Luis Eades, Leslie Fishman, Morris E. Garnsey, Peter A. Gilman, Jack H. Gore, Theodore D. Graves, Douglass Greenlee, Kenneth R. Hammond, Robert Hanson, David Hawkins, James Hockenhuil, Richard Jessor, Shirley Jessor, Byron L. Johnson, Gerald Johnson, Ronald C. Johnson, Fred Kern, Jr., Jay Kopelman, Jack Kraushaar, Frank Keith, Dale Kunz, Gottfried O. Lang, Joyce Lebra, Paul Levitt, John K. Link, Julius London, William F. Love, Michael Mandell, Raymond C. Miles, Philip Mittering.

James Donald Monk, Bertram Morris, Leonard Moskovit, Mary E. Nelson, Russel O. Olin, Frank Oppenheimer, Henry Pettit, Thomas J. Potter, John Powelson, David A. Prior, Roland Reiss, William Rense, Edward Rose, Richard L. Roth, Stephen D. Ross, Ernest Rost, Edward Sampson, Jr., Frank Sampson, James Sandoe, Kurt Schlesinger, Mary Schlesinger, Doris J. Schwalbe, William A. Scott, Ozzie G. Simmons, Maurice P. Smith, Charles L. Squier, Gary Stahl, Rebekka Struik, Paul V. Thompson, Walter H. Uphoff, Karl H. Usow, John A. Visvader, Douglas S. Vogel, Arthur G. Wasserman, Donald Weatherley, Glenn A. Webster, Wal-

ter Weir, Irving Weiss, Rita S. Weiss, Forrest Williams, John Byron Wilson, Richard Wilson, George E. Woodman, John Wrenn, Chris Zafiratos, Richard N. Zare, Reuben Zubrow.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK—BROOKLYN COLLEGE

C. Beam, Melvin Belsky, John Boardman, Joseph Bossom, Joseph Church, May D. Amata, Elizabeth Fehrer, George Fried, Marcia Friedman, William Friedman, M. Gabriel, Solomon Goldstein, Walter Goldstein, Rita Guttman, Dorothy Hammond, Eric G. Heinemann, Gerald Henderson, Donald D. Hurst, William Ittelson, Alta Jablow, Joseph Jablow, Myrtle S. Jacobson, Sol Jacobson, N. Levin, Naphtali Lewis, Pearl Meissner, Barton Meyers, Solomon Miller, Esther Milner, Howard Moltz, Harold Proshansky, Leonard Radinsky, Evelyn Raskin, Ann Haeberle Rees, S. Salthe, Frederick Schuster, Bernard Seidenberg, Robert Slotnick, I. Tittler, Norman C. Weissberg, Austin B. Wood, Carl B. Zuckerman.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK—CITY COLLEGE

Adolf Abrahamson, Nancy Abrams, Jane Aptekar, Michael Arons, Alvin Bachman, Allen Ballard, Jr., Morton Bard, Philip Baumel, Irving Branman, Frederick Benson, Nathan Berall, Arthur Bierman, Frederick Binder, Paul Blackburn, Roger Boxill, Betty Bronstein, Emanuel Chilli, Madeleine Cosman, Kazuko Dalley, Allan Danzig, Helen Davidson, Harold Davis, Roger Deakins, Angelo Dispenzieri, Barbara Dohrenwend, Abraham Edel, Sylvan Edwards, Marlon Faingier, Harold Falk, Erwin Feinberg, Muriel Forrest, Jane Franck, Reuben Frodin, Graham Frye, Joan Gadol, Arthur Ganz, Sharon Geier, Naomi Gordon, Matthew Grace, David Graves, Howard Greenberg, Judith Greenberg, Daniel Greenberger, Theodore Gross, Judith Guthwin, Thomas Haines, Leo Hamalian.

James Hatch, Samuel Hendel, John Herz, Alfred Herzog, Henry Huttenbach, Fred Israel, Fritz Jahoda, Anthony Jansic, Thomas Karis, Florine Katz, Robert Katz, Hubert Kauffman, Margaret Kenny, Yvonne Klein, Leonard Kriegel, Jeffrey Kurz, Robert Lea, Daniel Leary, Matilda Lerner, Sandra Levinson, Carol Lipkin, William Long, Robert Ludwig, Harry Lustig, Sol Magzmen, Karl Malkoff, Marvin Markowitz, Abraham Mazur, George McKenna, Samuel Meer, Eve Merriam, Claire Metz, Samuel Middlebrook, Gladys Natchez, Edith Nagel, Philip Nesbitt, Karen Orren, Stanley Page, Melva Peterson, Donald Petty, Lawrence Plotkin, Betty Popper, Edward Quinn, Wilma Rausa, Arnold Rogow, Julius Rosen, Kenneth Rubin.

Charlotte Russel, Hugh Salzberg, Myriam Sarachik, Zeborah Schachtel, Peggy Schwartz, Sally Scully, Mimi Segal, Claire Sellitz, Aurel Seifert, Oscar Sherwin, Jack Shapiro, David Shelpusky, James Shields, Marietta Shore, Marvin Siegelman, Martin Silverman, Erwin Singer, Jeannette Slavin, Bernard Sohmer, Harry Soodak, Peter Tea, Jr., John C. Thirlwall, Martin Tiersten, George Tulley, Amos Turk, Regina Turk, Frederic Tuten, Stephen Ungar, Edmond Volpe, Barry Wallenstein, Barbara Watson, Henry Weber, Emmeline Weinberg, Martha Weisman, Samuel Wilen, Harold Wilenski, Theresa Woodruff, Arthur Woodward, Jackson Young, Martha Young, Philip Zacuto, Sheldon Zalkind, Arthur Ziegler, Philip Ziegler, Rose Zimbardo.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK—GRADUATE CENTER

M. L. Balinski, John Cossey, Edgar A. Feldman, Alex Heller, Elliott Mendelson, Richard Sacksteder, F. Supnick, Leo Zippin.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK—HUNTER COLLEGE

Lemoine P. Callender, Mary Owen Cameron, Norman Curtis, Ralph A. Dale, Margaret E. Donnelly, Jane Greenspan, Irving Howe, Larry Johnston, Dorothy Krash, Otto Krash, Robert Lapides, John McNeil, Allen Mandelbaum, Bernard S. Miller, Peggy R. Monkmeier, J. H. Neuwirth, Joseph B. Prince,

I. H. Rose, Robert Sikora, John Somerville, Dorothy J. Susskind, Ingrid Matson Wekerle, Roger R. Woock.

NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mortimer Becker, Arthur Gremen, Eustace Burnett, Savin Cohen, Allan De Giulio, John Donohue, Robert Feinstein, Leon Goldstein, R. Ward Harrington, Sidney Helfant, Nathan Kalt, Evelyn Keating, Fred Klanit, Victor Lauter, Simon Lawrence, Edward Mapp, James McGrath, Mel Mendelssohn, Murray Myers, Benjamin Pacheco, Cyril Price, Thomas Ryley, Fred Schmitz, Thomas Shaw, Lester Singer.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK—QUEENS COLLEGE

Michele F. Cooper, George E. Dorris, Margaret L. Eberbach, Myron Gordon, Ruth Graham, Marianne Hauser, George Jochowitz, Shirley L. Kafer, Roger Kaimien, Lawrence Kaplan, Leonard B. Kaplan, Jerome Kass, Stanley T. Lewis, Irving L. Markovitz, Madeleine Morris, Nicholas Pastore, Barbara T. Petrie, Marilyn Pittalo, Sol Resnik, Robert E. Savage, Stephen A. Schwerner, Leslie I. Shore, John S. Stamm, John Teitelbaum, Frank Warren, Michael Wreszin, Harriet Zinnes.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Alexander Alland, Harold Barger, Allen H. Barton, S. M. Belser, Ruth Bennett, Eric Bentley, Bruce J. Berne, Richard Bersohn, Joseph L. Blau, George S. Boos, Ronald C. D. Breslow, Justus Buchler, Sue Buckingham, Ruth Bunzel, Charles Cantor, Theodore Caplow, Leigh S. Cauman, Ralph della Cava, David Caplovitz, Stephen F. Cohen, Myron L. Cohen, Samuel Coleman, Arthur W. Collins, Ken Cousins, Robert Cross, Elizabeth Czornicz, Phyllis Dain, Alexander Dallin, Arthur C. Danto, Istvan Deak, Morton Deutsch, Sigmond Diamond, Vernon K. Dibble, Ray Disch, Vera S. Dunham, James Elliot, Ainslee T. Embree, B. F. Erlanger, Alexander Erlich, Amital Etzioni, Donald A. Feinfeld, George Fischer, Robert M. Fogelson.

Morton Fried, Richard Fried, Horace Friess, Serge Gavronsky, Peter Gay, Daniel E. Gershenson, James F. Goldberg, Maurice M. Goldsmith, Dewitt S. Goodman, Irving Goodman, Loren R. Graham, Richard Greeman, Ellen M. Gumpertz, James Gutmann, Isabella Halstead, Elizabeth Hausol, Marvin Harris, Michael Harner, Ralph Holloway, Harland W. Hoisington, Terence K. Hopkins, Harvey Hornstein, Carl F. Hovde, Jane H. Hovde, Herbert Hyman, Jacob Jaffee, Peter H. Juviler, Jeffrey J. Kaplow, George M. Katz, Thomas Katz, Peter Kenen, Stephen Kern, Mark Kesselman, Morton Klass, Rolf Knight, Alexander Kouzmanoff, Stephen E. Koss, Richard F. Kuhns, Jr., Paul F. Lazarsfeld.

Garl K. Ledyard, Michael E. Levin, Raymond Lubitz, Edward E. Malefakis, Peter S. McHugh, Robert J. McShea, Sidney Morgenbesser, Charlotte F. Muller, Robert F. Murphy, Charles D. Parsons, Orest Ranun, Eugene F. Rice, Jr., Abraham Rosman, Michael Ross, Mario Salvadori, James P. Shenton, William Silverman, Paul Singer, Jane Slater, Michael A. Slote, Walter H. Slote, Sidney Socolar, Ralph Solecki, Leo Srole, William F. Starr, Robert Steigler, Samuel Sutton, Nicholas Turro, William S. Vickrey, Charles Wagley, Immanuel Wallerstein, Suzanne Wemple, Kenneth Winston, Robert P. Wolff, Leonard Zablow, Robert Zevin, Harriet A. Zuckerman.

THE COOPER UNION

Samuel Brody, Richard Dattner, Lewis Davis, Alan Schwartzman.

DICKINSON COLLEGE

George Allan, Merle F. Allshouse, Daniel Bechtel, Frederick Ferre, Clarke W. Garrett.

DUKE UNIVERSITY

Peter H. Klopfer, R. Bruce Nicklas.

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Emma Lou Benignus, Larry L. Bothell, Carl N. Edwards, Joseph Fletcher, Harvey H.

Guthrie, Jr., L. G. Patterson, William B. Schmidgall, Charles W. F. Smith, O. C. Thomas, William Wolf, J. R. Wright.

FINCH COLLEGE

Rosa Trillo Clough, Robert Diffondorfer, Ruth Miller Elson, Margaret Hall, Roslyn F. Hayes, Marshall Mount, Iris Mueller, Jane Ross.

HAMLINE UNIVERSITY

William A. Dolid, Donald P. Irish, James Lynskey, Charles R. Moyer.

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL

David Alpers, Joel Alpert, Beulah Amsterdam, Ezra A. Amsterdam, Robert S. Berg, Richard J. Bonier, D. L. D. Caspar, Eric Chivian, Carolyn Cohen, Susan Cowey, Frank Davidoff, Bruce R. Ditzion, Marvin Edleman, David S. Feingold, Frances Fox, Howard S. Frazier, A. Stone Freedberg, Edwin M. Friedberg, Cornelia Friedman, Henry Friedman, Edwin J. Furshpan, Sheldon Lee Glashow, Irving H. Goldberg, Adriane Gordon, Harvey Greenberger, Jerome Gross, Henry Grunbaum, Jonathan Guttmacher, Audrey Haschemyer, L. Lee Hasenbush, S. R. Helsey, John Heilman.

Edgar C. Henshaw, Howard H. Hiatt, Christine Hildebrand, Kurt Isselbacher, Herman M. Kalckar, Lloyd Kamins, Laurence H. Keddes, Stephen M. Krane, Edward A. Kravitz, Alexander Leaf, Sidney Leskowitz, Elizabeth Liben, Peter Livingston, A. Marshall McBean, Walter S. McNutt, Eugene Morlzin, Calvin Nafziger, John C. Nemiah, H. Richard Nesson, Stephanie Pincus, Gerald R. Plotkin, Michael Rees, Ronald O. Rieder, Dwight Robinson, Chester B. Rosoff, William Sillen, Clement A. Smith, Philip R. Steinmetz, Peter Sterling, Thomas D. Tollard, Maurice Vanderpol, Donald F. H. Wallach, Leonard Weiner, Torsten N. Wiesel, Norman L. Wilson, Samuel Wilson.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Barbara Ayres, Ursula Bellugi, Allan Berling, Marshall Berman, Steven Berrien, Kenneth Bleeth, Lawrence Blum, Dwight Bolinger, John Brode, Howard Brown, Yolán Carter, David Cavers, Courtney Cazden, Christopher Clague, Lawrence Crapo, David E. Drew, John Edsall, Rupert Emerson, Gordon Finley, Alan Fuchs, Albert J. Gelpi, Joseph C. Grannis, Peter K. Hepler, Stephen C. Harrison, Albert O. Hirschman, Lawrence Holcomb, II, Anne Hudson, John Katz, Martin Kilson, Rustam Kothavana, John Kroll, Michael C. Latham, Wassily W. Leontief.

David Levey, Paul Levy, Richard J. Levy, John M. Lewis, John R. Marquand, Paul Martin, Edwin P. Moise, John P. Moriarty, D. H. Morrill, Andrew Nathan, Peter F. Neumeyer, Wayne O'Neill, Martin Peretz, Heschel Raskas, Ragelio Reyes, David Riesman, Paul Roazen, Richard Roblin, Richard Rochberg, R. A. Rosenthal, T. Graham Roupas, Nadav Safran, Robert Schultz, Blanche L. Serwer, Alice K. Smith, Constance Smith, Steven Smith, Jerry Sobel, Mark Solomon, Robert Stiefel, D. J. Swanger, Karl Teeter, Sandra Temmallo, Frank Thompson, Richard Titlebaum, Allan J. Tobin, George Wald, Ruth Wald, Michael Walzer, David Winfield, Herman Winick, Sara K. Winter, Maury Wolfe, John Womack, Jr., David Ziegler.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Richard Bernstein, Edwin Bronner, John Cary, Thomas D'Andrea, Paul Deslardins, Andrew Effrat, Irving Finger, Robert Gavin, Linda Gerstein, Harvey Glickman, Marcel Gutwirth, Louis Kosman, Ursula Santer, Josiah Thompson, Sidney Waldman.

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

Howard Ball, Meyer Barash, Rubin Z. Baratz, Thelma Bearman, Donald M. Berwick, Ethel S. Brook, Charles Calitri, Leon Charney, David Christman, Harold E. Clearman, Lois Crews, Robert A. Davison, Michael N. D'Innocenzo, Dorothy W. Douglas, David V. Erdman, Gloria O. Evans, Ruth Formanek, David P. Funt, David Owen Glazer, Larry Goldberg, Avriel Goldberger, Emanuel Green,

Herbert Grossman, Robert Guttchen, George D. Jackson, Jr., David T. Jacobs, Eugene Kaplan, Charles E. Kinzie, Shirley P. Langer, Harvey J. Levin, Mary G. Ligon, Howard B. Lord, Margaret Lorman, George Mannello, Jacques Marchand, William A. McBrien.

John C. Moore, Anne Morgenstern, Robert E. Myron, Harold Nagler, Rhoda B. Nathan, Arthur Niederhoffer, Sylvia F. Pines, Charlotte Podolsky, Merritt B. Queen, Sabine Rapp, Yehuda Ray, Georgette Reitman, Gerard Rosenfeld, John A. Rounds, Alice Scourby, David Shapiro, Evelyn U. Shirk, Elie Siegmeister, Shirlee Sloyer, Timothy H. Smith, Esther Sparberg, Russell Stabler, Ruth M. Stauffer, Gitel Steed, Janice Studholme, Leonard F. Swift, Harold Tanyzer, Marcel Tenenbaum, Albert Tepper, Lynn Turgeon, John E. Ullmann, Rhoda K. Unger, Bess Vogel, Alexander Weiner, Doris Widerkehr, Murray Yanowitch, June Zaccane.

COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS

Rev. John Brooks, S.J., Edward F. Callahan, Rev. Wm. Van E. Casey, S.J., Francis P. Devlin, Rev. Joseph Donahue, S.J., John Dorenkamp, J. M. Fallon, S.J., Terrence Fieland, Maurice Geracht, Rev. William Guindon, S.J., J. J. Judge, John J. Lynch, Vincent O. McBrien, Robert F. McNeerney, Jr., Robert B. Norman, Rev. Joseph Pomeroy, S.J., Joel H. Roache, III, Paul Rosenkrantz, Lonnie Supnick, Andrew Twaddle.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS (CHICAGO CIRCLE)

R. M. Archer, Sandra L. Bartky, Peter Chelstron, Priscilla P. Clark, Frank R. Cumming, Herbert J. Curtis, Janet Eisenberg, David A. Foulser, Howard Gadlin, Margaret George, Norman Gritz, Douglas E. Johnson, Jay Kantor, Eliezer Krumbeln, Arnold Levi-son, C. M. Lombard, Alan McConnell, J. McGuinness, Richard Mouw, John Pappademos, Terrence D. Parsons, Yecheskel Rasiel, Alexander J. Rosen, Henry B. Russell, Irving Thalberg, Vivian Weil, Peter S. Wyer, Gary Young.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Peter D. Noerdlinger.

JULLIARD SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Shelley Datner.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

Robert T. Bobilin, Richard Dulin, John P. Farrell, Alfred C. Habegger, Richard F. Hardin, Robert E. Hinshaw, J. Channing Horner, Louise B. Horner, J. Kamp Houck, David Ignatow, David A. Jones, Howard Kahane, Herman D. Lulan, Michael Maher, Frederick G. Mitchell, Thomas W. Moore, Warner A. Morris, Leland Pritchard, Thomas Rehore, Edward S. Robinson, Edward L. Rue, Hamilton J. Salsich, Richard A. Schira, Richard B. Sheridan, John B. Simmons, Arthur Skidmore, Maynard H. Strothmann, Max K. Sutton, Thomas B. Woodward, Ferdinand Vanderveen.

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

C. C. Billings, Denez Gulyas, Rev. Wm. E. Jacobs, Paul L. Sites, Roy E. Wenger.

LONG ISLAND UNIVERSITY

Miriam S. Aronow, Arnold Asrelsky, Hubert F. Babinski, Ann Beinhart, J. R. Bogan, Kenneth Bridenthal, Ethel L. Cleavans, George Cohen, Joan Davidson, Joseph Duchac, Joseph J. Friedman, Gabriel Gersh, Judith G. Kirshner, John E. Lane, Gerda Lerner, Ray C. Longtin, Terence Malley, Barbara Pasternack, Melvin A. Pasternack, Leo Pfeffer, Edith Schor, Annette Schrieber, Paul N. Siegel, Joseph W. Slade, Robert D. Spector, Emanuel Tsantes, Donald Warren, Jr.

MANHATTANVILLE COLLEGE OF THE SACRED HEART

Gertrude Brady, Marlene Fisher, Maurice Friedman, Joseph McDermott, Robert McDermott, Jean Rosenwald, Guillermo Segreda, Patricia Shoyinka, Beth Singer, Gerard C. Thormann, John A. Williams, Maria de Issekutz Wolsky.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Frederick Adams, Stanford Anderson, Donald Appleyard, John D. Aram, Warren G. Bennis, Roberta Berrien, Noam Chomsky, David M. Epstein, David Frisch, Alexander Gang, Arnold K. Griffith, Peter Griffith, Adolfo Guzman-Arenas, David A. Kolb, Henry Millon, Joel Moses, Rabbi Herman Pollack, Barry Spacks, Gerald J. Sussman, Peter Tem-in, Lise Vogel, Gilbert Edgar Voyat.

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Dean A. Allen, Tom Aninger, Albert S. Anthony, Page Bancroft, Roger L. Bancroft, Leon O. Barrow, J. L. Benson, Loren T. Beth, Philip Bezanson, Max Bluestone, Gerard Brauthal, Emma M. Cappelluzzo, Miriam W. Chrisman, Charles T. Close, Philip B. Coulter, Thomas P. Dikes, Marlene Dobkin, Edwin D. Driver, Micheline Dufaw, Seymour Epstein, Andrew Petter, David Fortier, Thomas M. Fraser, Jr., Robert W. French, Harvey L. Friedman, Ernest Gallo, Hilda H. Golden, Morris Golden, Sheldon Goldman, Leonel Gongora, Glen Gordon, Joseph Havens, James P. Hendricks, Samuel Himmelfarb, Keith W. Hollingworth, Julian F. Janowitz, Harold Jarmon, Edgar N. Johnson, Walter Kamys, Yoshihiro Kato.

David Klingener, William Kornegay, Joel Krosnick, John F. Manfredi, David R. Mayhew, Gerald W. Melsner, Stanley M. Moss, John G. Moner, Richard W. Noland, Felix Oppenheim, Dorothy Ornest, John F. O'Rourke, Alex Page, Peter Park, Wolfgang Paulsen, Herbert Potswald, Aron Pressman, Howard H. Quint, Daphne S. Reed, Rogelio Rayes, Donald P. Reutlinger, Grace S. Rollason, Irving P. Rothberg, T. D. Sargent, Andrew Scheffey, Eva Schiffer, Ann Byrd Schumer, Harry Schumer, James G. Snedecor, Edward A. Soltysik, Robert L. Stern, Anwar Syed, Robert E. Taylor, Hui-Ming Wang, Seymour S. Weiner, Robert R. Wellman, G. Whaples, Miriam K. Whaples, Thomas O. Wilkinson, Elaine Wilson, William J. Wilson, Alvin E. Winder, Horst Wittmann, David Yaukey, Jules M. Zimmer.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY, OHIO

Jerome Allender, Joyce Benson, W. Brad Blanton, Melvin Bloom, Susan Bocher, Reo Christenson, Roland Delattre, Edward Fiebler, Thomas Gregg, Thomas Indinopulos, Harry Landreth, James Lehman, Terry Long, Warren Mason, Robert Meredith, Robert Reid, James Reiss, George Seiboulian, Ronald Shaw, Ralph Stone, Max Welsbarn.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

L. A. Addison, Henry D. Aiken, Paul J. Alexander, William P. Alston, E. B. Allaire, Frithiof H. Bergmann, Sydney E. Bernard, Bernard Berofsky, Harvey Bertcher, Richard Boyd, Richard B. Brandt, George W. Brooks, A. M. Casson, Carl Cohen, Alan N. Connor, Fred M. Cox, N. A. Drews, John Etropman, Carl Ginet, James D. Halpern, Robert H. Hauert, I. C. Hinkfuss, Peter G. Hinman, Lawrence Jones, Gordon Kane, Wilfred Kaplan, Stanislaw V. Kasl, Nicholas D. Kazarianoff, Robert C. Lyndon, Cleve B. Moler, Julius N. E. Moravcsik, C. Thornton Murphy, Anatol Rapoport, Sheldon D. Rose, Marc Ross, P. N. Sanders, Jr., James A. Schafer, Jerome Segal, Allan L. Shields, Daniel Sinclair, Robert Sklar, Brian Skyrms, Joel Smoller, Stanley H. Stahl, Frank Stenger, Charles J. Titus, Kendall Walton, Gabriel Weinreich.

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE

Edward Chittenden, Edward P. Clancy, Thomas E. Dow, Jr., Stephen Ellenburg, Kathryn Eschenberg, Lawrence G. Flood, Eugene Goodheart, Elizabeth Alden Green, Roger Holmes, Joe H. Hicks, Michael Hamburger, Richard Johnson, Marjorie Kaufman, John D. Landstreet, John F. Piper, Jr., Jean Pearson, Marcia Reecer, Frederick C. Shaw, Jean Sudrann, Martin Waine.

MOUNT SINAI HOSPITAL

Richard Hausknecht, Joseph Kolker, Miriam de Salegui, Arthur J. Samuels.

NASSAU COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Shirley Aronson, Gerald Axel, Joel Berger, Jack Berland, Florence Cogan, Dolores S. Faber, Arnold Gullub, Eugene Glickman, Jewell L. Gresham, Leonard Grundt, Porter Kirkwood, Jr., Anne C. Messing, Melvin Morgenstein, Lucille Nathanson, Ruth Nelson, George Oliver, Gerald Pintel, Martha F. Robbins, Edward H. Schiller, Doris Schaffer, Edmond Trunk, Ralph Whitehill, Peter M. Wickman.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Joseph Axenroth, Matthew von Baeyer, William Bonnice, Allan Braff, Paul Brockelman, Alan Cohen, G. Harris Daggett, John Donovan, R. V. Dusek, William R. Fuller, David Fullhan, Herman Gaden, Robert Isherwood, Gail Hawkins, Erwin Jaffe, Marianne Jaffe, Robert W. Jenkins, Scott Johnson, Mark Klein, Robert Lambert, John W. Mangold, Lyman Mower, John E. Mulhern, Hugh Pritchard, Sam Rosen, Cecil Schneer, Robert Silverman, Robert E. Simpson, Selma Singer, R. Peter Sylvester, M. P. Wakstein, Cyrus Weeks, William Witthoff, Fred Wurzburg.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Raziel Abelson, Flavia Alaya, Charlotte Alexander, Harvey Allen, Marcelle Altieri, Stanley Amdurer, Diane Argyros, Arthur M. Arkin, Ralph A. Austen, Sabert Basescu, Harold Basowitz, James F. Becker, Avrum Ben-Ami, Nora Benjamin, Ann E. Bello, Sidney Belman, David Berger, Eugene Y. Berger, Stanley A. Blumenthal, Phyllis Bober, Robert Boyd, Blanche Brown, Ruth Bournazian, Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., Fredric Burns, Robert D. Burrows, Ray Cagan, Kenneth Neill Cameron, Harmon Chapman, Jane S. Dahlberg, Ruth E. Dale, H. Clark Dalton, Miriam Bruce Dancy, Susan Darley, Bill Davis, Martin Davis, Ashley T. Day, Stan Deutsch, Lenore Deutscher, Chauncey B. Downes, Sylvan Ehrenfeld, Arnold Elsen, Ruth-Jean Elsenbud, Mera Elsen, Kenneth Elsold, Claire M. Fagin, Irwin Feigin, Lee Flierman, Bozena Fishbein, Emanuel Fisher.

Harry Fiss, Joan Fiss, Rebecca Folkman, Elliot Friedson, Marjorie Friedman, Bernard Friedland, Lou Frydman, David Gans, Leo Ganz, Bernard Garniez, Florence L. Geis, Jack Goldberg, Thelma Goldberg, Jacob Eli Goodman, M. A. Goldiner, Rosalind Gould, Howard Green, Charles Grosser, Alice Hageman, Edna Hammer, Muriel Hammer, John R. Hanson, James B. Harrison, Mel Herman, Thad Harshbarger, Michael Heidelberger, Doris G. Heller, Edward H. Henderson, Melvin Herman, Merrill T. Hollinshead, Robert Hoppock, Melvin Housner, Doris H. Hosmer, Richard J. Hyman, Will Inman, Miriam John, Alan Johnson, Bernard N. Kalinkowitz, Irving Karp, Edwin Kasin, Arthur Katz, Bernard Katz, Phyllis Katz, Simon Karpatrikin, George Kaufer, Harry C. Keeton, Minnie Kennedy, Abraham K. Korman, Fred Landis, Lillian Langseth, Robert Laupheimer, Herman Leon, G. T. Lesser, Marguerite Levy, Zyra Lourie.

David Malkin, Janet Malverti, Irwin Mann, Noreen Manget, Richard Margolis, Gloria A. Marshall, Mae Maskit, Evelyn Mason, Evelyn A. Mauss, James Michaelos, Alvin Mickens, Saul D. Miller, Thomas Joseph Miller, Walter James Miller, John Mineka, Nancy Modiano, Helen Moglen, Wheeler Mueller, Michael Munk, Frank Mukai, Jose M. Musacchio, L. Nirenberg, Alvin Nickens, R. A. Nixon, Julius Novick, Conon Cruise O'Brien, John Opper, Charlotte Oshewitz, Gisela K. Oster, Joan H. Owen, Martin T. Paul, Anthony J. Pearce, Blanche Persky, Derek L. Phillips, Richard Pollak, Alice M. Pollin, Martin Pope, Agnes Preston, Durward Pruden, Richard Quinney, Michael Rabins, Naomi Radinsky, Lawrence E. Randall, Frederick L. Redefor, David Reimers, Richard L. Reinhert, Roger Reinhold, Lynette Richardson, Carl Riley, Lenore Ringler, Joseph de Rivera, Elsa E. Robinson, David J. Rodkin, H. Mark Roelofs, Oscar Rosenfeld, Susan Rose.

Alex Rosen, H. Laurence Ross, Margo Rosenblitt, Philip E. Sarachik, Bert Salwen, Irving Sarnoff, Harold V. Savitch, Martin A. Schain, Allan A. Shapiro, Jacob Schwartz, Milton Schwebel, Helen Scire, William P. Sears, Jr., Carl Scott, Mary E. Segal, Chaim Shatan, Burt Shachter, Jane Shipton, Robert E. Silverman, Alberto Sirlin, Camille Slights, Herschel Snodgrass, John Gay Snodgrass, Mary Ann Solet, Peter Solet, Chandler Stetson, William A. Sude, Lois G. Sussman, Constance Sutton, Mark Tarail, Bernard Tieger, James V. Taylor, Gilbert Trachtman, Herbert Turkel, William Vorenberg, Franz Weiss, Herbert F. Weiss, Jacqueline Wendt, Harold D. Winters, Robert Wolfe, Howard Wolowitz, Ann Yasuhara, Mitsuru Yasuhara, Anne Zeidberg, Pearl Zipser, Philip G. Zimbardo, Herbert Zucker, Marjorie Zucker, Allan Zuckerman, Daniel Zwanziger.

NEW YORK MEDICAL COLLEGE

Bernard Blitz, William Burke, R. Camerini-Davalos, Bernard Carol, Ada de Chabon, Mary Jane Clark, Harold Cole, Albert Dinnerstein, Leonard V. Fisher, Morton Frank, Alfred M. Freedman, Samuel Gelfan, Robert Goldstein, William Gutstein, David Haft, Lelf Horn, E. Roy John, Stanley Kramer, Rema Lapouse, David Lehr, Rachmiel Levine, Herbert Mark, David Maude, Alex Miller, J. N. Muller, Samuel Prigal, Irving Rappaport, Edward Reith, Fred Rosenthal, Sheldon Rothenberg, Samuel Rubin, Daniel F. Ruckin, Clifford J. Sager, Sarah Schiller, Joseph Seifter, Jack Sobel, Bernard Straus, Mark Straus, Milton Terris, Natalie Tulchin, Felix Wassermann, Herbert Weisberg.

NEWARK STATE COLLEGE

Robert F. Allen, Harry Dubin, Samuel Lourie, Saul Pilnick, Zita Polsky, Goodwin Watson.

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Reuben Abel, Allen Austill, John Franklin Bardin, Norman Birnbaum, Fairfield Caudle, Elinor Chaikin, Joseph Chaikin, Elizabeth Coleman, Curtis Crawford, Earl Davis, Stanley Diamond, Joseph Greenbaum, Murray Greene, Aron Gurwitsch, Eleanor Hakim, Albert Healey, Robert Heilbroner, Ralph Herrod, Edythe Herson, Diana Hertzog, Phoebe Heyman, Herbert Hill, Jean-Claude van Italle, Robert McIver (President Emeritus), Rachel Jacoff, Hans Jonas.

Edith Kramer, Judith Koppersmith, Esther Levine, Richard Levy, Adolph Lowe, Sheldon Lubin, Ruth Machanek, Marilyn Manley, Eleanor Miller, Margaret Naumburg, Deborah Offenbacher, Michael Oubre, Henry Pachter, Adamantia Pollis, Sylvia Price, Rebecca Reyher, Joan Roland, Malcolm Scheer, Elizabeth Schoonouer, Barbara Schwartz, David Schwartzman, Trent Shroyer, Dorothy Snoke, Edward Sullivan, Robert Terwillinger, Ruth Van Doren, Arthur Vidich, Thomas Vitorisz, David Wdowinski, Sheila Weinberg, Bernard Weitzman, Paul Zucker.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Edward Behrman, J. B. Bell, Hamilton Cravens, Michael Curran, John Freeman, Myron Hale, Austin Kerr, Thomas A. Knapp, Edward Kuechel, David Levy, Alexander Liebowitz, Julian Markels, Clayton Roberts, Carole Rogel, Jack Tager, Joan Webber, Mary Young, Cecile Zinberg.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Henry Alexander, Robert Bill, Alfred Bloom, Bruce Combs, John Cook, Frank Ebersoli, Robert Herbert, Bertram Jessup, Don Levi, Barry N. Siegel, William Strange, Barrie Toelken, Arnulf Zweifel.

PASADENA CITY COLLEGE

John Ellett, A. Eudey, K. Miedema, A. Walker.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Lee Benson, Joseph W. Bernhelm, Harold Bershad, Barton Blinder, Victor B. Burt, Robert R. Bush, Jack Catlin, Harold Chapman, John Darnell, Helen Davies, Adelaide

Delluva, Jack Schultz, Harris Savin, Sandra Scarr, Helen Schor, Othello Desiderio, Allan Epstein, Joseph Eyer, Jean Claude Falmagne, Robert Figlio, George Fisk, Joel Flaks, Fred Frankel, Cella E. Freda, Charles Gallistel, James H. Geer, Eileen S. Gensh, Isidore Gensh, Henry Gleitman, Mary Katherin Glick, Marian Goldsmith, Lester Goldstein, Sol Goodgal, Jay Gunther, Donald Hanson, Edward S. Herman, Howard Holtzer, Dorothea J. Hurvich, Leo M. Hurvich, Dell Hymes, Lionel Jaffee, Roland Kallen, Neville Kallenbach, Jerry Kazdan.

George Lakey, Olga Linares deSapir, Sue Lowy, Irma Lustig, Morton Lustig, Steven Maler, Albert S. Mildvan, Margaret Miovic, Alan Moscovitch, Jacob Nachmias, Margot, Mass, Andrew Nemoth, Arthur Newbold, Robert J. Osborn, Arthur Owalsky, Phyllis Petow, Lewis Pizer, Phillip Pochoda, Edith Postel, Wilfred Postel, Berfon Pressman, Carolyn Ristau, Joanne Rudd, I. Sankowsky, J. David Sapir, Martin E. P. Seligman, Arthur Shostak, Helen Smith, June Smith, Yusniyaya Suyama, Margaret Turanski, Betsy Van Camp, Bernard Warren, David R. Williams, Saul Winegrad, Harvey Winston, Sol Wirth.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

Elinor Allen, John H. Anderson, L. M. Arner, Elizabeth Baranger, Bernard L. Cohen, Richard W. Cottam, Thomas M. Donahue, Myron Garfunkel, David Halliday, Allen I. Janis, Thomas F. Jordan, Ezra I. Newman, Nicholas Rescher, Jerome L. Rosenberg.

POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE OF BROOKLYN

Ephraim Banks, Judith F. Bellin, Judith Breman, E. S. Cassidy, Kenneth K. Clarke, Irving Cohen, Irwin A. Cohen, Frank C. Collins, Sid Deutsch, John J. Dropkin, Marvin E. Gettleman, Murray Goodman, Helmut Gruber, Hellmut J. Juretschke, F. Kreiling, Elinor Leacock, John Langrod, Louis Meltes, Louis Menashe, Lawrence Mendelsohn, Melr Menes, Gerald Oster, Don Rapp, Murray Rothbard, Kurt Salzinger, M. Schwartz, Paul E. Spoerri, Joseph Steigman, George Stell, Richard Stern, Leonard Strauss, Max Sucher.

PRATT INSTITUTE

Leonard Bacich, Albert W. Christ-Janer, Couros Ghaznavi, Gerald Gulotta, Robert Dish, Elliot Feingold, William Foss, William Garfinkle, Josef E. Garai, Robert Mallary, Lucille Nabemow, Barry Schwartz, Arthur H. Seldman, Oscar Shafel, Ronald Schiffman, Robert Slutsky, Pauline Tish, Christopher Wadsworth, Sal Westrich.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

John V. A. Fine, Sam Glucksberg, David Hack, Earl Kim, George Klauber, Carol C. Pratt, Bernard P. Spring, Stanley I. Stein, Edward Schneider, Karl Utti.

PUBLIC HEALTH RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Richard M. Franklin, Peter Hinkle, George K. Hirst, Wallace Iglewski, Barbara Iglewski, Eunice Kahan, Leonard Mindich, Gladys Monroy, E. H. Mosbach, Richard Novick, Maynard Pullman, Sarah Ratner, Irene Schulze.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

J. R. Christensen, Ralph Crozier, Everett M. Hafner, R. James Kaufmann, Vincent Nowlis, James Peskin, Arnold W. Ravin, Stanley M. Sapon, Hayden V. White.

ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY

Marshall Cohen, Harry Frankfurt, Rollin Hotchkiss, Mark Kac, Maclyn McCarty, Henry P. McKean, Norton Zinder.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY—NEW BRUNSWICK

Philip Abbott, Elihu Abrahams, Arthur M. Adlerstein, Richard W. Arthur, Gisela E. Bahr, Daniel S. Beagle, Gerald A. Bertin, Paul Bertram, John H. Best, William H. Boynton, Robert J. Bongiorno, Barbara Breasted, Leonard N. Brown, Terrence Butler, Clauro Cambron, Julius Cohen, George Collier, Roger E. Craig, Lillian N. Ellis, Paul Fussell, Ludwig

L. Geismar, David Gershator, Paula Gersh-pacher, Stephan S. Gosch, H. Heukelekian, Claude Hill, Richard Hixson, Michael Israel, Mary Ann Karpel, Martin Kantowitz, Noemie Koller, Theodore H. Kruse, Solomon Leader, Alan Leshner, Hannah Levin, Ralph Ley, Arthur Liebman.

Edna Liebman, Peter Lindenfeld, Terry Major, Simon Marcon, Majorie Murphy, Paul Nelson, Alicia Ostriker, Richard L. Peskin, Richard J. Plano, Richard Poirier, Glorienne Robbi, Allen B. Robbins, Arthur Robbins, Amelie Rarty, John Rosser, Julius Samuels, Frederic Schick, Lauren Schulman, Michael Seitz, Barry Seldes, Bernard Serin, Judy Shepps, Richard H. Shoemaker, Lawrence Shulman, Norman Spear, Laurent Stern, Warren I. Susman, Georges Temmer, Roger Tishler, Dan Tycko, Joyce J. Walstedt, Renee Weber, Peter R. Weiss, Anna Mary Wells, Abraham Yeselson, Seymour T. Zenchelsky, Robert L. Zimmerman.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, NEWARK

James D. Anderson, Solomon E. Asch, Frank Bartlett, Jacquelyn Beyer, Alexander Brooks, Norman Dain, Dorothy Dinnerstein, Mark Friedman, Howard E. Gruber, Ernest W. Hansen, Marshall Harth, Barry R. Komisaruk, Daniel S. Lehrman, George F. Michel, Celia L. Moore, Jay S. Rosenblatt, Benjamin D. Sachs, Jacqueline S. Sachs, John Schmerler, Susan Schmerler, Ethel Somberg, B. P. Sonnenblick, Judith Stern, D. C. Wilhoft.

ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE

Thomas Donohue, John Ianucci, Rev. Thomas Loughrey, James McDonough, David Marshall, Angel de L. Medina, Michael Toconita, William Toomey.

SALK INSTITUTE OF BIOLOGICAL STUDIES

David Baltimore, Mel Cohn, Renato Dulbecco, Walter Eckhart, E. Eylar, Charles Kimmel, Paul Knopf, Edwin Lennox, Marguerite Vogt, Martin Weigert.

SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

B. Aase, L. Flengold, R. Guthrie, J. Hogins, F. Horn, J. Kirby, M. Kuttner, R. Light-hall, C. McAuliffe, I. Manuel, J. Obata, H. Price, J. Robison, P. Shinnerl, D. Smalheer, J. Steiger, D. Stevenson, R. Yarber.

SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE

Melvin Crain, Stanley Crockett, Jonathon Knowles, Walter Koppelman, David Munro, Kurt Nelson, Hilda Nelson, Sherwood Nelson, Stanley Pincetl Jr., Harry Rula, Marc Simmerman, William Snyder, John Theobald, Lowell Tozer, Eugene Troxell, Jacqueline Tunberg, Stanley Weissman, Kingsley Widmer.

SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE

Gertrude Baltimore.

SLOAN-KITTERING INSTITUTE FOR CANCER RE-SEARCH

M. Earl Ballis, Aaron Bendich, Ellen Borenfreund, L. F. Cavalleri, Jack J. Fox, Barbara H. Rosenberg, Martin Sonenberg.

SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE

Hans Graetzer, Julia Hazzard, Robert Rue Parsonage, Russell Tarver, Darrell Wells.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Robert Baker, Barton Bernstein, Robert McAfee Brown, Jerome Cheryn, Robert Cohn, Kenneth Coopee, Claus Dehlinger, Charles Drekmeler, Margot Drekmeler, Melvin Edelstein, Paul Englund, Leon Festinger, Merman Flering, Robert Firn, Dave Fisher, Avram Goldstein, Albert Guerard, Zack W. Hall, Hadley Kirkman, Jacques Kornberg, Robert W. Lee, George Leppert, Max Levin, Mark Mancall, Julius Margolis, Hubert Marshall, Emanuel Mesel, John Meyer, Lincoln Moses, Davis Napier, Jay Neugeboren, Ingram Olkin, Robert Osserman, Park Pearson, Leland Rather, Yosai Rogat, Nevitt Sanford, Paul Seaver, Donald Spences, George Stark, Charles Stein, Paul Switzer, Sidney Verba,

Paul Wallin, Michael Wigodsky, Michael Yarush.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK DOWNSTATE MEDICAL CENTER

Anna M. Antonovsky, Frederick Baekeland, Julius Belford, Harried P. Bernheimer, Harvey Bezahler, Samuel W. Bloom, Martin Blum, R. Carbonneau, Rita W. Clark, Julian J. Clark, Bion Cristiansen, Harvey Cohen, William A. Console, Robert Cutler, Jacob Davidowitz, Joseph De Bianco, Phyllis De Bianco, Robert Dicks, Paul Dreizen, Mel Drossman, Nobel Endicott, David M. Engelhardt, Hanna F. Faterson, Irwin Feinberg, Geraldine Fink, Norbert Freedman, Robert F. Furchgott, Varda Ganz, Donald R. Good-enough, Standley Grand, Milton Gross, Ralph Gundlach.

Stanley Hoffman, David Kaplan, Harriet Knapp, Yale Dramer, Norman Krasnow, George Krupp, Robert Lawrence, Suzanne Lehr, Marvin Lipkowitz, Karen Machover, Solomon Machover, Reuben Margolis, Meyer Marvaid, G. Moffat, Harold Neimark, Philip P. Oltman, Else Pappenheim, Fred Pine, Franz Reichsman, Ruth Resch, David Reskof, A. E. Ring, Leonard Rosenblum, Frank Scalia, Melvin A. Scharfman, Doreen Schecter, Raul Schiavi, Jean Schimek, Lawrence Schweitzer, S. Warren Seides, Justin Simon, Arthur Shapiro, Marvin Stein, Alfred Stracher, Martin J. Welch, Evelyn M. Witkin, Herman A. Witkin, Carl T. Wolff.

STATE UNIVERSITY, NEW PALTZ

Judson S. Lyon.

STATE UNIVERSITY, STONYBROOK

Robert Boikess, Francis Bonner, Dana Branel, R. P. Creed, Gerald C. Davison, George Emerson, Leonard Eisenbud, Edward M. Eisenstein, Harold Freidman, Marvin R. Goldfried, Norman Goodman, Ted Gorelick, Albert Halm, Walter Hamilton, Charles Hoffmann, James R. Hudson, Rudolph Hwa, Harry I. Kalish, Boris Kayser, Leonard Krasner, Kurt Lang, Robert Ledachman, Richard Mould, Ned Polsky, David M. Pomeranz, T. A. Pond, Fausto Ramirez, Jerome E. Singer, Abby C. Smith, Marius C. Smith, Richard Solo, David Sox, Arnold Strassenburg, Robert Weinberg, Arnold Wishnia, Everett J. Wyers, Joseph L. Young, Ina Zoob.

STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Winston H. Bostick, Fred Bowes, Hugh W. Byfield, Thomas J. Dougherty, Peter Geismar, Jonathan Goldberg, Maurice Kasten, Earl L. Koller, I. Richard Lapidus, Joel Magid, Robert Packard, Gerald M. Rothberg, George Schmidt, Snowden Taylor, George Yevick.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

Peter van de Kamp, John J. McLaughlin, John Moore, Michael Ossar, Charles Raff, Kenneth Rawson, Clair Wilcox, John W. Williams.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Norman Balabanian, Elias Balbinder, Peter G. Bergmann, Robert A. Durr, Joshua Goldberg, Sylvia Gourevitch, Donald Justice, Gordon Kent, Louis Krasner, J. Lebowitz, H. Richard Levy, David Lyttle, S. J. McNaughton, Allen Miller, Peter Mortenson, Donald Morton, George Pappastayros, Betty Potash, Ralph Slepecky, William Wasserstrom, Waldo Whitney, Robert Wolfson.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Daniel Berger, Allan H. Cristol, Charles A. Domenicali, Robert Drayton, Shirley Drayton, H. Francis Havas, Peter Havas, Diane Lalson, M. A. Melvin, Herbert L. Needleman, Donald J. Ottenberg, Charles M. Phillips, Charles F. Reed, Larry A. Rotenberg, Robert J. Svenson, Evelyn B. Wilson, T. G. G. Wilson.

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO

Simmie S. Blakney, Nancy Britz, Bernard A. Coyne, Gertrude A. Curtis, Lorenzo J. Curtis, Ernest W. Gray, Stanley Greenblatt, George P. Guthrie, Daniel L. Hannon, Claude Hunsberger, Robert F. Jackson, Arnold A.

Johnson, E. Jane Johnson, Michael Manheim, Wallace Martin, Nelliemay Miles, J. Carroll Moody, John M. Morgan, William Phillips, Peter Rosenthal, Elias S. Schwartz, Stephen E. Spielberg, Charles Sprandel Robert White, John M. Wilson, C. R. Winegarden.

VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY

James F. Anderson, Edward Cahill, Richard J. Gaffney, Michael P. Slatery.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Lawrence M. Brammer, J. Gregory Dash, Irwin I. Eisenberg, Robert G. Fleagle, Gordon Griffiths, Barbara B. Hancock, Barry Lichter, Mark McDermott, J. D. Slegworth, Edward A. Stern, Julius Stone, John M. Wallace, Frank J. Warnke.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

Howard Banow, Alice Blifton, Alexander Coleman, Michael Goldman, Clifford Green, Edward V. Gulick, Daniel Horowitz, James H. Loehlin, Torsten Norwig, Gerasimos Santas, C. H. Wang, Nancy Zumwalt.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Arthur A. Adrian, Clyde Bratton, W. H. Carnahan, Herman Chow, Christofer Drummond, Robert F. Eckel, Thomas Esper, D. F. Farrell, Allan Harris, W. Snead Hill, Robert Huntington, Peter Jono, S. Jhi, Raymond A. Koleski, Irwin H. Lepow, Martha Lepow, Robert Lerner, Jerome Lieberman, W. G. McCollom, Thomas McFarland, Edward Marshall, Robert Ornstein, W. B. Piper, Raphael Poritsky, Richard Roth, Peter Salm, Roger B. Salomon, Samuel Spector, John Storr, James Taaffe, Robert Wallace, Joseph W. Weinberg, Israel Weisberg, James Waston, Robert Winer.

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY

Karl Andreson, George Floro, Howard Lutz, David Murdoch.

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY—ALBERT EINSTEIN COL-LEGE OF MEDICINE

Samuel Barondes, Lillian Belmont, Ira Belmont, George Bemski, Joseph Bethell, Boyce Bennett, Michael Bennett, Marion Blank, Beverly Birns, Everett Bovard, Walter Bradshaw, Wagner Bridger, Robin Briebl, Meume Budka, Joseph Casten, Alex Charlton, Alice Childs, Harry Cohen, Joseph Cramer, Mark Daniel, Quentin Deming, David Dub-nau, Howard Eder, Sybille Escalona, Lawrence Felmus, Ida Fier, Gerald Flamm, Joel Feiner, Mark Golden, Sidney Goldfischer, Edwin Gordon, Margaret Gordon, Johanna Hagedoora, Phillip Henneman, Eric Holtzman, Ernest Kafka, Seymour Kaplan, Eric Karp, Elizabeth Kramer, Mike Lesser, Irving London, Maria Lymberis, Sasha Malamed.

Irwin Mandel, Jerome Mangan, Donald Marcus, Albert Mowtaw, Tina Moreau, Selig Neubardt, Alex Novikov, James O'Brien, Benjamin Otto, Jacques Padawer, Harris Peck, David Port, David Preven, Anne Rand, Joseph Richman, Steven Rittenberg, Peter Roemer, Seymour Romney, Ora Rosen, Samuel Rosen, Itamar Saloman, Berta Scharrer, I. Herbert Scheinberg, Sam Seifetz, Eli Siegel, Issar Smith, Edward Sperling, Stephen Stein, Peter Steinglass, Hillel Swiller, Jack Terry, Minda Turkel, Gerald Turkewitz, Edward Yellin, Mary Weitzman, Israel Zwerlin.

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY—BELFER GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE

R. E. Behrends, I. A. Coburn, D. Finkelstein, Martin Goldstein, G. Horowitz, Arthur Komar, J. Koranyi, J. Lebowitz, J. Lewittes, D. C. Mattis, J. I. Musher, D. J. Newman, H. E. Rauch, Wm. Spindel, Marvin J. Stern, I. Susskind, A. E. Woodruff.

YESHIVA UNIVERSITY—FERKAUF GRADUATE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Alvin Atkins, A. Bassin, Ira Belmont, S. A. Cohen, John Ceraso, Morris N. Eagle, William Fowler, H. Jon Geis, Allan C. Goldstein, Edmund W. Gordon, Norman Gordon, Sol Gordon, Harry Gottesfeld, Paul Graubard,

John Gumpertz, Aron Herschkovitz, Louis Hoffman, Vivian Horner, Vera P. John, Shaun Kelly, Ruth Lesser, Martin Miller, Esther Minskoff, Irvin Rock, Dorothy Sievers, Bluma Weiner, Doxey Wilkerson.

OTHERS

Bernice Bauman, Gerald Bauman, Richard Bender, Jacob Bleiberg, Sam Blum, Nettie Curtis, Gerard Chrzanowski, Jeffrey Dell, Clifford Deutscher, Gerald M. Emmet, Ida Fier, Bernard Fromartz, Lennard Gorelick, Beatrice A. Halsted, Joseph Hellman, Milton Kannerstein, Elias M. Karnoff, Shella Solomon Klass, Elizabeth J. Kramer, Matthys Levy, Gerold S. Lieberman, Ral Y. Okamoto, Karen Orren, Tician Papachristou, Morton Pardes, Randolph Phillips, Gerard Piel, James Polshek, Mordecai Rosenfeld, Alexander Sandow, George Soras, Harold Taylor, Ethel Tobach, Howard Zucker.

CLERGY

Rev. Robert T. Dick, Rabbi Harvey J. Fields, Dr. Henry L. Gerner, Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn, Rev. Justin J. Hartman, Paul Lindsay, Rabbi Judas B. Miller, Rev. Franklin P. Smith, Rev. Meyer J. Strassfeld, Rabbi M. David Weiss, Rev. Farley W. Wheelright, Rev. Roger W. Woolton.

ATTORNEYS

Gerald A. Berlin, John W. Carey, Eugene S. Daniell, Jr., Sidney J. Dockser, Bryan Hamlin, Alard K. Lowenstein, Charles Merton, Max Samolar K. C. Tanner, Zipporah R. Wiseman, C. G. Zaroulis.

ARTISTS AND AUTHORS

Gertrude Barrer-Russell, James Crumbaugh Frederick D. Hickler, A.I.A., Miriam Beerman Jaffe, Frank Russell.

INDIVIDUALS

Betty Aldington, Robert Amdur, Bruce Amps, Ph. D., D. D. Bean, Jr., Diana Berg, Liselott Berliner, Robin Souther, William Brandt, Edward Brummer, Margaret Brummer, Marge Chapman, Virginia Chorley, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Cottrell, Mrs. John W. Carey, Marga S. Cooper, Charles Garland Cox, Pedro C. Cuatrecasas, Gerald Ehrenstein, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Ellmann, Susan Erster, Mr. and Mrs. Robert French, Bernie Freedman, Melinda S. Furche, Arthur Furst, Audrey Haschermeier, Chester A. Graham, Bernard Grey, David J. Herzog, Ph. D., Mildred M. Hill, John Jacobs, Ernestine Kapon, Seymour Kaufman, Nancy Kaza, Werner Klee, Ph. D., Catherine Lauris, Rose Leopold, Donna Lieberman, Maud McClusky, Betsey W. McGuire, Helen Maley, Murray Melbin.

Brina Melemed, Ray L. Mklethun, Evelyn Morton, S. Harvey Mudd, Ph.D., Jane Nelson, Violet N. Nettleton, Donald C. Pitkin, Arlene R. Popkin, William L. Porter, Kendrick W. Putnam, Janeal T. Raundal, Janice Robertson, Philip Ross, Ph.D., Roger Scattergood, Gary Selsenseld, Ph.D., Harry Schaich, Giselle Sharof, Myron R. Sharof, Mrs. Karl Singer, Peter Slavin, John H. Sloss, Helen P. Sorokin, Susan Stern, Walter F. Stern, Bert Stone, Maxine Sweetman, Margaret Terzaghi, John M. Torney, Ph.D., Philip Vandeman, Mr. and Mrs. Archie Velde, Mrs. Eberhardt Welfer, A. Young Woody, John K. Wright, Michael Yarmolinsky, Ph.D.

OTHER FACULTY

M. Albertson, M. G. Anderson, S. S. Anderson, W. L. Barnette, J. Barrett, J. Beck, G. Blair, R. J. Blattner, W. Bloom, J. Bolz, Murray Braden, A. Brender, Rev. G. Campbell, S.J., L. Caroline, T. L. Carney, A. H. Cash, M. Collier, Robert Colman, Roberta Colman, R. Cooper, A. C. Currier, J. H. Dupre, R. F. Duska, T. Elliott, D. Elliott, O. Fleischman, J. N. Frost, E. Fussell, H. Geiringer, L. Glierymski, Rabbi R. E. Goldberg, M. Gordon, P. Gordon, M. Guggenheim, E. Haber, A. Hacker, D. E. Halsey, M. Harmin, J. A. Hawkins, M. Healy, S. Henderson, H. Hill.

A. Hofmann, J. Hotson, L. Humphreys, L. C. Hunter, H. Isaacson, R. Jacobs, R. James,

L. Jokobovits, G. Jordan, J. A. Joseph, L. Joseph, M. Katz, T. M. Kerr, P. H. King, W. Klassen, H. Korsch, G. Laison, H. A. Lauter, V. R. Lewin, O. Lewis, H. M. Lynd, M. P. Mack, B. Magnus, E. Maier, E. Makinen, M. Marcus, A. Mark, L. Marquis, F. Marti, M. Millman, F. C. Moss, W. Moy, R. E. Murphy, A. Nason, Sr. M. L. Navarro, D. Nowlis, V. Obenhaus, M. Oberlin, P. —, D. Ounjian, D. Paluska, G. Park.

Rabbi S. Perlman, R. Perry, J. M. Phillips, M. Perr, W. Priestley, O. F. Puciani, T. Rosebury, A. Rhodes, R. Repas, R. Reinitz, T. C. Reeves, J. L. Rosner, H. R. Rudin, F. Rebsky, L. H. Rouillard, C. W. Savage, R. Scholten, C. E. Schweitzer, M. H. Sibley, K. Shields, J. Schwartz, B. B. Seligman, M. Sibley, H. Smith, E. Strauss, D. Strauss, R. W. Strickland, G. P. Symonds, Jr., F. W. Neal, P. Weiss, W. P. Weiss, A. White, G. Wickes, H. Willits, L. Wolfenstein, G. Zohn, M. Baylor, A. Szent-Gyorgyi.

BARLOW SCHOOL

Elise Beecher, Leonard Beecher, Ann Griffiths, David Griffiths, James G. R. Stewart.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

E. D. Comrains, Colleen Eldridge, A. S. Goldhaber, J. Harte, A. H. Rosenfeld, C. Schwartz, G. Segre, Arlene Skolnick, Jerome H. Skolnick.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

Robert Accola, Allen Clark, John Dittmer, Wendell Fleming, Kenneth Ireland, Michael Rosen, Harold N. Kerd.

CHEYNEY STATE COLLEGE

Charline Conyers, Carolyn Hoehn, Harold Larsen, Miles Lovelace, Walter Malone, Charles J. McLanahan, Wiltrude Paprotta, Sally Bould Ventill.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC.

Nathaniel Burwash, Lorin N. E. Churchill, Charles A. Haynie, William P. Hull, Frieda S. Ployer, Conrad Snowden, Antony Sharkey, Cornelia Voorhees, Daniel Watt.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Lionel Etskovitz, Florence W. Freed, Charles W. Havice, William L. Porter, Donald Shelby, Richard Skillman, Gerald Welsenberg.

THE SCHOOL IN ROSE VALLEY

Philip Barkan, Ellie Fernal, Ruth Goodenough, Jean McKay, Jeanne Molitor, Meredith Reinhold, Norman Roseman, Grace Rotzel, Lucy Stephens.

SMITH COLLEGE

Maria Banerlee, Ron W. Banerlee, Murray Kiteley, R. T. McDonald.

TUFTS MEDICAL SCHOOL

Michael Dohum, Alvin Essig, Morris E. Friedkin, Raymond Greenberg, Norman I. Krinsky.

WESTERN COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

T. Arthur Bisson, Richard Sakurai, Sandra Sakurai, Willis Stoess.

MINISTERS

Carl Nelson, Jas. Merlin.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Herbert Bisno, Stephen Deutsch, Theo. Farris, Philip George, George Gray, John Howard, Jamie Hunter, Jack Maddex, Kenneth Polk, Walter Schafer, Harold Weaver.

SALEM UNIVERSITY

Byron Doenges, Jon Daykin, Martha Fullenwider.

(NOTE.—Faculty members are listed by their Institutional affiliations for purpose of identification only.)

(2968 signatures from 86 institutions were published in the New York Times on Sunday, January 15.)

(This advertisement is being paid for by contributions from the individual signers. Additional contributions toward the cost are welcome.)

(Please write or wire President Johnson and your Senators and Representatives endorsing the demand of this ad.)

AD HOC FACULTY COMMITTEE ON

VIETNAM,

Prof. Hilary Putnam,

Chairman.

Prof. S. E. Luria,

Secretary-Treasurer.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1967]

CEASEFIRE IS URGED ON JOHNSON BY 300 IN FIELD OF DESIGN

A group of architects, engineers, planners and other members of the design professions has sent an open letter to President Johnson calling for an immediate ceasefire and negotiations to end the war in Vietnam.

The letter, signed by more than 300 people, appears as an advertisement on page 7 of the News of the Week in Review section of today's New York Times.

The letter says that "as members of the design professions we direct our skills towards the creation and improvements of man's environment." It points to both increased destruction in Vietnam and a reduction in spending "for housing, health, education and welfare programs in the United States and for other constructive purposes around the world."

A spokesman for the group said the letter was "a broad statement made so that the widest support among the professions could be obtained." Maxfield F. Vogel, whose Park Avenue office is listed as headquarters for the Committee of the Planning Professions to End the War in Vietnam, said that the advertisement cost \$2,019.60.

"We're going to keep going. We want to increase the list to 10,000 names," Mr. Vogel added.

Among those listed at the end of the letter were Albert B. Bauer, chief architect of the City Department of Public Works; Thomas H. Creighton, former editor of Progressive Architecture; M. Paul Friedberg, who recently won a prize for his design for a playground at the Jacob Riis housing project; Carl Koch of Boston, designer of the Tech-Built House, and Christopher Tunnard, chairman of the Department of City Planning at Yale.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1967]

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As architects, engineers, planners, and other members of the design professions we direct our skills towards the creation and improvement of man's environment. We know the vast quantities of talent, materials and man hours of labor needed to produce the housing, schools, hospitals and replanning required by our towns and cities, and those all over the world.

When we see so many of our resources—men and materials—used for destruction in Vietnam, with the danger of the war being escalated to uncontrollable magnitude, we must join with the many legislators, members of the judiciary, scientists, educators, clergymen and others who have appealed for an immediate end to the conflict.

Already the budgetary commitments inherent in the conduct of a war and resulting in the destruction of farms, villages, communications systems and productive resources of both North and South Vietnam have led to a reduction of spending for housing, health, education and welfare programs in the United States and for other constructive purposes around the world.

We earnestly urge that you declare an immediate cease-fire, even if that implies some risks. We further urge that negotiations be undertaken with the participation of all combatant forces, including the National Liberation Front and that the basis for these negotiations be the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

Peter Lee Abeles, Morris Abraham, A.I.A., Peter J. Abramo, P.E., Gustave J. Abrams, A.I.A., Bernard Aisenberg, P.E., S. N. Alderman, Consultant, William A. Amenta, A.I.A., Stanford Anderson, A.I.A., Jack Aronow, P.E., Neville, Ashurst, William Atlas, P.E., Youssef Bahriz, Norman Balabanian, Prof. E.E., Bertram L. Bassuk, A.I.A., Albert B. Bauer, A.I.A., Hubert Bebb, A.I.A., Robert K. Bedell, P.E., Wallace Berger, A.I.A., Ellen Perry Berkeley, Richard G. Berkenfeld, P.E., Lewis A. Berne, Fred Bernhard, P.E., Theodore A. Bickart, Ass't Prof. E.E., Philip Birnbaum, A.I.A., Nicol Bissell, A.I.A., Joseph Blumenkranz, A.I.A., J. Conrad Breiby Jr., A.I.A., Simon Breines, A.I.A., Blythe S. Brewster, A.I.A., John D. Brule, Assoc. Prof. E.E., George R. Brunjes, Jr., Herbert Burmeister, A.I.A., James T. Burns Jr., Murray Burstein, P.E., Albert E. Byler, Morton S. Cahn, A.I.A., Moses Cammer, C.H.E., Carl Carlson, A.I.A.

E. K. Carpenter, Eduardo Catalano, Arch., Giorgio Cavaglieri, F.A.I.A., Ruth Cheney, Ned D. Cherry, Arch., Studt., Peter Claman, R.A., Isadore M. Cohen, P.E., Martin M. Cooper, P.E., H. H. Craigwell, P.E., Thomas M. Creighton, F.A.I.A., Gottfried P. Csala, A.A.A., Philip I. Danzig, Linda Davidoff, Paul Davidoff, A.I.P., Ronald J. Delahouse, Arch., Harrison DeSilver, R.A., Walter M. Diakow, R.L.A., Maude Dorr, Leon L. Dunkley, A.I.A., Philip Dworkin, A.I.A., Edward G. Echeverria, A.I.P., P.E., Isiah Ehrlich, A.I.A., B. W. Elsworth, Alexander Elan, P.E., Regina Elbirt, Arch., Draft, Neils Eneyolosen, R.A., David H. Engel, Land, Arch., Jerome Felcher, P.E., H. I. Feldman, A.I.A., Harold Fink, P.E., Hugh Finney, Arch., Studt., Robert D. Fisher, Barry Fishman, Arch., Studt., Mrs. Frances Frazier, B. Arch., Arthur L. Fray, P.E., M. Paul Friedberg, A.S.L.A., Louis H. Friedheim, A.I.A., Abraham N. Friedman, P.E.

Frederick Frost, Jr., F.A.I.A., Harold Flemister, Samuel Garnett, P.E., Walter Gauley, Abraham Geller, A.I.A., D. L. Ginsberg, A.I.A., Milton M. Glass, A.I.A., Saul Goldsmith, P.E., Aviva Goldstein, Leslie A. Good, P.E., Harrison Goodman, P.E., Percival Goodman, F.A.I.A., Robert Goodman, P.E., Robert Goodman, R.A., Sergius Gottlieb, P.E., Irving Gratz, Isadore S. Grossman, P.E., Paul Grotz, Dr. Paul Gugliotta, R.A.P.E., Ralph J. Gurfeld, P.E., Harry Halbreich, P.E., Aaron Halpern, P.E., Clifford Hanssen, R.A., Floyd Hasselris, S.P.E., James Hastings, R.A., Henry C. Heaney, A.I.A., Richard Hill, P.E., Edward J. Hills, A.I.A., Arnold D. Hirsch, P.E., William A. Hofferberg, F.A.S.C.E., John M. Hogg, A.I.A., Arthur C. Holden, F.A.I.A., Burton H. Holmes, A.I.A., Robert J. Holmes, Rudolph M. Horowitz, A.I.A., William H. Hough Jr., A.I.A., R. A. Hovey, C.E., Richard J. Hunter, A.I.A., Percy Inall, R.A.

Benjamin W. Irvin, R.A., Gustave W. Iser, A.I.A., Robert Hyde Jacobs Jr., A.I.A., Gert O. Jensen, A.A., Herman J. Jessor, R.A., Conrad Johnson, R.A., Richard A. Johnson, Prof. E.E., Richard S. Joslin, R.A., Jules Kabat, A.I.A., Gerhard M. Kallmann, A.I.A., Max Kandel, A.I.A., William J. Karp, P.E., Geraldine B. Katz, Sidney L. Katz, F.A.I.A., Robert Kennard, Stanley Kennedy, B.Arch., Harold Keeney, A.I.A., C.S.I., Gordon Kent Assoc. Prof. E.E., Hollister Kent, A.I.P., Walter L. Kent, P.E., Milton F. Kirchman, A.I.A., Eugene H. Klaber, F.A.I.A., A.I.P., Norman Klein, A.I.A., Max J. Kleiner, P.E., Henry Klum, F.A.I.A., Carl Koch, F.A.I.A., John M. Kochanczyk, P.E., Thomas Kupper, Samuel M. Kurtz, A.I.A., Morris Kweiler, P.E., Bancel L. LaFarge, F.A.I.A., Lawrence Laguna, A.I.A., David H. Larson, R.A., John Black Lee, A.I.A., Thomas F. Lee, Designer, Jacob Leeds, P.E., C.R. Leet, P.E., Thomas C. Lehrecke, A.I.A.

Walter G. Leight, R.A., P.E., Samuel Owen Meier, P.E., Wilbur R. LePaige, Prof. E.E., Mel Leshowitz, A.I.A., Harold J. Levy, A.I.A., Herman Licht, R.A., Fred L. Liebmann, A.I.A., Leon Lipshutz, R.A., Robert A. Little, F.A.I.A., Kevin Lynch, A.I.P., Solfred Malzus, R.A., David Malamud, A.I.P., Max Mandel, P.E.,

C.E., Richard May Jr., A.I.P., Albert Mayer, F.A.I.A., William P. McCall, Arch. Studt., Frederick James McCaskey, Roosevelt E. McElroy Jr., B. Arch., Noel M. McKinnell, Richard Meier, A.I.A., Irving Mennen, A.I.A., Elizabeth Mesties, Daniel Metliz, P.E., F.A.S.C.E., George G. Miller, A.I.A., Philip Miller, Richard A. Miller, A.I.A., David I. Millet, P.E., Henry Milton, A.I.A., Marvin H. Mills, Irving E. Minkins, P.E., William J. Modin, A.I.A., John C. B. Moore, A.I.A., Lewis Mumford, Honorary A.I.A., Irving P. Munves, P.E., Rolf Myller, R.A., R. P. Nanavati, Ass't. Prof. E.E., Doris Nathan, George Nemeny, A.I.A., Joseph Neufeld, A.I.A.

Brendan A. O'Hare, R.A., Rolf Ohlhansen, A.I.A., Philip E. Olin, P.E., Herbert B. Oppenheimer, A.I.A., Julia Owen, Lewis G. Patulo, Ivan Pinsker, P.E., Samuel Pinsker, Rosaria Plomelli, Harry A. Pollack, A.I.A., Ralph Pomerance, A.I.A., Peter A. Powsner, Jeon Proguer, Walther Prokosch, M. L., Radoslovich, F.A.I.A., Joan Ranschoff, Walter P. Reid, R.A., P.E., Joseph J. Roberto, A.I.A., John T. Roberts, A.I.A., Samuel Roberts, P.E., Arthur Rosenblatt, A.I.A., Arthur H. Rosenfeld, A.I.A., Isadore Rosenfield, A.I.A., Zachary Rosenfield, A.I.A., Robert Rosenwasser, P.E., Margaret M. Ross, R.A., Richard Roth Sr., A.I.A., A. J. Rothenberg, A.I.A., Jan C. Rowan, A.I.A., P. Rydell, Ass't. Prof. Urban Plan, William Sagar, B. Arch., Philip M. Salaff, P.E., Mario G. Salvadori, F.A.S.C.E., Albert E. Sanner, A.I.A., Dalim Sau, John C. Schiff, Ben Schlanger, A.I.A., Timothy Schmiderer.

Arthur O. A. Schmidt, A.I.A., Henry Schubart, Jr., A.I.A., Sidney Schuman, R.A., Harry Schwarzlander, Asst. Prof. E.E., Harry Schwartz, Richardo Scodifo, A.I.A., Barbara Sedlin, Assoc. A.I.P., Carmen Dolores Seguinot, R.A., C. Stuart Seip, P.E., Solomon Selden, Fidel A. Sevilano, P.E., Stanley J. Shafitel, A.I.A., Gautam B. Shah, Arch., Louis E. Sharou, R.A., Lawrence Shutkind, P.E., H. Irving Sigman, P.E., Samuel Sigman, P.E., Irving Silverman, P.E., Arthur H. Silvers, A.I.A., David Siroto, L. J. Sklar, P.E., Maurice K. Smith, A.I.A., Melvin H. Smith, A.I.A., Neill Smith, A.I.A., Seymour Solomon, P.E., Harry D. Som, R.A., Richard Sonder, A.I.A., Abraham Sperling, A.I.A., Benjamin L. Spivak, P.E., Clarence S. Stein, F.A.I.A., Joseph Allen Stein, A.I.A., Julius Stein, A.I.A., Richard G. Stein, A.I.A., Suzanne L. Stephens, Claude Stoller, A.I.A., David E. Stoloff, Assoc. A.I.P., George Storz, R.A., Jerome L. Straus, P.E., A.S.M.E., Edwin Stromster, Earl H. Strunk, A.I.A.

Wayne C. Teng, F.A.S.C.E., Howard Thompson, P.E., George Thomson, A.I.A., Prof. Christopher Tunnard, A.I.P., Sam Unger, A.I.A., Nancy Vagenas, R.A., Oscar J. Vargo, P.E., Josef Vanderkar, A.I.A., Vytautas Vepstas, R.A., Louis Viola, A.I.A., Maxfield Vogel, A.I.A., C. Wadsworth, Assoc. Prof., Harold E. Wagoner, A.I.A., Taina Waisman, A.I.A., Henry J. Wald, P.E., Herbert H. Warman, A.I.A., Booker T. Washington III, Elroy Weber, R.A., A.I.A., Read Weber, A.I.A., Merle W. Weidman, Robert C. Weinberg, A.I.A., A.I.P., Irving Welner, A.I.A., Saul Wexler, P.E., Norval White, A.I.A., Elliot Willensky, A.I.A., Charles S. Wiley, R.A., Henry Wilcox, P.E., Gabriel Wilner, P.E., Forrest Wilson, John Louis Wilson, A.I.A., George Wolfson, A.I.A., John M. Woodbridge, A.I.A., Wilbur T. Woods, R.A., Henry Wright, Joseph Wythe, Arch., Morris Zeitlin, R.A., A.I.P., Simon B. Zelnik, A.I.A., John J. Zimmerman.

(NOTE.—Affiliations are given for identification only. No endorsement by these societies is implied.)

(Costs of publication have been paid for by friends and signers. If you wish to associate yourself with this letter and contribute toward republication and continuing activities, please sign and mail the coupon below.)

COMMITTEE OF THE PLANNING PROFESSIONS TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM,
Room 331, 101 Park Avenue, New York,
New York 10017.

THE PACEM IN TERRIS II CONVOCATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am very much pleased to take note of the announcement of plans to hold a second international convocation on the theme of pacem in terris, to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, next May 28 to 31.

Like the first pacem in terris convocation held in New York City in February 1965, this conference is being inspired by the historic encyclical of the same name which was handed down by the late Pope John XXIII and which already has done so much to alter the course of world affairs.

As one of the participants in the 1965 convocation, I found and strongly believe that these important meetings can play a vitally important role in translating the high intent of Pope John's encyclical into the practical results that were intended. Great credit is due to the sponsoring organizations, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, an independent educational institution in Santa Barbara, Calif. under the aegis of the Fund for the Republic, and to its president, Robert M. Hutchins.

There is every indication the pacem in terris, II, will be an especially significant event. Its agenda will include discussion of two matters of special concern to all of us, the war in Vietnam and the East-West confrontation in Germany. Among those expected to participate are U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations, and our own distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

It is worth noting also, I believe, that invitations have been extended to the Republic of Vietnam—South Vietnam—and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam—North Vietnam—the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation—Vietcong, the Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China.

It is not often that private, unofficial diplomacy can be conducted on such a scale, and when it is, exciting possibilities for new advances in the quest for peace are opened to us. I know that all Members of the Senate will be as interested as I am in following the progress of this notable convocation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press announcement from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions and a background document on pacem in terris, II, also from the Center.

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

PRIVATE AMERICAN ORGANIZATION ARRANGES "PEACE ON EARTH" CONVOCATION IN GENEVA

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.—A privately sponsored world peace conference of official and unofficial delegates from East and West—communist, non-communist and unaligned nations—will be held in Geneva this May.

U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, will be a major speaker.

United States Senator J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will attend as a participant.

Among those invited are representatives

from the Republic of Viet Nam (South Viet Nam), the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam (North Viet Nam), the South Viet Nam National Front for Liberation (Viet Cong), the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China.

Included on the agenda for discussion will be two major obstacles to world peace—the war in Viet Nam and the East-West confrontation in Germany.

Known as *Pacem in Terris-II*, the convocation has been called for May 28-31 in the Swiss capital by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, a private American organization.

Some 300 public officials and private leaders from around the globe will assemble in the Palais des Nations, once home of the League of Nations, where the United Nations Secretariat will provide simultaneous translation facilities.

The first *Pacem in Terris* convocation, which also took its name from the "Peace on Earth" encyclical of the late Pope John XXIII, who appealed for peaceful coexistence between East and West, was held in February, 1965, in New York City.

Pope Paul VI, unable to attend the opening session held in the United Nations General Assembly Hall, sent two messages to the convocation. Later, Pope Paul came to New York to address the United Nations on the theme of *Pacem in Terris*.

Attended by some 2,300 persons from throughout the world, with the major exception of Communist China, *Pacem in Terris-I* also was sponsored by the Center, an independent educational institution in Santa Barbara, California, operated by the Fund for the Republic, Inc.

Chairman of the board of the Center is United States Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. Honorary Chairman is Paul G. Hoffman, first Administrator of the Marshall Plan and now Administrator of the United Nations Development Program. President is Robert M. Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago.

Executive Vice President is Harry S. Ashmore, former Pulitzer Prize-winning editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*. With another Center director, William C. Baggs, editor of the *Miami (Florida) News*, and Luis Quintanilla, former Mexican ambassador to the United States, Ashmore recently visited Hanoi to invite the North Vietnamese government to participate in *Pacem in Terris-II*.

In announcing the convocation, Hutchins said:

"It is our purpose to bring together once again a combination of political and intellectual figures in a wholly unofficial gathering where they are not limited by the necessity of speaking formally on behalf of their countries.

"*Pacem in Terris-II* is designed to consider the requirements of coexistence in the practical terms of the contemporary world.

"Largely because of the success of *Pacem in Terris-I*, the Center became recognized in both East and West as the one private organization with the stature and independence to arrange a truly representative gathering of private and public world leaders to consider seriously what is required to make Pope John's call for 'Peace on Earth' a living reality.

"Many delegates who took part in *Pacem in Terris-I* urged the Center to hold this second convocation, which will deal in greater detail with the specific requirements for peace.

"It was agreed that every effort should be made to have the Mainland Chinese, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, as well as the others involved in the Viet Nam war, represented at the convocation. As a result, the Center has sent emissaries to Peking and Hanoi to urge such participation.

"We have encouraging indications that the discussants will include representatives from

all the Southeast Asian countries, including North and South Viet Nam.

"We are convinced that the case of Viet Nam requires consideration of problems beyond the conditions of an armistice or temporary political settlement. So we will discuss ways and means of neutralizing the whole of Southeast Asia.

"We will give representatives from the two Viet Nams an opportunity to set forth their views to a world audience without direct involvement of the great powers. While no agreement will be sought, the discussion could shed important light on the necessary terms of a durable settlement.

"Problems left over from World War II and from the dismantling of colonial empires must be considered seriously in the light of thermonuclear weapons, the existence of military blocks and the confrontations which occur periodically as a result.

"Thus, we will discuss the many facets of the German problem beyond the immediate fact of American and Soviet confrontation and explore possibilities for a German settlement. Discussants of this topic will be drawn from the European nations directly involved.

"Finally, we will conduct a realistic evaluation of the United Nations and an examination of the non-political trends pushing nations toward interdependence.

"Our efforts in arranging the convocation in no way have been sponsored by the United States government, although the Center has kept the White House and the Department of State fully informed of its activities. It has done the same with other interested governments and the United Nations Secretariat.

"It can be truly said that this is a private initiative toward peace which is being followed with close attention by the United Nations and by all governments and individual world leaders with a stake in peaceful coexistence."

The convocation agenda will include panel discussions of "Threats to Coexistence," with Abdul Rahman Pazwak of Afghanistan, President of the United Nations General Assembly, presiding; "Intervention: The Case of Viet Nam," Chester A. Ronning, former Canadian High Commissioner in India, presiding; "Interdependence," J. Kenneth Galbraith, the American economist, presiding; "Confrontation: The Case of Germany" and "Beyond Coexistence," presiding officers yet to be selected.

Others who have accepted invitations as panel discussants include:

N. N. Inozemtsev, director, Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Academy of Sciences, USSR; Arsene A. Usher, Foreign Minister, Republic of Ivory Coast; Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister, Thailand; Dr. Nugroho, former minister, Embassy in Washington, now with the Department of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Indonesia; Chief S. O. Adebo, Ambassador to the United Nations, Nigeria; Princess Moun Souvanna Phouma, Laos; David Horowitz, governor, Bank of Israel, State of Israel, and Joseph Hromadka, a leading Czechoslovak theologian.

Representatives of the Vatican and the World Council of Churches are expected to attend.

BACKGROUND OF PACEM IN TERRIS II

The second *Pacem in Terris* (Peace on Earth) convocation will be held by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions on May 28-31, 1967, in Geneva, Switzerland.

Its purpose is to assemble official and unofficial delegates from countries throughout the globe—East and West, Communist and non-Communist, aligned and unaligned—to examine in specific detail the requirements for the nations of the world to coexist in peace.

Following is the background of this important event:

Into an uneasy and still largely uncom-

promising world atmosphere Pope John XXIII injected a profoundly significant new spirit when he presented his encyclical, *Pacem in Terris* in April of 1963.

Until this time, the concept—or possibility—of coexistence among nation states had been a Soviet idea, geared to Marxist-Leninist theory and the practical needs of the Russian state. As such, it was accorded the suspicion and rejection of the Western world, particularly of United States official diplomatic thinking. U.S. statesmen and intellectuals of widely divergent views—Harvard professor Henry A. Kissinger, psychologist Erich Fromm, diplomat-scholar George F. Kennan, to name a few—perceived contradictions and irreducible dilemmas in United States policy as it was then implemented. From a practical standpoint, however, emerging domestic criticism of American policy caused little more than a ripple on the diplomatic waters. The official United States position underwent no fundamental change. Such statements as that of General Twining's as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that "the struggle is too big, too vast, too deadly for compromise," illustrated United States and general Western reluctance to abandon traditional wariness or to depart from "positions of strength" and military deterrence policies.

Coming from a major Western institution, the Roman Catholic Church, and transcending the confines of Catholicism and Westernism by appealing to "all men of good will," the encyclical bridged in one stroke the East-West ideological gap: "All political communities are of equal natural dignity." While reaffirming Catholic belief in the right of man to individual initiative and rejecting any political or economic system based on "the mere will of human beings individually or collectively," it disengaged the Christian Catholic Church from anti-Communist political activity. In a world split into hostile segments, it committed this Western spiritual institution to the task of fostering mutual endeavor for the benefit of all humanity. Unmistakably Catholic in nature and basically moral in its appeal, the document nonetheless provided Western states with a fresh philosophical and practical approach to international problems. It created a significant new dimension to traditional thinking, Communist, Western European, and American, on what constitutes Peace on Earth. Tailored to the age of the atom, it offered practical guidelines for the development of a world community of independent and interdependent nation states where peace could mean more than a temporary absence of war.

To emphasize the immediate pertinency of the encyclical and to bring into public light the issues it raised, a private American educational enterprise, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, sponsored an International Convocation on the Requirements of Peace in February of 1965. Called *Pacem in Terris* after the papal document, the convocation brought together in New York distinguished intellectuals and statesmen from the United States, Western Europe, the Soviet bloc nations, the Near East, and Asia—from the world at large (with the major exception of Communist China).

Opening the convocation, Robert M. Hutchins, President of the Center, outlined its goals and narrowed its scope to the realm of imminent possibilities:

"This is not an ecumenical council assembled to debate religious topics. This is a political meeting. The question is: How can we make peace, not peace through the medium of war, not peace through the dreadful mechanisms of terror, but peace pure, simple, and durable. If the principles of *Pacem in Terris* are sound, how can they be carried out in the world as it is? If they are unsound, what principles are sound, and how can

they be realized today? What does it mean to coexist, and how can we do it?"

THE BASES OF COEXISTENCE

Consideration of the varied meanings implicit in the term "coexistence" requires prior answers to questions of its applicability to modern relationships among societies. On what bases could the intellectual and political leaders at the convocation expect to build the concept of coexistence into anything more than a lofty declaration of principles or a utopian expression of ideals?

One major basis for viewing coexistence as a practical end no less than as a moral ideal was simply that it was in effect, in a limited sense at least. The Soviet's N. N. Inozemtsev and Polish Central Committee-man Adam Schaff emphasized that the two major representatives of Marxism and capitalism were not and have never been at war. Coexistence as it had operated for nearly half a century had involved interrelationships, diplomatic, cultural, economic, and political. In the words of Philip Jessup, "The Soviet Union and the United States . . . do not coexist in a vacuum. States do not sit off, one here, and one there, and merely glare at each other." They interact. In the interaction, coexistence in the fuller sense of cooperation, agreement, and mutual respect had to some extent taken place.

A second basis for hard-headed effort to extend and solidify coexistence was stark necessity. No one at the convocation denied the climate of anxiety created by the nuclear arms race nor did anyone minimize its dangers. Impelling urgency in the face of impending disaster on a world scale provided inescapable grounds for exploring coexistence further.

A third reason was the economic plight of non-industrialized, emerging nations. The well-developed nations' "vast outlay of intellectual and economic resources" on armaments, which had been mentioned by Pope John, was contributing to an international economic instability inconsistent with either world harmony or lasting peace.

Finally, participants at the *Pacem in Terris* convocation were motivated by what Protestant theologian Paul Tillich called "the seeds of hope" in modern society from which a future state of dynamic peace could grow. The first such "seed," fear, though negative, contained the germ of positive development, Tillich thought; it brought to men of conflicting ideologies a sense of "common destiny." Tillich perceived, secondly, that the conquest of space had drawn together men from many nations in common technical endeavors; possibly this unity of interest would provide a wedge for alleviating inbred hostilities and promoting mutual appreciation. Thirdly, Dr. Tillich found encouragement in the multiplying areas of supranational endeavor—in the cultural and scientific exchanges, in the mutual attempts at solutions to problems of over-population, nutrition, and the like. A final "seed of hope" lay in the existing international judicial structure, imperfect and inadequate as it admittedly was. With added impetus and sufficient dedication, Dr. Tillich foresaw the possible emergence of a vehicle capable of ensuring some degree of permanent peace.

THE MEANING OF COEXISTENCE

Among the more formidable barriers to an amicable world climate was a fundamental disagreement on the meaning of coexistence. Interpretations at the convocation ranged from acceptance of the minimal condition of combustible status quo *detente* to insistence on the maximal position of peaceful cooperation in all matters.

Basic to all the discussions were the concepts put forward in the Papal encyclical. Even here a variety of interpretations occurred. What, precisely, did Pope John say on nuclear war? on revolution? on the relations between states? on the world community? on the bases for lasting peace? That

Pope John rejected the practicality, the humanity, or the justice of nuclear warfare was incontrovertible: "... It is hardly possible to imagine that in the atomic era war could be used as an instrument of justice." He noted the implicit dangers of having "the arms of war . . . ready at hand"; he emphasized the role that chance or accident might play in setting off a nuclear holocaust; he deplored the atmosphere of fear engendered by the nuclear arms race; and he pointed out the possible lethal consequences attendant on nuclear testing itself. He climaxed his appeal for an end to this dangerous competition by reiterating the warning of his predecessor Pius XII: "Nothing is lost by peace. Everything may be lost by war."

The Pope went further. Nowhere in the encyclical did he make a distinction between "coexistence" and "peace." He ruled out force of arms as a means of settling differences between states on the grounds that the elimination of war in all its forms not only satisfies the greatest human desire everywhere but brings benefits to all peoples.

In the same spirit, he denounced violent revolution as an instrument of social change. Recognizing that injustice breeds unrest, he cautioned against the impatience that gives revolution its allure. Quoting his predecessor, he left no room for misinterpretation:

"Pius XII proclaimed: 'Salvation and justice are not to be found in revolution, but in evolution through concord. Violence has always achieved only destruction, not construction . . .'"

Emphasizing the inevitability of contention and confrontation if nations pursue their own advantage, with power as their objective, Pope John spurned "deceit or trickery," the oft-used tools of power diplomacy, and urged instead that nations commit themselves to the common good and harmonize their relationships "in truth, in justice, in a working solidarity, in liberty." He averred that states can no longer act in isolation and independence: whatever one state does must now affect the well-being of all others. His desire was that all nations, for their mutual benefit, voluntarily support a world authority and give it proper means to carry out the common objective. Mutual consent, not violent coercion, must be the cornerstone of allegiance to such world authority.

Few of the *Pacem in Terris* deliberants accepted *in toto* the philosophy of Pope John. Representatives of vastly different ideological and political backgrounds nonetheless responded sympathetically to his call for a fundamental change in the world atmosphere. Such divergent voices as those of U.S. author-critic-entertainer Steve Allen, the United Nations' U Thant, and the U.S.S.R.'s Yevgeniy Zhukov proclaimed the common aim of coexistence: to abandon the world of discord, antagonism, and violence for an international atmosphere of harmony, justice, and free competition toward the common good. Russia's Inozemtsev found in the discordant world picture a basis for optimism: "... ours is not just an epoch of sinister dangers looming over mankind . . . but an era of radiant hopes and possibilities." Participants concurred unanimously with Vice-President Humphrey of the United States that "since that day at Alamogordo when man acquired the power to obliterate himself from the face of the earth, war has worn a new face." Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium spoke for Communist and capitalist countries alike when he declared that the nations of the world must accept the challenge to coexist in an era when there can be no victor and no vanquished, when mutual destruction will be the only result of nuclear exchange.

Disagreement on the scope of coexistence short of nuclear exchange, however, forecast the difficulties that a quest for specific solutions might encounter. Unlike Pope John, a great variety of delegates failed to rule out

the justice and efficacy of certain limited wars or to accept the immediate practicality of peaceful settlement in all disputes.

Unable to accept the philosophical reasoning of the Pontiff, the chief representatives of the Communist bloc nations nevertheless exhibited little or no divergence on the implications of coexistence. To them it meant negotiation instead of armed conflict to settle international disputes; "competition in bringing happiness to mankind and in meeting its material and spiritual needs"; and a peaceful ideological contest "for the hearts and minds of men." While categorically opposing the export of both revolution and counter-revolution—the first as anti-Marxist and impractical, the second as unwarranted aggression—they tacitly sanctioned spontaneous revolution as an instrument of justice. Further, they favored non-military economic and spiritual support for socialist revolutionaries in their struggle to overthrow capitalist societies.

United States opinion embraced a much wider range. A number of U.S. panelists displayed cautious reluctance to abandon all non-nuclear agents of force. At one end of the philosophical spectrum, Herman Kahn, Director of the Hudson Institute, while admitting the impracticality of nuclear war, accepted coercion as the sometimes necessary means to justice; when inequities demanded correction, he saw both internal civil violence and externally applied force as occasionally useful. Claremont Professor Fred Warner Neal was inclined to accept the Soviet analysis that revolutions are usually indigenous and a secondary rather than a primary concern of coexistence. He saw the key to coexistence in a reorientation of the two great nuclear powers toward each other, with particular need for the United States to alter its estimate of Soviet aggressive intentions in the light of historical reality. Former President Eisenhower's Disarmament Advisor, Harold E. Stassen, stressed how wide is the gap between theoretical concepts of a peaceful world community and the hostile actualities; he advocated a step-by-step approach to each area of existing dissension, with the President of the United States taking the initiative in closing the gap.

Even among those American participants who concurred with the Pope in rejecting force entirely, full agreement was lacking. To the University of Chicago's Hans Morgenthau, the hope for coexistence lay in rapid transition from a world community of obsolescent sovereignties to a genuine United States of the World. Paul Ramsey, Princeton theologian, saw nothing either in the encyclical or in world trends to indicate the obsolescence of nation states. He interpreted coexistence as demanding a revision not of political institutions but of basic attitudes. "There can [not] be a consolidation of the peace of the world on the basis of what . . . might be called 'the community of fear.'" Chief Justice Earl Warren and Judge of the International Court Philip C. Jessup defined coexistence in terms of world law: Warren in the need to define and perfect international law, Jessup in the concept that international law, never a panacea for all man's ills, grows effective one step at a time on a foundation of smaller accords.

From non-Communist Europe came further variations. West Germany's Carlo Schmid saw three requirements inherent in minimal coexistence: respect for existing governments; peaceful negotiations within the territorial status quo; and freedom to align. Historian Arnold Toynbee of Great Britain replied that "the status quo cannot be frozen, and we ought not to try to freeze it . . . because constant change is of the essence of life." Robert Buron of France temperately commented that realisms too are subject to change; unrealistic though the destruction of nuclear stockpiles might seem in 1965, this might soon become the ultimate in realism.

Each participant brought to the interpretation of coexistence his country's specific needs and aspirations, his own deep cultural heritage, and his ideological bias. But it is of significance that these conversations, the first of their kind on an international level, revealed an agreement of aim and a unanimity of concern more profound than any divergence of means. Abba Eban, Deputy Prime Minister of Israel, speaking on the nature of the problem confronting the world, expressed the prevailing mood at the convocation: "It is not inevitable that we march in hostile and separated hosts into the common abyss. There is another possibility—an ordered world, illuminated by reason and governed by law. If we cannot yet touch it with our hands, let us, at least, grasp it in our vision."

THE CONDITIONS OF COEXISTENCE

What were the philosophical soft-spots threatening to spread decay and disintegration throughout the world community? On what moral foundations could the requirements of lasting peace be built? Pope John believed that any change from peace-by-deterrence to peace-by-agreement must arise from an "inner conviction" that anxiety and negative expectation could no longer substitute for the principles of "justice . . . right reason and humanity." In this vein Paul Tillich called for a cessation of what Madame Pandit of India termed prevailing "violence of the mind and heart." Tillich saw no alternative but to foster a spirit of "communal *eros*." Transcending narrow interests and legal processes as well, "communal *eros*" would result in love by the people of each nation for all other communities of people. This peace-oriented attitude Tillich considered essential to replace current disruptive intercultural suspicion. Israel's Abba Eban developed this theme still further, proposing that "those qualities which a nation holds uniquely to itself, its special memories and dreams, may well be its distinctive gift to human culture." Jordan's Rifa'i, Ghana's Quaison-Sackey, America's Pauling, Poland's Schaff and many more joined in urging a new spirit of coexistence embracing the heart as well as the mind, an international emotional acceptance of love, morality, and tolerance.

In what climate could such a spirit of reciprocal empathy mature and flourish? As a first step toward fruitful negotiations, Belgium's Spaak suggested that diplomats leave room for some margin of error in their discussions. He asked them to realize that in negotiations between states, as in individual arguments, each story has two sides, each utterance its reason. He called on every diplomat to regard his counterparts in other countries as "associates" not as "adversaries"; and to think only of what he can take. The Soviet Union's Zhukov added that coexistence presumes interchange of ideas between diplomats on equal footing, not between the dominators and the dominated.

Pope John had advanced as a primary requisite of peace that men use modern communications not for propagandistic distortion but to help the nations of the world understand each other. United States Senator J. William Fulbright suggested as one avenue to international *rapprochement* that each ideological group adjudge itself, seeking out its own limitations as well as its strengths. From candid self-appraisal could emerge a sympathetic understanding of the good in other philosophies. If men expected to replace destructive fanaticism with fruitful commitment to ideals, he encouraged them to enrich healthy skepticism with humor, compassion, and tolerance.

Closely related to the question of propaganda was the part played by ideological conflict in spawning international disturbances. Participants for the most part accepted Zhukov's proposition that for one nation to try

to impose its ideological system on another could be nothing less than "senseless" and was probably "utterly dangerous" in the atomic era. Abba Eban suggested that countries use "the human community as the focus of the teaching of history" since a good deal of ideological misunderstanding could be traced to the universal practice of stressing nationalistic history.

Pope John had also decried racism as incompatible with an atmosphere of mutual trust. To Spaak an end to racism meant more than a negative ceasing to hate; it implied positive acceptance of all men as members of the human family. True acceptance, to Dr. Tillich's mind, involved in addition a respect for the rights and aspirations of men in ancient Oriental cultures where individual dignity is not of supreme value as it is in the Christian and humanist traditions.

A wide range of panelists found the persistence of out-moded habits of thinking a major obstacle to coexistence. Biologist Hudson Hoagland ascribed this lag to a failure of cultural-social mechanisms to adapt to a rapidly evolving modern society. A human tendency to ascribe only the worst motives to the "foreign" adversary; an inability to grasp the correlation between nationalistic self-interest and common human interests; the failure of each nation to understand fully that far-removed economic and health problems eventually affect its own well-being; a lingering proclivity to view the world as a white man's planet with a colored fringe, ignoring the reverse actuality—these remnants of pre-technological, pre-atomic colonial thinking were responsible, many delegates thought, for much faulty perception in the modern world.

Obsolete vocabulary alone, author-critic Marya Mannes pointed out, stifled efforts to cope intelligently with current peace problems. As long as "negotiation" meant "surrender and appeasement," "socialism" connoted "the end of freedom," and "honor" was equated with "retaliation," world leaders would remain to a large extent prisoners of their own terms and preconceptions.

Combine these ingredients with an unrealistic assessment of the security-military strength relationship, and a war-disposing international climate resulted. As Professor Takayanagi of Japan emphasized, "The anesthesia of nuclear deterrence has produced a fatal drift toward tolerance of the ultimate intolerance," nuclear war. Obsolete and fugitive thinking had produced concrete situations compatible only with an uneasy, fragile *detente*, never with permanent peace. Of special concern were instances of revolution and counter-revolution. Taking no issue with the Soviet analysis of revolution as the expression of deep social unrest, Harold Stassen nevertheless saw in any kind of violence the seeds of nuclear conflict. Dr. Tillich explored this possibility step by step: natural and rightful resistance to injustice leads often to rebellion; from rebellion grows revolution; revolution can escalate into full-scale war; "and history leaves no doubt that the wars over contrasting ideas of justice are the most cruel, most insistent, and most devastating ones."

From the Soviet viewpoint, outside intervention in internal strife offered more threat to coexistence than the strife itself. Citing "hotbeds of danger" like Vietnam, the Congo, and the Caribbean, Inozemtsev urged a world-wide policy of military non-interference whenever and wherever civil strife erupted. Historians H. Stuart Hughes and Arnold Toynbee found it difficult to support or condemn either revolution or intervention in the abstract. Hughes saw great need, however, for the United States to clarify its "defense of freedom" policy. Citing the case of Vietnam, he described the nearly inescapable tendency of a nation defending "freedom" to creep into active, unjustifiable interference. When any nation appoints itself an international vigilante,

economist Stanley Sheinbaum noted, the result is often a disastrous laying waste in the areas of contention with concomitant alienation of the countries involved.

Left-over problems from World War II had created multiple threats to coexistence: the unresolved German question in a politically divided, restless Europe; the presence of two Chinas in Asia; the governmental vacuum left with the break-up of colonial empires; and the emergence of aspiring, underdeveloped nations in Africa, Asia, and the American hemisphere. Still nationalistically oriented, sovereign powers continued the habit of sending their own troops, instead of U. N. troops, to trouble spots. James Farmer, National Director of the Congress of Racial Equality, added another serious source of trouble—the lack that oppressed nations feel of any alternative to violence in their fight for justice. He suggested world-wide support from the "haves," in the form of sanctions, subsidies, and investments, to encourage the "have-nots" in non-violent resistance.

The panelists gave critical scrutiny to two principles still guiding the actions of the great powers and undoubtedly contributing to world instability in the guided missile age. George Kennan called for a reevaluation of the concept of "first use" of mass destruction weapons, a line of reasoning he felt directly responsible for nuclear proliferation and certain to lead to "eventual use." America's Bayard Rustin, Italy's Pietro Nenni, and Japan's Takayanagi emphatically questioned the place of "spheres of influence" and "balance of power" precepts in the present era. In Rustin's words, "the dominant powers—the United States, China, and Russia—while mouthing freedom, are determined that the small nations of the world, including those in Asia and Africa who have recently emerged, shall be in their sphere of influence come hell or high water or atomic war." All three saw in the perpetuation of these concepts a continuing paralysis of supranational authority and the possible collapse of even minimal coexistence.

The convocation found a basic correlation between the economic needs of countries large and small and general political tension. Problems of balance of trade among the large powers, unstable international monetary policies affecting all countries, the urgent needs of less well-developed nations old and new, each contributed a share to international unrest. Famine and starvation, particularly in the Pacific Basin, were, according to National Farmers' Union President James Patton, fanning fires of resentment against well-fed, opulent societies. "It is among hungry, desperate, oppressed peoples where the potential lies for a local war to escalate into a major war."

Ex-President Lleras Camargo of Peru dealt a sharp rebuke to the non-nuclear powers which had failed to champion human rights or to voice vigorous support for social justice; instead they had contributed nothing to peace, content to "perform as the chorus in a tragedy that could unfold at any moment . . ." Mrs. Vida Tomsic, Foreign Affairs Committeewoman from Yugoslavia, also cautioned against this fearful, do-nothing attitude on the part of the non-nuclear powers; recognizing the responsibility of developed countries to avoid further exploitations, she advocated simultaneous strenuous effort by the smaller nations to focus attention on urgent worldwide political and economic needs.

Jordan's Abdul Monem Rifa'i called for a reevaluation of foreign aid programs that they might strengthen, not stultify, the new-found independence of emerging nations. Chief Adebbo of Nigeria added the warning that "a Great Society for one country alone is impossible, unless, together, we provide for the 'Great Society' on the international level."

For many, though not all, the solution to world tensions could lie only in some supranational control capable of curbing and redirecting man's aggressive tendencies. Many at the convocation favored enlarging and strengthening the United Nations. Some went well beyond. Describing the prevailing international atmosphere as "a precarious balance of terror," lawyer Grenville Clark advocated genuine world government inspired by strong leadership and endowed with power to control any and all destructive national tendencies. James Patton sought for a means to abolish the Security Council, which he described as "a big-power complex sitting upon the small nations of the world." Mexico's Luis Quintanilla urged that the U.N. be a truly representative governmental body with universal membership, proportional representation in the Assembly and an enlarged Security Council. He also suggested giving the U.N. exclusive control of nuclear weapons and abolishing veto rights.

Others were more cautious. Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan of Pakistan defended the worth of sovereignties and their right to cede, or not cede, their authority to a world power; he urged use of peaceful instruments like arbitration and judicial referral in addition to negotiation. Former State Department Advisor Abram Chayes and Britain's Lord Caradon preferred working with the U.N. Charter as it stood, making gradual improvement and greater national support the goal.

While no agreement was sought, the discussions at the convocation thus brought to light areas of accumulated tension, resentment, and misery liable to momentary spontaneous combustion. Largely the heritage of the nineteenth century aristocratic regimes, of the age of colonialism and of World War II, these current problems menaced such coexistence as was operating and blocked further world accord. Revolution and counter-revolution, "spheres of influence," "balance of power" and "first-use" doctrines, defense of "freedom" and defense of "liberation" policies, gross economic inequality—these concrete realities perpetuated conditions incompatible with peace and dangerous to coexistence. Many members of the convocation saw the solution to these problems only in world-wide rededication to the human values of tolerance, cooperation, mutual respect, and reciprocal appreciation; in a concerted, open-minded effort to apply these values to the unresolved problems; and in a determination to extend and strengthen these principles into a workable supranational political fabric.

THE FUTURE OF COEXISTENCE

With few exceptions, participants at the convocation spoke of coexistence and meant peace—peace in small entering wedges, peace step by step, or peace through sweeping reform, but always peace. Following the directive of Convocation Chairman Robert M. Hutchins, participants had attempted to forge beyond the immediacy of two hostile camps and explore the requirements of peace "on a level somewhere between apathy and panic, and this side of the irrelevance of propaganda." From these explorations there emerge one central question, an issue still unresolved: Is the doctrine of coexistence a solid framework on which to build peace or is it a stop-gap remnant of the age-old philosophy of "victory through war"?

In the span of its life from the time of Lenin to the present coexistence had meant not peace but survival. It had ensured continued life for differing political, economic, and social systems, and a postponement of obliteration for most of the world's peoples. Numerous conflagrations, including World War II, the Korean conflict, eruptions in the Suez and in Hungary, open warfare in Vietnam, and border clashes in every hemisphere had thrust the prospects for international peace through coexistence in the shadow of

grave doubt. Would the future of coexistence be the razor-edge path of survival or the road to productive accord?

Many of the convocation's participants saw hope for peace through coexistence only if its "shape," as Adam Schaff put it, altered sufficiently to bring conflicting interests and ideologies into closer and closer cooperative endeavor. To the minds of a significant number of speakers and panelists, as long as the principles of national sovereignty and the pursuit of purely nationalistic interests prevailed, coexistence could expect a conflict-torn future.

To give impetus to a new and broader interpretation of coexistence, Abba Eban suggested that the heads of state for one week each year divert themselves from national problems and devote their consideration to the human problems of over-population, malnutrition, illiteracy, gross inequality of income, and the damage man has done to the face of the earth.

Professor of Psychiatry Jerome Frank saw a need for fresh ideas and fresh solutions if coexistence were to survive and work, not to eliminate conflict but to channel and control it. He suggested that these solutions might emanate from society itself rather than from government. Dr. Frank detected a particularly positive opening in the Gandhian method of doing battle by non-resistance, a form of conflict that juxtaposes traditional concepts of courage and cowardice and thwarts the tendency of men to dehumanize their enemies.

Although he agreed with Dr. Frank that "the prophet of the atomic age is surely Mahatma Gandhi," Arnold Toynbee found little to recommend in coexistence itself as a pattern for the future. With the emergence of major world-scale problems like pollution and overpopulation, Toynbee saw less inherent risk in mutual trust than in the Cold War coexistence practiced by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

Closing the convocation, U.N. Secretary General U Thant asked his now famous question: "What element, then, is lacking, so that, with all our skill and all our knowledge, we still find ourselves in the dark valley of discord and enmity?" Men lacked neither the aspiration nor the structure for peacekeeping, he asserted. They lacked the confidence to give of their trust, the foresight to release old-fashioned precepts in a world with a new face, the persistence to strive unceasingly, and the will to face the future squarely.

AFTER THE CONVOCATION

The Center disseminated the material of the convocation in various forms. The proceedings themselves, edited by Edward Reed, Director of Publications of the Center, were published by Pocket Books in a paper-back book entitled *Pacem in Terris/Peace on Earth*. The Center published several pamphlets: "... Therefore Choose Life," five papers commenting on the encyclical itself; "To Live as Men: An Anatomy of Peace," six addresses as given at the convocation; and three Occasional Papers covering different subjects discussed in the convocation: "On Coexistence," "On the World Community," and "On the Developed and the Developing." (Copies of the Pocket Book are available from the Center at 95 cents each; a sample copy of any of the pamphlets is available without charge.)

In the months that followed the convocation, world events deepened doubts that coexistence could insure survival, much less peace. The war in Vietnam escalated. The People's Republic of China renewed its efforts toward major nuclear capability and at the same time tightened its philosophic commitment to militant communism. Unrest erupted into sporadic violence over the face of Central and South America. Violent incidents spotted the globe. Sovereignties displayed a seeming disposition to force

their wills by coercion, in the teeth of the nuclear threat.

In the shadow of this gravely deteriorating international situation, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions held a small, informal conference in June of 1965 at its headquarters in Santa Barbara, California. Participants were foreign diplomats and international experts, including several ambassadors to the United Nations, officials of the U.N. Secretariat, and members of the staff of the Center. (See Appendix for list of participants.) The purpose of the conference was to evaluate the accomplishments of the Center's *Pacem in Terris* convocation in New York and to explore the usefulness of further international conversations in the quest for avenues to world peace.

The participants felt that it was both desirable and necessary to focus further worldwide attention on the present dangers to the peace and their possible catastrophic implications for the future. It was the unanimous view that the broadening intervention of the United States in the Vietnamese conflict had served to freeze normal channels of diplomacy and that the only hope for renewing the East-West dialogue lay in the hands of a non-official organization of demonstrated independence and competence. The group assembled at Santa Barbara urged the Center to explore the possibilities of a second convocation to be held outside the United States where even more universal participation might be assured, including representation from the People's Republic of China. The general feeling was that this second convocation, using for its base the broad themes developed in the first convocation, might focus on more concrete foreign policy proposals.

Accordingly, the Center called a preliminary planning session at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, May 30-June 2, 1966. An invitation to send participants or observers was transmitted to Peking; receipt was acknowledged, but there was no further response, and the People's Republic of China was not represented. (See Appendix for list of participants.)

At the opening of the planning conference, Robert M. Hutchins posed a basic question: Could a convocation dealing with broad questions of coexistence have meaning in the face of the continuing Vietnam war? It was unanimously agreed that the Vietnam conflict, in one sense a diversion, made such a convocation all the more essential. As United States Senator GORE pointed out, mankind's greatest need was for communication among men of good will. N. N. Inozemtsev of the Soviet Union felt that a second convocation could profitably consider the general international situation in terms of those problems which worsen it, like Vietnam, and those ideas which might improve it, like disarmament. Professor Lachs of Poland saw no contradiction in seeking solutions to larger political problems and at the same time making efforts toward a Vietnam settlement. U.S. Justice Douglas felt that the Vietnam conflict, as a symptom of international disorder, argued for the importance of having a second convocation. Participants agreed unanimously with Japan's Professor Cho that this should be a convocation aimed at bridging gaps, especially between the United States and China.

Questions of participation at a second convocation centered around the inclusion of the People's Republic of China. Without exception, the participants at the planning conference agreed on the great desirability of having Chinese delegates and urged the Center to pursue every possible avenue of approach to include representatives from Peking. All agreed that the impact of the convocation would be in proportion to its world-wide representation and that delegates from North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front should be invited to participate.

The Center was urged to select a site where universal participation would be possible.

PACEM IN TERRIS II

In response to the unanimous recommendation of the planning conference at Geneva and the encouragement of officials at the United Nations, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions will accordingly sponsor a second International Convocation on the Requirements of Peace, *Pacem in Terris II*, in Geneva, Switzerland, May 28-31, 1967. The participants will include leading political and intellectual figures from every part of the world, representing all possible ideologies and political persuasions.

That the concept of coexistence is still the minimal hope for survival in the atomic era is unquestionable. That it can adjust to the imperative needs of the future is uncertain. *Pacem in Terris II* will study these questions and will seek solutions compatible with the needs of all men and all nations. The subjects for panel discussion, as presently projected, will include the following:

The Threats to Coexistence.

Intervention: The Case of Vietnam.

Confrontation: The Case of Germany.

Beyond Coexistence.

Interdependence.

APPENDIX

THE PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE

In the court of a series of discussions at the Center on the practical, secular implications of Pope John XXIII's encyclical, Fred Warner Neal, Professor of International Relations at Claremont Graduate School, suggested the possibility of a major convocation focused on *Pacem in Terris*. Accordingly, on May 17-19, 1964, at Wingspread, the Johnson Foundation conference center at Racine, Wisconsin, the Center convened a small planning session to consider the feasibility of such an undertaking.

Robert M. Hutchins served as chairman, with Harry S. Ashmore as his deputy, as they did for all the conferences. The other participants were:

S. O. Adebbo, Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations.

Ahmad Al Nakib, Deputy to the Ambassador to the United Nations from Kuwait.

Livingston Biddle, Special Assistant to Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island.

Father John F. Cronin, S.S., Assistant Director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Maitre Xavier Deniau, Deputy for Loiret, French National Assembly.

Marian Dobrosielski, Counselor of the Polish Embassy, Washington, D.C.

Nelson Glueck, President, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

Brooks Hays, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, consultant to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Hudson Hoagland, President, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Georgi Kornienko, Minister Counselor of the Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C.

Msgr. Luigi Ligutti, Permanent Observer of the Holy See to FAO, Vatican City.

Senator George McGovern, South Dakota.

Hans J. Morgenthau, Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy, University of Chicago.

C. V. Narasimhan, Executive Office of the Secretary General, United Nations.

Fred Warner Neal, Professor of International Relations and Government, Claremont Graduate School.

Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin.

Leslie Paffrath, President, Johnson Foundation.

Josip Presburger, Counselor of the Yugoslav Embassy, Washington, D. C.

Eugene Rabinowitch, Editor, *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*.

Rashid Al Rashid, Ambassador to the United Nations from Kuwait.

Andrew Shonfield, Director of Studies, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, England.

John Tomlinson, Director of Mission and World Service Liaison for the National Council of Churches.

Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, Judge of the International Court.

PACEM IN TERRIS I

The Center's convocation on the Requirements of Peace, based on the encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, was held in New York City February 18-20, 1965. At the opening session in the Assembly Hall of the United Nations, the principal speaker was Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey. In the plenary sessions that followed at the Hilton Hotel, before an invited audience of some 2,500, panel discussions and individual addresses were directed to these topics:

A European settlement. *The Main Issues: Military Confrontation; Germany and Berlin; Nuclear Proliferation.*

The institutional structure. *The Main Issues: National Sovereignty; International Organization; The Rule of Law; Peace-Keeping.*

The non-nuclear powers. *The Main Issues: National Independence vs. International Dependence; Alignment vs. Non-Alignment—Economic Disparities—Political Instability.*

The terms of coexistence: Mutual interest and mutual trust. *The Main Issues: Ideology and Intervention; The Limits of Non-Military Conflict; Change vs. the Status Quo.*

Paul G. Hoffman, director of the United Nations Development Program and honorary chairman of the Center's Board of Directors, presided at the opening session at the United Nations. Robert M. Hutchins served as chairman of the convocation, with Harry S. Ashmore as his deputy, Leslie Paffrath, President of the Johnson Foundation, as secretary general, and Fred Warner Neal as program consultant. Other participants at the plenary sessions were:

S. O. Adebbo, Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations.

Robert Buron, Chairman, National Committee on Productivity, Republic of France. Alberto Lleras Camargo, Former President of Colombia.

Lord Caradon, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, United Kingdom.

Xavier Deniau, French National Assembly.

William O. Douglas, Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court, and Chairman, Board of Directors, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Abba Eban, Deputy Prime Minister of Israel.

Senator J. William Fulbright, Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate.

George H. Guilfoyle, Archdiocese of New York.

N. N. Inozemtsev, Director, Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.

Philip C. Jessup, Judge, International Court of Justice.

George F. Kennan, former United States Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. and to Yugoslavia.

Edward Lamb, President, Lamb Industries and Member of the Board of Directors, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

M. D. Millionshchikov, Vice-President, Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.

Pietro Nenni, Deputy Prime Minister of Italy.

Madame Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Governor of Maharashtra, India, and former President of the United Nations General Assembly.

Linus Pauling, Nobel Science Laureate and Nobel Peace Laureate, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Alex Quaison-Sackey, Representative of Ghana to the United Nations, and President of the United Nations General Assembly.

Luis Quintanilla, former President of the Council, Organization of American States, and Ambassador of Mexico.

Abdul Monem Rifa'i, Representative of Jordan to the United Nations.

Adam Schaff, Member of the Central Committee, United Workers' (Communist) Party of Poland.

Carlo Schmid, Vice-President of the Bundestag of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Paul-Henri Spaak, Vice Premier and Foreign Minister of Belgium.

Adlai E. Stevenson, Representative of the United States to the United Nations.

Kenzo Takayanagi, Chairman of the Constitution Revision Commission of Japan.

U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

Paul Tillich, John Nuveen Professor of Theology, University of Chicago.

Mrs. Vida Tomsic, Member of the Committee for Foreign Affairs, Federal Assembly of Yugoslavia.

Arnold Toynbee, Historian, Great Britain.

Miss Barbara Ward, economist and author, Great Britain.

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States.

Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, Judge, International Court of Justice.

Yevgeny Zhukov, Director of the Institute of History, Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.

In addition to the participants in the plenary sessions, special panels of United States foreign policy experts were assembled to discuss and analyze each day's proceedings. They were:

Steve Allen, author, critic and television personality; Eugene Burdick, professor of political science, University of California; Abram J. Chayes, former legal adviser to the Department of State; Grenville Clark, attorney and co-author of *World Peace Through World Law*; John Cogley, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; Norman Cousins, editor, *Saturday Review*; James Farmer, national director, Congress of Racial Equality; Jerome Frank, professor of psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University Medical School; Hudson Hoagland, executive director, Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology; H. Stuart Hughes, professor of history, Harvard University; Herman Kahn, director, Hudson Institute; Henry R. Luce, editorial chairman, Time, Inc.; Marya Mannes, author and critic; Eugene J. McCarthy, United States Senator from Minnesota; George McGovern, United States Senator from South Dakota; Walter Millis, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; Hans J. Morgenthau, Director, Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy, University of Chicago; James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; Claiborne Pell, United States Senator from Rhode Island; Gerard Piel, editor and publisher, *Scientific American*; R. Paul Ramsey, Harrington Spear Paine, professor of religion, Princeton University; Elmo Roper, public opinion analyst; Bayard Rustin, executive secretary, War Resisters League; William Fitts Ryan, Representative from New York, U.S. Congress; Stanley K. Sheinbaum, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; George N. Shuster, assistant to the president, University of Notre Dame; Harold E. Stassen, disarmament adviser to President Eisenhower; Carl F. Stover, executive director, National Institute of Public Affairs; Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, founder, Women Strike for Peace.

AFTER PACEM IN TERRIS I: THE CONFERENCE AT SANTA BARBARA

At this evaluation session in June, 1965, the result of which was a recommendation to hold a second convocation, the participants were:

S. O. Adebo, Representative of Nigeria to the United Nations.

Joseph A. Amter, Chairman, Committee for Research on the Development of International Relations.

Patrick Armstrong, Secretary General of Parliamentary Group, House of Commons, London, England.

Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs, United Nations.

Ritchie Calder, University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

Michael Comay, Ambassador of Israel to the United Nations.

Joseph W. Drown, Member of the Board of Directors of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Ahmed Houman, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, Judge, International Court of Justice.

Stuart Mudd, World Academy of Art and Science, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

C. V. Narasimhan, Chef de Cabinet, United Nations.

Fred Warner Neal, Claremont Graduate School.

Linus Pauling, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Luis Quintanilla, former President of the Council, Organization of American States, ambassador of Mexico.

E. R. Richardson, Ambassador of Jamaica to the United Nations.

José Rolz-Bennett, Under Secretary, United Nations.

Piero Vinci, Ambassador of Italy to the United Nations.

Harold Willens, Member of the Board of Directors, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

THE GENEVA PLANNING CONFERENCE

Individuals from ten countries attended the meeting May 30–June 2, 1966, at which initial plans were made for *Pacem in Terris* II. They were:

H. E. Sonn Vuensal, Ambassador of Cambodia to France.

Pierre Mendès-France, former Premier of France.

Jean Chauvel, Ambassador and Diplomatic Counselor to the Government of France.

Maitre Xavier Deniau, French National Assembly.

Alastair Buchan, Director, Institute for Strategic Studies, England.

C. V. Narasimhan, Chef de Cabinet, United Nations.

Mrs. Kiyoko Cho, Professor, International Christian University, Tokyo.

Luis Quintanilla, Former Ambassador of Mexico.

Manfred Lachs, Warsaw University.

Mohammed El-Zayyat, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, United Arab Republic.

William O. Douglas, Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court and Chairman of the Board, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Albert A. Gore, United States Senator from Tennessee.

George S. McGovern, United States Senator from South Dakota.

William C. Baggs, Member of the Board of Directors, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Edgar Snow, author and journalist.

Nikolai N. Inozemtsev, Director, Institute of World Economics and International Relations, Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R.

Dmitri D. Muraviev, Secretary-General, Institute of Soviet-American Relations, U.S.S.R.

HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was saddened this morning to learn of the untimely death of my good friend and colleague, former Representative Henry Aldous Dixon. He passed away yester-

day after suffering a heart attack at his family home in Ogden, Utah.

Although short of stature, he will be remembered as a giant among men by the thousands of students, teachers, and friends he made during the more than 40 years he spent in the field of education, and during the 6 years he served as a Representative in the House from Utah's First Congressional District.

It was my privilege to work with Henry Aldous Dixon for more than 30 years on the General Sunday School Board of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. I knew him many years before that when he was a cashier at a bank in Provo, Utah.

Dr. Dixon began his career as an instructor at Weber College in Ogden, Utah, after graduating from Brigham Young University in 1914. He served two different terms as president of Weber College from 1919 to 1920 and again from 1937 until 1953. He also served as superintendent of Provo City, Utah, schools from 1920 to 1924 and again from 1932 until 1937. He mixed his academic career with an active interest in business and served from 1924 until 1932 as the managing vice president of the Farmers and Merchants Bank of Provo, Utah. He also served several terms as president of the chambers of commerce in both Provo and Ogden, Utah. He was active in the Rotary Club and many other scholastic, fraternal, and church organizations.

In 1953, Dr. Dixon was appointed president of Utah State University, at Logan, Utah. He served in this capacity until he was overwhelmingly elected by the people of Utah to serve in Congress. After serving for three terms, he chose to retire and devote his remaining years to his first love—education—and to enjoy the abundant good fishing and hunting in Utah's streams and hills. He was an avid sportsman and loved the great out of doors almost as much as he did the warmth of a good discussion in the classroom or on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Henry Aldous Dixon will be sorely missed by his family and friends, but his many contributions to education, business, and politics will long be remembered by the people of Utah and by his friends throughout the Nation.

THE MEANS TO COMBAT CRIME

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the most serious and urgent problems with which this Congress must deal is the problem of devising effective means to combat crime. During the past year, in consultation with State and local law enforcement officers, I have been developing a number of proposals for action to improve the training of police and correctional officers, to provide local and State officials with improved technology to combat crime, and to provide educational benefits for law enforcement officers. In the near future, I will introduce a bill embodying those proposals.

In the meantime, I have been heartened by the fact that a number of the ideas I will propose in that bill have gained significant endorsement. The President mentioned a number of them

in his state of the Union address. Then, last Thursday, January 19, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] delivered before the Columbia Law School Forum an address entitled "Crime in the Cities: Improving the Administration of Criminal Justice." I am pleased to see that, in many ways, Senator KENNEDY's thinking closely parallels mine. For that reason, I commend his address to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the RECORD.

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

CRIME IN THE CITIES: IMPROVING THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(Address by Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Columbia Law School Forum, Columbia Law School, New York City, January 19, 1967)

I. INTRODUCTION

St. Thomas Aquinas once said that "freedom is willing obedience to law". There is, of course, no better way to start an argument in a law school than to put forth a simple declarative statement which contains two words like "freedom" and "law". But one of the principal issues facing our society today is just this simple relationship—between law and freedom, justice and order—and the subject matter of your classroom debates is also the center of political debate, the most pressing immediate concern for millions of individual Americans, a matter of literal life and death.

For these people—that is, for the 70 percent of Americans who live in cities—freedom is threatened most of all by the spreading incidence of crime. The most elementary freedoms of all—against arbitrary interference with one's bodily security or property—are in growing jeopardy. As a result, a deepening concern over law enforcement pervades urban society—in the ghettos of Harlem no less than in the row houses of Queens.

This concern is justified. Fear and freedom go ill together.

In the past five years alone, the rate of serious crimes reported across the country has risen by over one-third. Even allowing, as we should, for improved crime reporting methods, the problem is grave. On an average day in the United States in 1965, a robbery occurred every five minutes, an aggravated assault every three minutes, and a car theft every minute. And there are indications that many more such crimes go totally unreported and are therefore not reflected in these statistics.

Concern over crime in cities is of course not new. In the early years of this century, police would not enter Hell's Kitchen except in groups of six. The editors of the *New Republic* charged in 1925 that "the administration of criminal justice has broken down in the United States". In 1933, Senator Royal Copeland of New York, heading a special Senate investigation, stated that "the cost of crime is steadily advancing. . . . The administration of justice has fallen down." This history is a useful rejoinder to those who imply that crime is a recent development caused by court decisions or civil rights demonstrations—as is the fact that all crime is not increasing: the homicide rate now is actually lower by about fifty percent than it was thirty years ago.

But no amount of history, no comparison with other times and places, can alleviate our concern, for the problem of crime is greater now than it has been at any time in the past. Ours is a more complex and interdependent society, therefore more vulnerable to disorder; and mobility and instant public communications spread crime—its fact, its ex-

ample, and its political consequences—more rapidly than ever before.

Therefore, I come before you to discuss crime, and particularly crime in our cities, because you have a special responsibility in this area. Some of you will serve directly, as judges and prosecutors and defense attorneys.

All of you will have a responsibility—to lead public understanding of the delicate balance between private liberty and public order.

And, most immediately, it will be your responsibility as lawyers to press for and participate in the revamping of a set of law enforcement processes—from arrest to trial to imprisonment—that has not been fundamentally revised for decades.

Due to shortages of money, time, imagination, effort and commitment—and a shortage of cooperation from the community it serves—our law enforcement system has been deficient in preventing crime. It has thereby contributed to an atmosphere in which, all too often, it appears to the potential offender that the risks of crime are worth taking.

Re-examination of the process has begun. President Johnson focused attention on the problem in his State of the Union message. The District of Columbia Crime Commission has released a thorough and constructive set of recommendations for across-the-board action in the District. The President's Crime Commission, at work more than a year, will soon release a report that all of us await with interest. But far more remains to be done, far more effort will have to be made in translating recommendations into law, before the course of reform is complete.

Today I would like to discuss with you some of the revisions which must be accomplished. But before proceeding, I would make two observations.

First, it is clear that reducing crime involves far more than reform of the law enforcement system. Over the long run it involves the building of a society in which people do not want to and do not feel the need to violate the law—a society where equal opportunity for all is a reality, a society where self-respect and self-esteem are not commodities reserved for the economically advantaged. And that effort in turn requires that we vastly multiply our efforts against poverty, for education, for jobs, for fundamental justice in the economic and social relations between men.

But the new order will not be with us for some time, and the longer the war in Viet Nam persists, the longer that time will be. So immediate improvements in our law enforcement system are important.

Effective law enforcement is also critical in the sense that, even if we achieved total affluence at some distant time, crime would still be with us—as we can see from the recent increases in crime in our comfortable suburbs. Crime is a disease that is never totally cured. It exists under socialism as under capitalism, in primitive and advanced cultures, under all political forms. All societies have alienated and disaffected members; and some proportion of men will always prefer to act outside the rules to achieve personal advantage. This does not mean that crime cannot be reduced by reforming society; of course it can. It does mean that it cannot be eliminated, and that law enforcement will always be needed.

Second—an observation which must color our whole perspective—crime is principally a problem of young people. In 1965, almost three quarters of those arrested for serious crimes were between 13 and 29. Historically, increases in crime in this country have been closely related to increases in the size of the 13 to 29 age group; our recent increases in crime rates are in direct proportion to the "baby boom" of recent years; and, as the youth population continues to grow, we can

expect a serious continued growth of crime in the next decade and beyond. Thus our proposals must be shaped by the problem—by its character as a phenomenon of the teenager and the young adult.

II. IMPROVING POLICE ADMINISTRATION

A. Crime prevention and the apprehension of criminals

The policeman is the law enforcement system's representative on the street—and his very presence, the extent to which he is in evidence at any time, can deeply affect the amount of crime that is committed. Thus in Chicago, for example, putting more police cars into several high crime precincts, even with only one man inside each instead of the usual two, significantly reduced crime rates. Here in New York City, putting police on motor scooters in Central Park and Prospect Park in 1964 caused a 30 percent and a 40 percent drop, respectively, in muggings in a few months time.

These experiments bore fruit not just because potential violators saw the police or knew they were likely to be nearby, although that is certainly part of the reason. The point is far more basic, and it is particularly important in deterring young people from committing crime.

Claude Brown tells us that the young people of Harlem who spent their lives on the streets made their own rules and lived by their own code. They did so because there was no other security, no other enforced set of rules. The lack of a consistent, conscientious, even-handed authority—in other words, the lack of law enforcement in Harlem when Claude Brown was growing up—had a profound effect on his contemporaries. It caused them to substitute the rules of the streets for the rule of the law. As Brown notes, "I was growing up now, and people were going to expect things from me. I would soon be expected to kill a man if he mistreated me."

Adequate police presence on the streets is, therefore, no less fundamental than the social contract itself. It says to the young people: you can obtain security by making the law enforcement bargain. You can avoid the need for self-protective resort to the rules of the street by mutually agreeing to the rule of law. And it says also: you cannot expect to succeed by making your own rules.

Here, then, is a need which can be met only in one way: by putting more police on the street.

The first need is to obtain enough good policemen who can do the job well. Almost no large city police force is adequate in size. New York City, for example, told a National League of Cities survey last year that it needed 6,300 more officers, an increase of almost 25 percent over the number of police it then had. The average need for increased manpower reported by all 284 responding cities was ten percent.

One basic cause of these recruitment difficulties is salary—the typical starting salary in a large city is only \$5,800, and in smaller cities it is far less. About half the cities responding to the National League of Cities survey still pay less than \$5,000 as a beginning salary, and a sixth still have maximum salaries for patrolmen of under \$5,000. The average yearly wage in manufacturing in the United States is over \$5,600. Clearly, men of the calibre sought for law enforcement can find other employment at much higher pay.

Another major barrier to recruitment stems from the fact that police work lacks professional status in the eyes of much of the community. This is partly a reflection of the fact that police salary scales are low, and partly a reflection of inadequacies in the training process. More fundamentally, however, I think the organization of our police departments has limited the prestige of the job. Their structure is ordinarily such that promotion is unavailable to many qualified

men. Enough higher-level positions just are not available. As a result, men on the force for ten and fifteen years are still patrolmen, making little more money and bearing only marginally more responsibility than when they began. The idea of police work as a professional career in the public's mind is bound to suffer, to say nothing of the frustrating and deadening effect on the policemen involved.

Nor are most policemen, once recruited, adequately trained. The International Association of Chiefs of Police says 200 hours of classroom instruction is a bare minimum, and by no means an ideal. Yet barely a quarter of the nation's police agencies provide that much training. Large cities do far better than smaller ones, and the IACP reports that generally speaking, cities of less than 50,000 just do not have the capability by themselves of providing more than token training. As a result of these deficiencies, the rookie cop is often insufficiently prepared and highly impressionable when he hits the street. He is then taken in hand, usually, by a veteran policeman who has not received anywhere near the kind of in-service training that he in turn ought to have had to expand his capabilities—probably less than three days yearly—though experts recommend at least two weeks of special courses yearly for working policemen. Only New York City maintains a College of Police Science to provide educational courses and award degrees to working police officers.

Improving recruitment and training will depend primarily on State and local initiative, but the Federal government also has an important role to play in aiding this process. For example, the Department of Labor and the Neighborhood Youth Corps have funded extensive programs in New York City, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Newark, and St. Louis to recruit and train educationally-disadvantaged young people for police careers—thus offering the possibility both of more integrated police forces, and of policemen, recruited from inside the city, who are more intimately acquainted with the city and the people they will serve and protect. This illustrates one way in which the Federal government can be helpful, and it is the kind of effort that must be expanded and multiplied.

I believe the Federal government should assist in the development of a series of regional police training centers at interested universities around the country—to aid in educating recruit training instructors, in packaging and distributing courses to be given the recruits at the local level, and in providing courses and programs of study for men at all levels of police work. A regional system of university centers would, I believe, raise police standards everywhere.

Beyond increased training, we must explore a variety of ways to improve the status of police work. One—already begun by many police departments—is to hire civilian personnel to perform basically clerical jobs formerly handled by policemen. In connection with this, we should also consider ways in which the policeman's job can be lightened by having citizens serve as eyes and ears for the police in their own neighborhoods. There are always problems in trying to cloak ordinary citizens with any aspect of police responsibility, but the idea of a citizen patrol could, in my judgment, be quite constructive and should be explored.

More broadly, we should encourage the recruitment of many men who now do not consider police work at all—for example, most college graduates. About 50 percent of all high school graduates now go on to college, and the proportion is increasing every year. Thus, if the present pattern of police recruitment is maintained, we will be restricting ourselves to the lower half of our population for one of our most difficult and vital jobs. In the past, when education was more restricted and police pensions offered

unique security, there was far more competition, among a wider range of people, for places on the force; now most young men do not consider it.

One way to draw from a broader spectrum would be to recruit some proportion of patrolmen on a relatively short-term basis—say, for two, three, or four years. Short-term service might well be encouraged by providing a specific draft exemption in return for a definite number of years of police service. The matter would require careful study, to insure that the gains to the police manpower pool would outweigh, in their value to the community, the losses to the military manpower pool as a result of effectively freeing all new policemen from having to serve in the armed forces. But the basic point remains sound—a draft exemption for policemen would express both the public's concern over the need to attract more men to police work, and its respect for the worth of the police calling and for the dangerous service they perform.

Similarly, we might explore the possibility of a partial government subsidy for the college education of young men who agree to spend a designated number of years after graduation doing police work—just as we now do for officers in the Armed Services.

To the extent that approaches like these would attract men who would choose not to make police work a career, vital strength at the patrolmen level would be expanded without making the competition for promotion any more frustrating than it already is. Moreover, a new link to the community at large would be forged through these men who had served in the police force for a short period of time. And these trained but discharged officers might form the nucleus of a police reserve—an emergency force which could be called upon in time of disaster or civil disorder to augment the regular force. Such a force would certainly provide society with a more flexible and less drastic weapon than the National Guard.

Second, crime prevention can be enhanced and criminals apprehended more effectively if modern technology is used to deploy limited police manpower resources more efficiently.

For example, electronic data processing equipment—connected with a statewide computer network—can supply us with instantaneous information about criminal suspects. Chicago credits computer equipment as being a major factor in helping to decrease the city's crime rate in 1963 and 1964. New York City police have effectively used computers to help trace stolen cars and track down traffic ticket violators. Nevertheless, only 29 percent of the cities answering the National League of Cities survey had electronic data processing equipment although 45 percent more indicated it would improve their data handling procedures.

As another example, modern technology might also be an instrument in assuring the integrity—and therefore the true efficiency—of police interrogations. Video tape or film equipment might be used to record questioning, thus protecting both the police and the accused from false claims by the other at trial or on collateral attack of a conviction. Police Commissioner Leary told the Ribicoff Subcommittee in December that his department is undertaking just such an experiment, using sound recordings for some interrogations, layman observers for others, and film or video tape for still others. We shall await the results with interest.

In my judgment, federal funds should be made available to help finance all of these improvements in technology—including the development of a national network of computers and the acquisition of other needed capital equipment such as motor vehicles. Since these are in large part one-time expenditures which are beyond the capacity of many localities, Federal aid on an appropriate matching basis would seem entirely justified.

At the same time, however, we must act to assure that the new technology serves us properly and does not invade the privacy of the individual. The time has come for Congress to enact new legislation to reform completely our approach to wiretapping and to eavesdropping. I am now in the process of putting some proposals in this area into the form of legislation which I shall introduce in Congress shortly.

Third, more effective crime prevention also depends upon the reorganization and consolidation of local police departments. Some 40,000 separate and often overlapping police agencies now exist around the country. Fifty-four different police forces serve the six counties of metropolitan Detroit. Chicago and its environs encompass over 150 local police jurisdictions. There are 39 separate police departments in Westchester County. These situations are wasteful of scarce resources, and too often result in poor coordination in preventing crime and capturing criminal offenders.

We long ago consolidated school districts in rural areas, and many of our metropolitan areas have combined to meet sewage and transit and other area-wide problems collectively. I believe we should now move in the same direction in the organization of our police forces. This is not to suggest that we must make wholesale changes which destroy police familiarity with local conditions, or the responsiveness that they can offer to the needs of the people they serve. But the Kansas City area, for example, has a five-county area metropolitan squad, composed of 120 officers from 40 different law enforcement agencies in both Missouri and Kansas, which is activated when major crimes are committed in its zone of coverage. That is the kind of reorganization we should explore, at the very least. The result can only be better deployment of resources and better service to the public.

Reorganization within cities is needed as well. Precinct maps in many cities were drawn when communications were far slower and policemen far less mobile. In these cities a significant saving in desk-bound manpower and paperwork could be achieved by precinct consolidation and a greater centralization of headquarters functions.

In all of this the Federal Government has already begun to play a role. The recently-created Office of Law Enforcement Assistance in the Department of Justice has funded committees in six states which have been formed to examine and reorganize their law enforcement systems. Other applications for similar aid are being processed now. The D.C. Crime Commission engaged the International Association of Chiefs of Police to study the organization of the District's Police Department, and received in return a thoughtful and constructive report. These various efforts should be expanded, and I believe that federal assistance should be made available to enable other local police departments to obtain the kind of evaluation that was so helpful in Washington. The Federal government must also be prepared—as President Johnson pointed out in his State of the Union message—to bear a certain percentage of the additional costs that result when states establish master plans for combatting crime. Our goal is the creation of efficient and organized police forces, for such forces are critical if crime is to be prevented.

The policeman's job is difficult, hazardous, and often thankless. He is the sole representative of the governing authority on many streets of the city, and as such he is called upon daily to make decisions and take actions which may spell the difference between public safety and heightened tension and insecurity. If we want to make our streets safe and more secure, we owe it to ourselves to make the effort at all levels of government that will be required to recruit, train, and equip our police forces in a manner

which gives them the tools they need to do the job.

B. Police-community relations

At the same time, improved crime prevention has another element. The job our police are able to do will be shaped significantly by their own reactions and beliefs about the community they serve, and these attitudes will be shaped in turn by the attitude of the public and the level of cooperation within the community. I am in favor of any system or device for improving these relationships—open meetings between police and neighborhood representatives, establishment of public advisory councils, police participation in community activities; all these are important. But to these conventional approaches I would add two more basic points.

First, we hear a great deal in the press about problems in police-community relations arising out of the concern of ghetto residents about police brutality and racism. These are serious concerns, to be sure. But the overriding problem of ghetto residents—their abiding need—is for physical security, and thus for more police protection.

The John Kraft organization has conducted a number of polls in Negro and Puerto Rican neighborhoods in New York City, in which it asked people to list their problems. Crime came out "at the head of the list." What the people want, the Kraft group concludes, is "more police protection." And, the Kraft report continues, "Problems of 'police brutality'—in all these surveys—are conspicuous by their absence." What people want is more police presence rather than less.

When the statistics on crime are studied, this desire becomes very understandable. Although serious crimes are committed to a disproportionate extent by the poor, it is too often forgotten that these serious crimes are also committed in poor neighborhoods and the victims are generally the law-abiding citizens who live there. In general, crimes of violence are not the acts of stranger against stranger; rather they are normally committed by offenders who are known to the victims. Eighty percent of all murders are perpetrated by the family, friends or acquaintances of the deceased; over two-thirds of all aggravated assaults and rapes are committed by the same categories of offenders. And most crime is not interracial. A study in Detroit has shown that while 78 percent of the identified perpetrators of assaults were Negro, 76 percent of the victims were also Negro. A five-year study of homicides in Philadelphia revealed that only about 6 percent of the crimes were interracial, and of these, Negroes were the victims almost as often as they were the offenders.

I pointed out earlier the importance of a conscientious, consistent, even-handed police presence in preventing the young people of the ghetto from turning to crime. What I add here is really the other side of that coin—a capable and efficient police force is critical to the protection of the entire ghetto community, and it remains the indispensable element in developing community understanding and cooperation.

Second, however much we enjoin policemen to understand the problems of the slum and its people, we must realize and fulfill the obligations the rest of the community owes to the individual patrolman. He will never win anyone's confidence so long as he is sent to enforce unjust laws. Smile as he will, he will be no one's friend so long as he has to be a party to evictions by slum landlords. The key to police-community relations in the end is that there be justice in the relations of the people of the ghetto to the rest of the community. Then the deck will be shuffled fairly when the individual police officer comes in to do his job. And the assurance that justice is a concept applicable to the entire community is especially im-

portant to the youth of the ghetto—for whom the discrepancy between the American dream and the nightmare of everyday reality has become so vivid. The alienation of these young people has reached alarming proportions, so that, as elsewhere, it is in relation to the young that the need for action is most urgent.

III. IMPROVING THE TRIAL PROCESS

Improving police administration is, of course, just one aspect of the task ahead. After the arrest, the next step is the prosecution, and deficiencies in that process can also contribute to increased crime. Justice delayed is, after all, justice denied—in a variety of ways. The undue delay of a prosecution means that witnesses may die or forget or leave the jurisdiction, and, if a defendant escapes conviction on that account, the result is inevitably a decreased respect for the law, and an increased chance that others will think it worth the risk to commit a crime. Moreover, during a long delay before trial, the defendant who is out on bail or on recognizance, may get a job and settle down, only to be uprooted from his self-achieved rehabilitation—or he may commit another crime. Either way, respect for law suffers.

And the fact is that we have failed to modernize and expand our prosecutorial and judicial processes as an increasing population has made their caseloads heavier and heavier.

As in the case of police administration, at least part of the problem comes from a failure to commit sufficient resources. Salary scales for local district attorneys begin as low as \$1,200 a year in some states. As a consequence, the job of district attorney, in over four-fifths of the states, is only a part-time occupation that supplements private practice. In New York City, Assistant District Attorneys in three of the five Boroughs are permitted to have some private clients.

Meanwhile, criminal court dockets continue to lengthen. In some states, it can take as long as two years to bring a felon to trial. Even persons charged with misdemeanors often have to wait several months to be tried. In some states the number of cases getting to court is actually on the decline. In Washington, D.C., for example, the U.S. District Court handled 39 percent fewer felony cases in 1965 than it did in 1950.

This congestion and slowness in the handling of serious felony cases leads many prosecuting attorneys to accept pleas of guilty to lesser crimes than those originally charged, and to drop cases where the crime does not seem too serious or the evidence is less than overwhelming. Inevitably, unsupervised plea bargaining, reduced charges, and dropped cases lead to decreases in deterrence as it appears more and more likely to the potential offender that even if he is arrested, he may not be prosecuted or may receive a disproportionately light sentence.

And in too many criminal trials, efficiency is either lost or converted into a substitute for fairness. Numerous continuances and the failure to establish computerized scheduling of cases produce annoying waits for witnesses and lost time for police officials. In some police courts, judges try to make up for lost time and clear their calendars by hearing anywhere from 50 to 100 cases in a day. Innocence and guilt, justice and injustice are usually muddled in the process. As criminal law scholar Edward Barrett has pointed out, "How can we expect respect for the law . . . from citizens generally, when their personal involvement with courts is in mass-production settings where even individual explanations by defendants must be discouraged in order to clear up overcrowded calendars."

One prescription for improvement is monetary—a greater commitment of financial resources to the hiring of more able prosecutors and court administrative personnel. Another is careful re-examination of the kinds of matters now treated in the criminal process.

It is at present clogged with offenses involving derelicts and vagrants and with essentially administrative problems like building code and traffic violations. It is astonishing, for example, that almost one-third of the non-traffic arrests made in our cities relate to public intoxication and that in our nation's capital, this figure reached 50 percent in 1965. If our courts, and, for that matter, our police forces as well, are to deal effectively with serious crime, they must be relieved of the responsibility for keeping chronic alcoholics off the street. Instead, we must follow the example now being set in such cities as St. Louis, Washington, Boston and New York and begin taking the alcoholic completely out of the criminal process. Our overcrowded jail cells must be replaced by clinics and drying-out centers. If we can begin to treat those offenses which are really public health problems as such, and those offenses which are really administrative matters as such, we will have taken a giant step toward freeing our courts to deal expeditiously with serious crime.

Finally, we must begin to evaluate and to reform the juvenile court systems that exist in every State. Many of the problems in these courts are similar to those that mark the entire judicial process—inefficiency, insufficient personnel and inadequate facilities. But the juvenile court system, because it is based on the theory that defendants should be dealt with informally, raises fundamental problems of procedural fairness—problems which no longer plague the courts in which adult offenders are tried.

Reform of the juvenile courts is critical because such a high percentage of serious crime is committed either by adolescents or by adult offenders who were involved with the law when they were adolescents. The first law enforcement officer normally seen by the serious offender is the youth specialist, and the first courtroom that he enters is for juvenile offenders. Whether this youngster is deterred from future crimes or simply moves on to more serious offenses may be determined by what happens in these first contacts he has with the law enforcement system.

It is clear that from a crime prevention standpoint these first contacts are unsatisfactory as things now stand. To see just how unsatisfactory they are, one need only look to the rate of recidivism for adolescent criminals. The District of Columbia Crime Commission reported, for example, that more than 50 percent of the convicted adult offenders in Washington in 1965 had records as juvenile offenders.

There is much that we can and must do to improve our juvenile court systems. We should wipe out the arbitrariness that produces unsupervised dismissals of charges by arresting officers, special youth division police officer, and by the social service divisions of the juvenile courts. We should ensure that the juvenile offender who is not brought to trial because his act was not serious enough to warrant judicial proceedings does not simply return to the same environment under the same circumstances. If we do not wish to see this adolescent emerge again as the violator of a more basic norm of conduct, then we must establish a full range of remedial services to which he can be referred after running afoul of the law for the first time. Further, we need to eliminate the delays in adjudication which in cities like Washington may be for as long as six months and which can only convince the youth that we are not really concerned about his offense. As Court of Appeals Judge E. Barrett Prettyman notes, "If you bring a child into court six months after he committed the offense . . . you might as well not bring him there." Finally, we must end the unfairness that marks the juvenile proceedings in all too many of our states. Rules that deny to the adolescent his right to be represented by counsel, or to appeal, or

to the privilege against self-incrimination, or to know the exact facts supporting the allegation of delinquency, should be changed. Such violations of fundamental fairness—whatever their "advantages" in flexibility—do not teach young people that the game is worth playing by the rules.

IV. IMPROVING THE PROBATION AND INCARCERATION PROCESSES

We have now brought the defendant through arrest, trial, and conviction, and have seen what might be done to improve these processes so as to serve the end of preventing crime. But what of the processes that follow conviction? In brief, our efforts to rehabilitate convicted criminals, particularly young people, and reintegrate them into the community, have been deficient. The result has been a rate of recidivism that is inexcusably high.

We know only too well that urban crime is not distributed evenly by social and economic class. The offenders themselves are normally the poor and the alienated; they are the young people we have failed to integrate into American life. The possibility that a boy from the poorest area of a city will turn to crime is something like twenty times the chance that a boy from wealthy circumstances will do so.

A recent study in Atlanta revealed that over 57% of the city's juvenile delinquents came from the lowest income group, comprising only 24% of the population.

We know that crime is associated with lack of jobs and lack of skills. The number of totally unskilled laborers in the prison population is almost three times the national average. Over 75% of the men in federal prisons lacked steady employment during the two years before they went to jail. Over 85% of them have no savings. As Daniel Glaser notes in his classic work on prisons: "Regular work during imprisonment for even as little as one year, would be the longest and most continuous employment experience that most prisoners, and especially the younger prisoners, have ever had."

We know that crime is associated with lack of education. For example, the Atlanta study found that the typical boy sent to a state training school was 3.4 years behind his contemporaries in basic skills like reading and writing, and that almost 40% of those appearing in juvenile courts were 5 years behind the average youngster. In the age group from 25 to 34, 23% of the American public has attended at least one year of college and over 57% have graduated from high school. Less than 5% of those in prison have had any college training and only 17%—less than 1/3 the national average—have finished high school. Although possessing normal intelligence, the average federal prisoner has the knowledge equivalent to that of a fifth grader. Various studies reveal that between 10 and 30% of all federal prisoners must be classified as functional illiterates.

But despite all this knowledge, we have done very little to offer education opportunities and meaningful job training to convicted criminals or to help probationers and releasees from prison achieve gainful employment.

We should now undertake to modernize our sentencing and incarceration processes. What are some of the specific reforms that should be introduced?

A. Probation

We must make new efforts to expand and improve our use of probation. At present, only about one-third of those convicted of felonies in this country are placed on probation, although experts tell us that this figure could be doubled without endangering the safety of the community. In 11 states no probation services at all exist for persons convicted of misdemeanors. In the rest of the states such services exist on a spotty basis at best. And, in over 20 percent

of the nation's counties, probation services for juvenile offenders are either non-existent or fragmentary.

Several advantages would accrue from increasing the use of probation. For one, it would reduce the expense of dealing with convicted criminals. The average cost of maintaining a man on probation is anywhere from one-third to one-tenth the cost of imprisoning him. It would also alleviate the overcrowding of prison facilities and make it possible for those who are in prison to receive more adequate care and treatment. And probation, by keeping a young man out of prison, can keep the casual offender from being turned into a hardened criminal. Most significantly, probation, if properly administered, can serve as society's first step in reclaiming the young law breaker. With supervision, help, and encouragement, the probationer can return to school or find employment. He can grow to understand the causes of his previous behavior and learn to work out his problems without resorting again to crime. He can, in short, become a useful citizen.

But unfortunately, we have never done what was necessary to ensure that probation would mean positive rehabilitation.

To begin with, we have failed to provide adequate supervision for probationers. At a minimum, an efficiently run service requires one officer to every 50 probationers. Rarely has any jurisdiction in this nation approached that ratio.

Currently, a probation officer's usual caseload ranges from 100 to 200 men. Even within the federal system, the ratio of officers to probationers averages one to 75. In Washington, D.C., a juvenile court probation officer handles an average of 92 cases. At best he sees his charges once every two or three weeks for 10 to 15 minutes.

We have also failed to ensure that our probation personnel have the training and the understanding to handle their complex functions.

Worst of all, we have made little effort to link the probation officer with the rest of the community. The rehabilitation of released offenders cannot succeed unless probation officers have close working contacts with schools, job training programs, and public and private employment services. Federally financed job training programs have been as deficient as any others in this respect.

The availability of probation has been too sharply restricted as well. Many states place absolute bans on probation where the offender has a previous record of conviction or imprisonment. Often the list of crimes for which probation is unavailable encompasses virtually the entire range of urban crime. And in cases where probation is granted, our courts have often attached excessive and degrading conditions that neither relate to the treatment of the probationer nor to the protection of the public. For example, many states require the posting of a property or surety bond—a condition that makes supervised release impossible for the youthful offender who may most deserve and need it. Further, it is all too common for judges to condition probation on a prior period of detention in a county jail. Such a prerequisite serves only to provide the convicted offender with a taste of the incarceration that he has already been found not to require. As one commentator has noted, "If a man is . . . a good risk for probation at the expiration of a county jail sentence, he is an even better risk without such a sentence."

Finally, many courts, as a matter of course, prohibit probationers from driving cars, changing jobs, entering establishments that sell intoxicating liquor, or seeing old friends who have been in trouble with the law. Often these prohibitions are not essential to the rehabilitation of the offender. They serve only to make him feel totally estranged

from his community. The more he tries to fit into his surroundings, the more likely he is to violate the conditions of release and have his privileged status revoked.

The use of probation and supervised release as an alternative to jail sentences is an essential ingredient in any law enforcement system striving to rehabilitate and reintegrate criminal offenders back into the community. We must therefore increase our commitment to it and seek to reduce the disparities and restrictions in its use. For example, the Federal District Court in the Eastern District of Michigan has established a Sentencing Council where all members of the court meet with members of the probation department and exchange views on pending sentences. The judges of the Eastern District of New York do the same thing in three-judge panels. Through these efforts, greater uniformity in sentencing has been achieved and the use of prison terms has been considerably diminished. This same innovation could well be introduced in other federal courts and in state court systems, particularly those courts which sit within the boundaries of large cities.

But if we do increase the use of probation, we must also take the necessary steps to guarantee its success in a higher percentage of individual cases. We must make sure that our probation services work, or the net result of increasing the use of probation will be that we turn more people loose to commit more crimes. Thus, more and better trained personnel will be required at all levels—federal, state, and local. Efforts to link probation services with school systems, job training programs, and employment agencies must be undertaken. If the financial burdens are too great for local government, then the federal government must contribute toward the cost. To stint in applying our resources in the field of probation is to rob many of our young people of the chance for a decent and significant life.

B. Local jail conditions

We must also change the appalling conditions that exist in the more than 3,000 county and nearly 10,000 town jails in this country. Over one million people are held in these institutions for some period of time each year. At any particular time, a typical jail population is composed of pre-trial detainees who could not meet or were ineligible for bail, probationers serving their prescribed incarceration periods, and convicted petty offenders. Some of these people are innocent of any crime; others are hardened or habitual offenders. Some are physically or mentally ill; others are degenerates.

Most significantly, many of these prisoners are young. In 1965, approximately 100,000 children under the age of 18 spent some period of time in jails. In many jurisdictions, the age, physical condition, and past criminal behavior of the detainees make no difference; all are thrown together in the same cells.

Many of these jails are in deplorable condition. More than 40 percent of them were built before 1920. Most of them are outmoded. They are dirty, overcrowded, and devoid of adequate facilities. Training and educational programs are virtually nonexistent. Barely 5 percent of their personnel devote their time to treatment and training.

We must come to realize how inverted we have allowed the entire incarceration process to become. The worst felon who goes to prison at least receives some minimal care and attention. It is the suspect and the petty offender who are thrown into decaying and demeaning local jail cells.

Through the use of release on recognition, fines, suspended sentences, and probation, we must pare down the jail population. Children must never be detained in jails, and young adults—especially those who have committed minor offenses or are only criminal suspects—should be kept apart from the

more hardened inmates. We must make every effort to separate out the sexual pervert, the physically ill, and the mentally deficient and provide them with specialized treatment. For those who must remain in jail for some period of time we must provide short-term vocational opportunities and learning experiences. If our cities and towns cannot bear the immediate expense of remodeling and enlarging their incarceration facilities, then state and federal funds should be made available. Grants combined with long-term loans and subsidies for hiring trained personnel could do a great deal toward relieving our jail problem. Perhaps VISTA volunteers and members of the Teacher Corps could be utilized to run vocational and educational programs.

Regardless of the methods we employ to improve jail conditions, the important consideration is that we do improve them. Even if we ignore the humanitarian and philosophical reasons for instituting these changes, let us, at least, not ignore the pragmatic one, for jails as they presently exist are too often nothing more than subsidized schools for crime.

C. Prison reform

To improve the incarceration process, this nation must reform not only its jails, but its prisons as well. Our prison population presently is comprised of 211,000 men and women, almost all of whom will be released some time. If our present recidivism rate continues, then at least one out of three of these people will be convicted again and be returned to prison. Still others will violate parole and find themselves back in prison. A significant proportion of this recurrent pattern of crime could be prevented if our prison system did a better job of preparing its inmates to lead productive and useful lives.

To begin with, we need better-trained staffs in prisons and juvenile detention facilities. In the entire nation, our adult correctional institutions are served by a total of only 50 full-time psychiatrists and 100 psychologists. The ratio of teachers and vocational instructors to inmates is about one to 400 and, as the study for the District of Columbia reveals, these same disturbing figures appear again when we turn to the institutions in which juveniles are incarcerated. Less than 8 percent of those employed in the field of corrections have received any professional education.

Poor pay convinces most correctional employees to change to other jobs. As a consequence, most prisons face a yearly turnover of up to half of their personnel.

And what of the institutions that these men run? Many have inferior facilities; others are simply overcrowded. Severe physical punishment is too often the prescribed way to cope with recalcitrant prisoners. Just this summer, a federal court proceeding in California brought to light the existence of a "strip cell" in Soledad, the state's new "model" medium security correctional facility. To those who followed the case, it was shocking to read that, in a progressive state like California, men could be placed in cells encrusted with excrement that had no furnishings, no running water, no flush toilets, no heat, no ventilation—cells where men might remain for days or weeks without a shower and with only two cups of water a day.

But then it is almost as shocking to find that in our federal prisons only about 50 percent of the inmates are receiving some vocational training, and that less than 10 percent of the men are learning skills.

As for actual employment in federal prison industries, less than 25 percent of the men are employed daily. Their wages average only \$40 monthly and range as low as \$10—a sum which is high compared to some states where prisoners earn only 4 cents a day. In every state, statutes passed during the depression strictly limit the goods that pris-

oners can produce to those used by the government and to certain agricultural tools and supplies.

Most of the work done by prisoners takes little skill and rarely do inmates receive training that will help them upon release. Initial studies of released federal convicts reveal that of those who find jobs, only 17 percent have employment related to their work in prison.

In 1965, Congress passed a Rehabilitation Study Act to make possible a three-year examination of the methods for attacking the shortage of qualified manpower in correctional rehabilitation. The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance has already appropriated some \$600,000 for correctional projects. The Manpower Development Training Act now authorizes the establishment of demonstration job training programs in our prisons. These acts are a beginning, but that is all. We must now make a commitment great enough to ensure that no person emerges from a state or federal prison without the educational and vocational training needed to obtain a decent job and support himself and his family.

In reaching this goal, our state and private universities can be of great assistance. At present, few of them have made any attempt either to train correctional personnel or place their own students in internship programs at prisons. A study done by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency shows that of some 149 universities offering programs related to crime, only ten were placing any of their students in correctional institutions, and that less than 10 percent were training any prison personnel. Out of a random sample of 362 universities not offering a course of study on problems of criminology, only 9 percent said they were considering some new program on either corrections or law enforcement. The only encouraging sign was that 31 of the 50 responding Graduate Schools of Social Work had placed at least a few of their students in our prisons as guidance counselors.

The ties between our universities and our prisons must be broadened. What better way exists for young teachers and doctors and engineers, for social workers and criminologists and attorneys to learn about the problems of the poor and to test their skills, than by working in the prisons? And why should not industry and labor pool their talents to set up various facilities in all of our prisons—facilities where inmates can receive not only specialized training but earn decent wages and a guarantee that satisfactory performance will mean a job upon release? I believe it would be very helpful if a blue-ribbon Presidential Task Force composed of leading educators, industrial managers, and union representatives could study the status of prison vocational training and then outline a national program which, through combined private and public efforts, could be put into effect. It would also be useful if an appointed study group could examine not only the feasibility of increased family contacts through conjugal visitations both off and on the prison grounds, but also the ways for balancing more evenly the needs for prison order and individual fulfillment. In short, the possibilities for improving our incarceration facilities are virtually unlimited. With creative thinking and imaginative planning, we can turn our correctional institutions into training schools from which productive and useful citizens will emerge.

D. The post-incarceration process

We must drastically change our faulty handling of the post-incarceration process. The task of rehabilitating the offender—in particular the youthful offender—only begins when he leaves prison. The parolee or the convict who has fully served his sentence needs assistance if he is to adjust

successfully to society. At present, too little of this assistance is available.

We have known about work-release programs—programs in which pre-release convicts hold jobs outside the prison during the day and return to it at night—since the turn of the century. The five states that have instituted work-release programs have had great success with them. The same is true for the recently begun federal program which now has some 475 prisoners participating in it. Not only does work-release re-acustom convicts to dealing with society, but it helps men to support their families and to build up savings. Nevertheless, most jurisdictions are as unwilling now as they were 50 years ago to undertake such programs.

We know how necessary pre-release orientation is. Still, we have made little progress in putting such orientation plans into effect.

We know that pre-release centers and half-way houses are not only relatively inexpensive but extremely useful in helping the adolescent or the adult offender make the difficult transition from a completely supervised to a relatively unregulated existence. But only five states run any half-way homes and within the federal system little effort has been made to expand the system of pre-release centers for youthful offenders which we established while I was Attorney General.

This startling gap between knowledge and the implementation of knowledge appears in virtually every phase of the post-incarceration process. We know that upon his release, the ex-convict needs funds to purchase food and clothing and shelter. But where will he get these funds? He has little savings because he has earned relatively little while in prison. Gratuities from the state normally consist of a suit of clothes, a train ticket, and perhaps \$10 to \$20 in cash. In all but ten states, public loans are unavailable, and even in the ten, the sums obtainable are extremely small.

We know that it is important for the ex-convict to find steady employment paying decent wages as soon after his release as possible. Yet large-scale state employment services to assist him are non-existent. A majority of those who obtain work beginning immediately after prison do so with private and not public assistance. And meaningful jobs at decent pay are hard to find. Most wages barely reach the subsistence level. The average federal offender earns less than \$200 a month during the period immediately following his release. Only 25 percent of all federal releases work even 80 percent of the time during their first months out of prison, and only 40 percent obtain this much work within the first three months. During this same period, nearly 20 percent of the releases have found no work at all.

Everywhere he turns, the young ex-convict finds that the government which has urged him to pursue a normal, law-abiding life is the same government that bars the way to that pursuit. In some states, licensing requirements may prevent the releasee from becoming a barber or an embalmer—to mention only a few of the existing prohibitions. By reason of various state statutes, certain manufacturers cannot employ convicted felons. Other businessmen will not employ them because the state has taken no action to help the ex-convict obtain an employment bond. Public employment remains virtually closed to the releasee. He cannot even qualify for unemployment insurance because he has not earned a sufficient amount of money during the preceding year. And all of this takes no account of the natural barriers that stand in the ex-convict's way because he has had little opportunity for education or job training while he was in prison.

Under these circumstances, the ex-convict must normally turn to friends or to family for assistance. If he is rejected by them, then his next step is a welfare mission on

skid row. At any point along the way it may simply be easier for him to return to crime.

This nightmarish world must be changed if we are to prevent the large-scale recurrence of crime. We can and we must make the road of the released prisoner an easier one to travel. I believe it is time for the federal government and the states to undertake a partnership to establish a system of work-release programs and pre-release centers and half-way houses of meaningful scope. I believe, too, that government agencies should begin studying the possibility of encouraging firms which contract with the government to hire some qualified ex-convicts. At the same time, I suggest that government must lower its own employment barriers. Four months ago, the United States Civil Service Commission eradicated the requirement that an applicant for federal employment state whether he had ever been arrested. This is a step in the right direction, but the applicant may still be ineligible for employment if he has ever been convicted of an offense after he reached the age of 21. Not all employment within the federal system requires security clearance, and ex-convicts must not be arbitrarily excluded from jobs for which they qualify. We must also expand the demonstration bonding programs now being run by the Department of Labor. Similarly, it would seem a relatively simple task to amend our unemployment laws and establish public loan funds to help the ex-convict make the transition back to the world of freedom. In short, we can no longer afford to spend over \$2,000 a year to incarcerate each convicted criminal and then terminate our expenditure the moment he is released. A penny-wise and pound-foolish post-incarceration process inevitably produces the recidivism that we loudly denounce but quietly refuse to prevent.

V. CONCLUSION

All of these matters are vital to any effort aimed at reducing this nation's high rate of crime. And the salient point is that we must start now. If we do not help our police, unclog our courts, and reform our incarceration process, we can expect even worse problems than we now face.

Yet, even as we undertake the specific tasks of reform, we must understand that there is more to discouraging crime and apprehending criminals than improving law enforcement or even providing that all of our young people are adequately educated and can obtain jobs.

There is the matter of the spirit—of public attitudes, of our values, and our support for law enforcement.

Crime is not just in the streets. It is in the suburbs too. It is in white-collar offices and business. And it is organized.

Too often there is a tendency to dismiss tax evasion or stock fraud as unimportant, or as the miscalculation of one who was not clever enough to stay within the law. But the public attitudes which condone fixing—of prices or of traffic tickets—are attitudes which undermine respect for law throughout the society.

Crime in the streets is directly related to these attitudes, and especially to public apathy about organized crime. The young man in the ghetto who decides to steal rather than make that extra effort to find work is unquestionably influenced by the success which the numbers runner down the block has had. The bookmaker or the narcotics pusher is all too often the only conspicuous figure of success in the ghetto, the one who has demonstrated how to beat the system and gain wealth and prominence. Similarly, the worker who belongs to a corrupt union, or the businessman who must pay protection to keep his business or his life, are taught every day—as are their children—that our legal system has nothing to offer them. As

long as the public cares too little about the racketeers who control the gambling and the narcotics and the prostitution that feed upon the poor and the weak, there will be youngsters who see the gangster's way as the model, the path to follow.

Anomalies of public attitude also impede the course of legislation which would aid in reducing crime.

For example, where is the public outcry for more effective gun laws? Every year, thousands of Americans are killed by firearms—5,634 in 1965 alone. During the last six years, 278 law enforcement officers have been killed by criminals—and of these 96 percent died because of wounds from firearms. Of the weapons-users responsible for these deaths, 66 percent had been convicted of crimes before acquiring the murder weapon. Each year over one million inexpensive mail order weapons pass unchecked across state lines. Many of these guns go to juveniles, individuals with criminal records, and emotionally unstable persons. How many mass murders by firearms will the public need before it demands stronger national and local legislation to control their sale and possession.

The field of narcotics is another example. It is only in recent years that we have been able to gain public recognition that the addict should not be punished in the same way as the wholesale pusher, that addiction is a medical problem and should be treated as such. Even so, the 1966 federal legislation authorizing civil commitment of addicts accused of crime is so saddled with limitations as to be unavailable to those who might profit most from medical care. As long as we just run addicts through our prisons and back out onto the street, we cannot hope to have much impact on the rate of crime associated with the necessity of stealing enough money to buy drugs. The broadening of the medical treatment aspects of last year's legislation should be high on our list of priorities.

Still another example relates to car theft. The public approves, it appears, of heavy penalties against car theft, without realizing that literally thousands of such thefts every year are by teenagers whose motive is no worse than wanting to take their girl for a ride. It would be better if we concentrated our efforts on making it more difficult to take the car—on developing jump-proof ignitions and enacting legislation to punish the manufacture for mailing of master ignition keys.

Finally, public attitudes impede the course of law enforcement. Incidents like the slaying of Kitty Genovese, which occur, tragically, in one form or another almost daily attest to the public's lack of support of the police—in the last analysis, of an almost complete breaking of the bonds of community. In the end, we can never demand very much from our law enforcement system if we cannot cooperate with it and with our brothers in society.

Tom Paine once boasted that America had a message to tell the world and that message was that we stood as a nation "where the law is king." The task today, tomorrow, and of the years to come, is to transform this statement into reality.

WELCH, W. VA., MEETS ADM. DAVID McDONALD

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was instrumental in arranging for Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy, to visit Welch, W. Va., to address the Veterans' Day conclave there on November 11 of last year.

I was greatly impressed by Admiral McDonald's remarks and his depth of understanding of the economic and industrial facts regarding the State of

West Virginia. I already knew of his personal stature as a military leader, but I witnessed a very pleasant and happy establishment of rapport between Admiral McDonald and the people of the Mountain State who were present for the Veterans' Day activities at Welch. I am pleased to have been instrumental in having Admiral McDonald's views presented to my fellow citizens, and I ask that the Admiral's December 1, 1966, letter and November 11 remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
December 1, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am very privileged and honored that you should wish to insert my Welch speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I am pleased to furnish the copy you requested.

Although I very much appreciate your kind remarks, as well as those I have received from many citizens of Welch and McDowell County, they really are superfluous, because nothing I contributed can possibly match my own enjoyment of the day I spent in Welch. I shall never forget the warmth and contagious enthusiasm of the people of that small town and county in their celebration of our national holiday. Their pride and patriotism have given me refreshed faith in the true strength of the American people and a deep reassurance that those things which made our nation great endure in the hearts of its citizens.

It was a privilege—a very heartfelt privilege—to share that day with them, and with you. Both Mrs. McDonald and I thank you for the opportunity which made that possible for us.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. McDONALD.

REMARKS BY ADM. DAVID L. McDONALD, USN,
CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS ON VETERANS' DAY AT WELCH, W. VA.—NOVEMBER 11, 1966
Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am delighted to have this opportunity to visit West Virginia and particularly to come to Welch. Some might wonder why the Chief of Naval Operations comes to an area which is so far from the sea to talk about the Navy. First of all, I came because I was invited by your good friend and mine—Senator Robert C. Byrd, second, your celebration is a demonstration of patriotism rarely, if ever, surpassed anywhere; and finally the mere fact that you are an inland area in no way indicates what I know is your interest in our country's Navy.

Your state and the products of your state have a very close association with the Navy. For instance, today there are more than 8,000 West Virginians in our Navy; you have provided us with 23 Admirals—three of which are still on active duty. Furthermore, eight West Virginians have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor while serving on active duty in the naval establishment—four in the Navy and four in the Marine Corps.

And I wonder if you realize that even though West Virginia produces only about 40 per cent of the coal mined in the United States, you provide between 80 and 90 per cent of all the coal which our country exports, with almost all of it travelling by sea. And, of course, McDowell County is West Virginia's top coal producing area. As a matter of fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in West Virginia estimates that the present annual export value of West Virginia products is more than \$350,000,000, and again I say almost all of this travels through the

medium which your Navy is charged with protecting; namely, the free oceans of the world.

Today, I think it most appropriate for an active duty military man—talking on Veterans' Day—to talk about South Vietnam; an operation which is increasing the population of U.S. veterans. Although all of us wish that conflict was not necessary, we believe that what we are doing in Vietnam simply must be done, and I know that you share my pride in those young men who are today devoting their lives to their country in combat. I can assure you, you would be even prouder if you were able to see them and see the job they are doing.

I returned from Vietnam just day before yesterday. While I was out there I placed decorations for valor and purple hearts for combat inflicted injuries upon the breasts of 17 Servicemen. I was reminded then how unfortunate it is that with all of the progress which has been made in this world, men haven't yet learned to live at peace with each other. On the other hand as I presented these decorations it was a source of comfort and pride to realize that our young men of this generation are demonstrating the same courage which their forefathers exhibited in making our country what it is today. I talked to large numbers of both officers and enlisted personnel. The general impression that I got was that they felt that they were engaged in a most worth-while effort, and they were doing their very best to discharge their responsibilities to the maximum of their capabilities. As a matter of fact, I talked to many individuals who live not far from here. Among those with whom I talked was Chief Storekeeper John Megelech from Bluefield, and James L. Skeens from Princeton—both of whom are serving on the aircraft carrier Coral Sea. Not far away, and steaming in that same South China Sea aboard the aircraft carrier Constellation, I talked to Jerry Mosley, who is from Glen Rogers; to Richard Blankenship, who is a Third Class Boatswain's Mate from Panther, West Virginia; Kenneth Browning from Justice; William A. Kidd from Huntington, and a young man named Whittington from Nitro. Upon leaving SVN and prior to coming back to Washington, I visited one of the Navy's most important bases in the Far East, and that is the one located at Subic Bay in the Philippines. That entire complex is today under the command of Rear Admiral Gilkeson, who was appointed to the Naval Academy at Annapolis from Bluefield, and from that same Bluefield, I also talked with Lieutenant H. S. Tyree, Jr., who today is flying Navy multi-engine patrol planes throughout the Southeast Asian area in connection with our combat operations in South Vietnam. All of these men are busily engaged in our overall effort to insure that the South Vietnamese can have the kind of government they themselves want.

Now I would like to outline for you some of the U.S. Navy's participation in Vietnam today. In doing that, I think I should begin by pointing out that our participation really started when the Navy was the first to carry out the two initial decisions that involved U.S. Forces in actual combat; that is, the bombing of North Vietnam and the landing of combat forces in South Vietnam.

I wonder how many people realize that, when the decision was made to launch air strikes against North Vietnam in retaliation for attacks on our ships and barracks, those strikes were flown by Navy airplanes from the decks of Navy aircraft carriers. Why was that? Well, it was for a number of reasons. It was because the carriers were *there*. It was because they were *ready*. And here is a very important point—since those ships were really U.S. sovereign territory operating on the free high seas, they could be used at the order of our President, at any time, in any manner he chose, without involving such things as base rights in another country.

For similar reasons—the first U.S. combat forces sent into South Vietnam were the United States Marines. Within a very short time after the decision was made to commit our troops, more than 20,000 Marines were landed in full combat strength from Navy amphibious ships under the cover of the guns and airplanes of the Navy's Seventh Fleet. And although no opposition was encountered at that time, it was reassuring to know that the Navy-Marine Corps team could have put those men successfully ashore in the face of any conceivable opposition they could have encountered. I think the Viet Cong knew that, and I think they were smart enough not to even try to oppose them.

From those beginnings, the Navy's participation in Vietnam has expanded considerably.

For example, when the war started, we had three aircraft carriers in the Western Pacific, but as the need for air strikes grew faster than air bases could be built, we rapidly committed four, and then five aircraft carriers. We are still keeping five attack aircraft carriers in the Western Pacific, with three in continuous combat operations. From these carriers approximately 50 per cent of all the air strikes into North Vietnam are being launched.

There is another part connected with the air war in Vietnam that I want to mention to you, and that is the rescue force stationed just off North Vietnam in the Tonkin Gulf. As of yesterday, Navy ships and helicopters—together with Air Force amphibious planes—had rescued a total of 228 U.S. pilots and aircrewmembers from the waters of that Gulf. Of course, a number of others have been rescued from the territory of North Vietnam itself. That is really a *fantastic* accomplishment—one that is terribly important to all our pilots and their families, and to the nation itself, since each trained pilot represents about a half-million dollar investment that is almost irreplaceable today.

Those are some of the highlights of the Navy's participation in the air war in Vietnam, but of course, they are only a fraction of our overall efforts out there. For instance, the carriers belong to and are supported by the entire Seventh Fleet, which consists of about 140 ships and 70,000 men. Not all of them are in action at once, of course, but dozens of the Seventh Fleet ships are on station every day from almost as far north as Haiphong, in North Vietnam, all the way down around the tip of South Vietnam and into the Gulf of Siam.

One of the most direct contributions those ships make to the war in South Vietnam is gunfire support. This may be in direct support of troops—including the U.S. Marines and Army, the South Vietnamese, the Koreans, or the Australians—or it may be in the destruction of Viet Cong camps and supplies—but every single day, ships of the Seventh Fleet fire more than 1000 rounds of shore bombardment. That firepower is something the Viet Cong have really come to respect.

The Navy also has a substantial commitment within South Vietnam itself and in the waters just off shore. In fact, there are more than 22,000 Navy men actually stationed in South Vietnam today. About 3000 of them are the doctors, dentists, chaplains and hospital corpsmen serving with the Marines. In addition, about 6000 Navy construction men—we call them Seabees—are building airfields and base facilities in various areas.

The other 13,000 personnel are spread among many different commands and activities, but there are two particular Navy efforts in South Vietnam that I want to mention. One is an operation we are conducting with the Vietnamese Navy to prevent the Viet Cong from receiving any reinforcements or supplies from the sea. Now that might not sound like a very big job, but let's look at a similar problem we had here at home one

time. We called it "Prohibition." The coastline of South Vietnam is just about the same length as the coastline of the United States between Boston and Cape Kennedy, and the U.S. Coast Guard once had the job of cutting off all liquor traffic in that area. The force they needed grew until it included: 25 destroyers; 16 cutters; 226 patrol boats; nine major shore bases; five floating bases; and 240 beach patrol stations with 3840 men.

In World War II, the anti-spy network along that same coastline included the same weight of effort, plus 1353 dogs, 2415 horses, and 13,151 men—and every mile was in friendly hands!

Compare that with South Vietnam, where we are dealing with 40 to 50,000 junks along a coastline that is held by the enemy in many places. It was—and still is—a major effort to patrol it effectively. However, our force—which now includes everything from motorized junks up to destroyers and patrol aircraft—is continuously sweeping the area from the shore out to 40 miles at sea, and there is evidence to indicate that the Viet Cong are no longer receiving any appreciable amount of men or material by sea. Another effort in SVN is our endeavor to interrupt the Viet Cong logistic and taxation practices in which they engage along the river water ways. This is a difficult and hazardous undertaking but I believe that it will soon be paying off.

There is another aspect about the sea and the war in Vietnam that should never be forgotten. It is not a strictly Navy operation, but it is a Navy responsibility, and it is *very* important. I am talking about sea-lift—the unrewarding, backbreaking, frustrating, and often dull task of getting the equipment and supplies to the fighting men of the United States and her allies *wherever* they may be fighting. Because, ladies and gentlemen, if we cannot do that, we can no longer fight anywhere in the world except on this North American continent. That is a very simple, very fundamental fact, but too few people appreciate it.

Maybe one reason is that so many advances have been made in aviation that somehow ships don't seem so important anymore. Well, aviation *has* made advances—tremendous advances—in the past 20 years, and there are more coming. I should know because I first soloed an airplane in 1929 and I've been either in or around aviation ever since. But even in this air age, 98 per cent of all the material going to Vietnam still goes by sea. This includes *all* the heavy equipment, *all* the food, *most* *all* the ammunition, *all* the construction materials, and *all* the fuel—including the aviation fuel necessary to fly the transport planes back home after they reach Vietnam. Right now, ships owned or chartered by the Military Sea Transportation Service are landing more than 900,000 tons of dry cargo in South Vietnam every month. That's dry cargo alone; it doesn't include any fuels; and to do that, the number of ships carrying cargo to Vietnam has increased from 60 to 393 in the last 18 months. We in the Navy must not only provide the means of delivering this cargo, but—even more important—we must also have the means of making certain that these ocean lifelines are never closed to the United States.

These things which I have related are, I think, the highlights of the Navy's participation in the war in Vietnam. But someday that war is going to end; and after Vietnam what? I don't propose to have all the answers as to what might happen when the Vietnam operation has been successfully concluded, but I do have some definite ideas as to the role or roles which the Navy can continue to play even after Vietnam.

I am certain that our nuclear powered, ballistic missile carrying Polaris submarines will continue to be a most important asset in our country's nuclear deterrent arsenal. Their great survivability will always make

them uniquely valuable. I also believe that in the future, we will probably continue to have situations like those which have arisen in the last 15 years at Suez, the Tachen Islands, Lebanon, the Cuban affair, and the recent problem in the Dominican Republic. Therefore, I see no reason why the Navy shouldn't play just as important a role in these situations in the future as it has in the past. And, if perchance we should have problems with respect to obtaining base rights on foreign soil or overflights of other countries, the striking forces of the Navy with their mobile air power will be more important still because—after all—a ship is United States sovereign territory and its free movement upon the high seas, together with its built-in self-sufficiency, makes it a most vital weapons system in the hands of our President.

The foregoing items which I have projected into the future are really no more nor less than what we have experienced in the past. There is, however, one thing the future might hold for us with which we haven't been too concerned in the past. With the advancement of the ocean sciences and deep ocean exploration, we may well run into a new problem in the area of national sovereignty with respect to those areas of the seabed which we have been able to develop. Today, each country has sovereignty over the bottom of the ocean out to the edge of the continental shelf. But as our explorations go deeper and deeper we might consider who will exercise sovereignty over these ocean depths. Will a nation which has sovereign rights over a particular portion of what is now the free oceans' seabed control the waters above that seabed the way a nation now controls the airspace above the sovereign land mass? If so, will the sea continue to be free? When the time comes for such problems to be settled at the international conference table, we must make certain that we have the power to make our voices heard and, perhaps more importantly, we must make certain that we have the power—the seapower—to enforce any agreements which may be reached in such matters.

I hope that all of us will never forget that our way of life depends—among other things—upon our country's ability to both export and import, and that almost all of the things which are exported and imported travel by sea, and that in order to ensure that these ocean highways remain available to us—both in peace and war—an adequate Navy is most essential.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SENATE RULES—AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII, RELATING TO CLOTURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the pending business.

The Senate resumed consideration of the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 6), amending the Standing Rules of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT AND VOTE ON CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of the fact that a William Randolph Hearst dinner for youth will be held tomorrow at midday, and because

two students from each State will be present there, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, that there be a period for the transaction of routine business from 12 o'clock noon to 12:30 p.m. tomorrow, and that the vote on the cloture motion now at the desk take place 1 hour thereafter, or at 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that order will take care of the dinner and the vote. While I dislike very much to set a precedent relative to abrogation of the rules as set down in the book, I feel, after discussion with certain interested Senators, that this is the best way in which to handle the situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow, the time be equally divided between the majority and the minority leaders, or whomever they may designate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the Senator discussed this matter with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] and with other Senators?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not, but I have discussed it with the minority leader, and we thought that an equal division of the time was quite fair. It has been done before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the conclusion of that time limitation, at 1:30 p.m., the vote will take place on the cloture motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a prior order to that effect.

THE COMPETENT CITY: AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR URBAN AMERICA

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a number of bills dealing with urban affairs, which I shall discuss this afternoon.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee held 6 weeks of hearings last year on the Federal role in urban affairs. We heard the testimony of 75 witnesses—Federal and local government officials, representatives of industry, labor, finance, universities, foundations, private organizations, and the ranks of the citizens themselves.

Our inquiry was wide ranging. We proceeded from the premise that the appropriate organization of the Federal Government's efforts—and therefore the direction of our national efforts—to solve the continuing problems of American cities should be determined by examining the nature of the problems themselves.

Our witnesses described urban America. We examined both sides of the urban coin. On one side we found the highest standard of living known to man, a strong and growing economy, high wages, and record employment.

The other side of the urban coin is etched with the acid of despair. There

is an urban America seething with discontent, erupting in violence, rotting at the core of its cities, bound with the chains of problems too long unsolved and too massive to be ignored.

Witnesses recited a long series of statistics, calculated to demonstrate the magnitude of the crisis—but so familiar that we have become immune to their significance.

We heard from witnesses, too, who live with—and are—the statistics. They described the hopelessness that comes from cycle after cycle of frustration and despair—from dangling on the cliff between unemployment and underemployment. Their children attend schools described by educators as custodial—not educational—institutions. And they spend a far greater proportion of their meager incomes than the rest of us on the basic necessities—food, shelter, and clothing.

Sixteen million poor live in our metropolitan areas—10 million in the central cities of America. Another 26 million live in the shadowland of deprivation—with incomes above the minimum poverty level, but below what most authorities define as "adequate" means.

But it would be a tragic mistake to regard our poor and near-poor as basically different from the rest of us—with different hopes and different dreams. Like all Americans, they want a decent job and a home in a decent environment. The urban poor want to participate in the American free enterprise system. This system has worked for most Americans—now we must make it work for all.

The crisis in the American city is a crisis of doubt—doubt that the promise of America can be kept. It is the danger that exists when a legitimate hope is frustrated and aspirations destroyed. For when men cannot accomplish their goals in acceptable ways, they resort to shortcuts—and far too often, violence is the shortcut chosen.

Violence is self-defeating. It cannot result in true progress. But one of the tragic lessons of last summer's riots was that violence—the last alternative—often accomplished short-term results where reasoned approaches and orderly protest failed. Riots seemed to produce results—from sprinklers on fire hydrants to increase job opportunities.

Law and order must be maintained. But punishment alone is no answer. Orderly cities cannot be based on the passive order of a citizenry bowed into submission. They must be built on the order of a democracy working together for the common good.

Trucks, tanks, troops, and guns can restrain violence. But only citizens can maintain democracy—citizens with the self-respect that comes from participation in the society and the recognition of the rewards of initiative. Citizens denied the chance to achieve self-respect—economic, social, and moral—are denied fundamental justice.

How, then, shall we attain this justice? Not by talk. We have talked a great deal about the problems of our cities. To solve them, we have too often resorted to rhetoric—our most abundant resource.

Nor will we attain our objectives by

continuing on our present course. The temptation to do so is great. We are at war in southeast Asia. We have committed the lives of our men and the material of our industry to the defense of a nation thousands of miles away. And when foreign battle threatens, domestic efforts slow. We are tempted, then, to trust to good luck and fortune to muddle through—to keep on doing what we have done, but a little slower and a little less.

I submit that to take that road is to dissipate our resources. It assumes that our domestic programs are fully relevant to the problems of today, that they are properly organized for an effective attack on these problems, and that—if our foreign commitments were reduced—we would achieve automatic success in our cities.

That simply is not the case. For our current approach to solving social problems is programmatic—not systematic—in nature. For 35 years we have acted as if each individual problem in our society—large or small—could be solved by passing a new program. In view of the progress we have made in this Nation, it often is difficult to understand the need for a new approach at the Federal level.

Consider, for example, that since 1935 our gross national product has climbed 843 percent; per capita disposable income—in constant dollars—has increased 125 percent; unemployment has been reduced by seven times to a current rate of 3.7 percent. Examine the profits of corporations, which reached a new level of \$48.2 billion in 1966—an increase of 1,612 percent since the bleak days of 1935.

Our people are both better educated and better employed. As late as 1940, the median education level in America was between the eighth and ninth grade. Today, it is close to a full high school education—a jump from 8.4 years of learning to 11.8 years.

Back in 1930, only 14.2 percent of our labor force was employed in managerial and professional capacities—while 19.8 percent were unskilled laborers. By 1965, the proportion of managerial and professional people in the labor force had risen to nearly 40 percent—and our unskilled labor force had dropped to 11.3 percent.

For more than three decades, and through the administrations of five Presidents, we have educated the young, cured the sick, protected the aged, and promoted industrial growth. And there can be no question that our efforts were crowned with a success beyond the highest dreams of those who worked in the New Deal to found a new concept of government. Yet even the programs of the Great Society represent the end—not the beginning—of an era.

Our society has changed—and so our task has changed. We have moved from a nation staggering in the depths of a great depression to a nation of great affluence—from a society in which the bond between man and neighbor was forged of crying need and common desperation—to a society capable of living in large measure apart from the tragedy of our inner cities.

But we cannot continue to move ahead—to eliminate the slums of Amer-

ica today and build the competent city tomorrow—unless we change our tools and our techniques. For these are the most massive and complex domestic goals this Nation has ever set.

The hearings before the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization demonstrated the magnitude of the task ahead. It is enormous—as large as life itself—for we are speaking of the future life of an urban nation.

The cost of the task has been estimated as \$1 trillion—but that number can cause as much fear as concern. Let us examine that awe-inspiring figure.

One of the best analyses was included in, "Capital Requirements for Urban Development and Renewal," by John W. Dykman and Reginald R. Isaacs. The authors estimate the capital requirements to accomplish the rehabilitation of America's cities at nearly one thousand billion dollars over a 12-year period. They define rehabilitation as:

The total of all public and private actions which must be taken to provide for the continuous sound maintenance and development of urban areas.

Under their assumption, there would be—

safety and comfort in housing, highways, and public places, and availability of full utilities and community facilities, including police, fire and health protection. . . . All slums would be cleared and all existing structures would be replaced, renovated or repaired, and all new structures maintained in standard condition.

It is self-evident that the job is too big to be accomplished by government alone. Dykman and Isaacs believe the ratio of private to public investment should be 7 to 1. In testimony before the subcommittee, David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, stated that five private dollars should be involved to every one governmental dollar.

So let us not think of a trillion dollars of Federal money. Let us rather approach the subject systematically—as a question of assembling capital investment—something we have done in this Nation time and again. In times of war—in the assault on space—in the construction of a supersonic transport—even when we decided to lay rails across the continent, we have taken public actions to generate response by the private sector. So we must take public actions today to aid the cities where most Americans live.

There is no gimmick—no slogan—no simple mechanism called "Comsat" or anything else—that will automatically generate private investment in the rebuilding of our cities. Rather, there is a need for commitment—a commitment of time, money and talent—a commitment sufficient to shape the future. We must make that commitment and take constructive and selective actions to carry it out.

Imagine, for a moment, that all the problems of the cities were contained in a large, heavy, and irregularly shaped rock. We want to move that rock—to get our cities and their problems off dead center. One strategy would be to strike the rock with a massive force. We

could commit \$1 trillion of new Federal money to solving the problems. That would be both unrealistic and inefficient. Another strategy would be to try and move the rock by throwing many smaller stones at it—by continuing our present programs. That would only chip away at the surface.

Obviously, there is a more effective way. We can determine the key pressure points and then move the rock by applying leverage in the right places. We must apply leverage at the pressure points in our cities, so that private investment will multiply the original force of public investment.

Rebuilding our cities is a task of great magnitude—a difficult task which challenges our sense of responsibility as citizens. Assembling capital to build mechanical devices—whether they are trains or spacecraft—is far less complex and formidable a job than assembling the resources necessary to rebuild people's lives.

Since we are dealing with people, since we must understand the forces at work in the city and our society, then we must look at the people, not the houses; at the individual, not the group—at what a man wants, not what someone else tells him he needs.

An age symbolized by the computer and the megalopolis carries with it the threat of a nation of anonymous individuals—a lonely crowd of people without personal identities. Our policies must reflect the conviction that the larger our society becomes, the more we are dutybound to pay attention to its smaller units—the individual and the neighborhood.

The need is for Federal programs flexible enough to allow for local decisions and local control by the citizens who participate in them. We must measure our successes not in terms of conformity, but in terms of concrete impact on the life of the individual.

I have described the Great Society as the successful end of the New Deal, and the beginning of a new era. Fundamentally, the New Deal was a major innovation in the organization of the Federal Government—an innovation in scope and scale. Agencies and departments were reorganized and created to deal with the monumental problems of the depression.

Those problems are in large part solved. Now we have another set of problems, equally challenging. Yet our Federal agencies continue to administer programs in the time-honored traditions of the 1930's.

As the problems of the 1930's forced the Federal Government to reorganize, so the problems of the second half of the 20th century demand that the Government be modernized again.

It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who said:

The principal object of every Government all over the world seems to have been to impose the ideas of the last generation on the present one. That is all wrong.

We should heed this call to change today.

And so I propose a five-point program to improve life in our cities—a program that offers no single solution, because there is none—a program to provide:

First. Guaranteed job opportunities for all;

Second. A home in a decent environment;

Third. Maximum encouragement for private investment in rebuilding our cities;

Fourth. Involvement of the individual and an emphasis on neighborhood development; and

Fifth. Reorganization in the executive branch to meet the challenges of today with the techniques of the present—not the methods of yesterday.

GUARANTEED JOB OPPORTUNITIES

The most obvious fact in America is that a good job at an adequate wage is the key to providing self-respect for an individual and progress for a nation.

We have known this lesson for years. Yet our overall manpower situation still troubles us—and in the central cities it depresses us—economically and psychologically.

Unemployment in the central cities is twice the national rate. Men in the prime working years—25 to 54—have an unemployment rate three times greater than their counterparts in the Nation at large. One out of every four teenagers in the central city cannot find a job.

Even these statistics are incomplete. They include only those we know about. Hundreds of thousands who live in our cities are never counted.

Because we define "unemployed" as "actively looking for work and unable to find it," we overlook the men and women who have lost out so often they no longer seek a job. These are our most serious cases of unemployment—but we have little information about these people.

To rebuild and rehabilitate the American city, we must find out how many Americans we have in our cities; who they are; how many of them are working—and at what kind of jobs.

As the Reverend Leon Sullivan, whose opportunities industrialization centers have had huge success in training poor people and then placing them in good jobs, told us:

Begin to rehabilitate a people and you begin to rehabilitate a city. Structures do not make democracies or civilizations. Only attitudes and the spirits and desires of men to promote a change for their own betterment can do this. . . . Poor people . . . want a skill to prepare themselves for a job in order that they might be able to stand on their own feet.

The goal is clear: a job for every American capable of working, as well as adequate salaries and training programs so our people do not find themselves trapped in underemployment and unemployment.

I believe our society is capable of reaching that goal—and we should begin that effort in the central city. That is where the unemployment and the poverty, the crushed hopes, the alienation and the anger, the apathy and the despair are concentrated.

We begin there for two very important reasons: First, we want to break the cycle of hopelessness; and second, it is to our economic advantage to do so.

Reverend Sullivan's program in Philadelphia is an example. In its 2 years of operation, more than 2,500 men and women—most of them unemployed, the rest underemployed—have been trained

and placed in new productive jobs. They have added \$6 million a year in new purchasing power to the economy of the city of Philadelphia and saved the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a welfare cost of \$1 million a year—an overall gain of \$7 million. And this has happened with people whose median age is 27 and whose average level of schooling is below the ninth grade. This surely bears out another witness, Dr. Robert Coles, a psychiatrist, told us:

There is nothing in the minds of any group of Americans that necessarily compels our present problems to continue.

A fuller employed and a better employed nation—a nation of cities that function as complete human environments with enough jobs, accessible jobs, for all—will be a more financially and socially sound nation than one that concentrates its poor and near poor in one area and its jobs in another.

For this—the separating of the people from the jobs—is a major characteristic of American cities.

The central city as an economic unit is getting weaker and weaker. More than the middle class moves away. The jobs and factories disappear, too.

In the low-income neighborhoods of an earlier generation, a man could walk to work. But between 1960 and 1965, three-fifths of all new industrial plants were going up outside the central cities. In some cities, the percentage of new plants being built away from the areas of unemployment has been as high as 85 percent. This occurred at a time when local transit fares reached record heights and when wages did not consider the fact that a low-income person often had to travel twice as far to get to work.

Thus, when we look at our central cities in terms of manpower, we find that our current statistics are misleading in many ways. They do tell us that Negro unemployment is disastrous—twice the national average, and reaching the largest levels since the depression in some places. And they tell us that in terms of sheer numbers, there are more white unemployed in our central cities than Negro because there are more poor whites than poor Negroes.

But employment and manpower are constantly shifting factors. When men can slide into poverty very quickly, there is always a fear of layoffs and underemployment.

When we look at the city in these terms, we find that the poverty risk is greatest in the city—70 percent greater than outside the central cities.

We learn that families of service workers in the central city have an average income of 11 percent less than their counterparts outside the city in the same kind of jobs.

Work alone is no guarantee of a decent living standard. City families whose main breadwinner was a service worker earned 18 percent less than comparable families outside the city. For laborers, the figure was 23 percent less.

And we still have not begun to consider the tragedy of teenage unemployment—and what happens when young people suddenly learn that their educa-

tion has not opened any doors. Where will they turn then?

When we contemplate this waste in human resources and financial productivity, how true is the observation of Gunnar Myrdal, the distinguished Swedish observer of the American scene:

Never before in the history of America has there been a greater and more complete identity between the ideals of social justice and the requirements of economic progress.

EXPANDED EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Our job is to put people to work in our cities. We must involve in this endeavor all the resources of the Nation, public and private.

Our first task is to expand private employment opportunities in our cities. This is basically a responsibility of the private sector. The availability of employment depends on the location of the plant, business or store—and that, as it should be, is a private decision, freely arrived at, by American business and industry.

I believe that American business would locate, and relocate, in the cities again. It must be given the proper incentives—the proper assurances—and the clear understanding that government—be it Federal, State, or local—is willing to do its share and fulfill its commitment.

We cannot expect private businesses to locate in areas of unemployment out of the simple kindness of their hearts. We cannot ask the private sector to undertake a commitment that the public sector either has not made or has made halfheartedly. The private sector must be encouraged to locate where unemployment and underemployment prevail. Here the Federal Government can proceed in a number of ways.

THE ROLE OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

We should begin with an examination of the role of the Economic Development Administration—EDA—the only Federal agency created for the specific purpose of providing new job opportunities in areas of high unemployment or low family income. One would think that this would be the ideal agency to move into a high unemployment or underemployment area of a city in order to generate economic development in the area, new plant location and the like.

The EDA program is described in the "catalog of Federal programs for individual and community improvement" as one "designed to provide new industry and permanent jobs in areas where they are most needed. The single primary objective of the act is to create a climate conducive to the development of private enterprise in economically distressed communities." Has that meant help for Hough, or Harlem, or Watts? No—it has not, because those communities are parts of Cleveland, New York, or Los Angeles, and the cities are not economically distressed. But the jobless are in Watts, Hough, and Harlem. That is where the discontent breeds. That is where the poor live. That is where EDA should be operating at full speed.

Many have made suggestions about this vitally important proposition. I propose the addition of a new title VIII,

entitled "Urban Redevelopment Areas," to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. The amendment would enable the Economic Development Administration to provide financial assistance under title II of the act to public works and business loan projects in order that additional vitally needed job opportunities may be created to benefit the areas of concentrated unemployment now existing within the Nation's larger urban areas. Under the amendment, urban areas having a minimum population of 20,000 persons could be designated as urban redevelopment areas. The amendment contains a mandatory requirement of interagency coordination between the Secretaries of Commerce, Labor, Housing and Urban Development, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It is not enough simply to qualify core city areas for EDA title II assistance. We must examine the availability of that aid to determine its adequacy. Under existing law, EDA is authorized to make direct loans for 65 percent of the cost of industrial and commercial enterprises. Though an annual authorization of \$170 million is available for this program, we appropriated last year \$56 million—about one-third the authorized amount.

Experts estimate \$10,000 as the average amount of private investment needed to create one job. The \$56 million appropriated last year thus committed the Nation to the creation of 5,600 jobs—and hardly one was in a major city. How can we expect private enterprise to take Government seriously when we pass bills and administer them with great ballyhoo and little followthrough? We should greatly increase this program and fund it accordingly. At least \$1 billion a year should be made available for this direct loan assistance.

But the Federal Government need only be the lender of last resort. Direct loans are important—but we should also encourage private business and industry to locate in distressed areas through other, less costly means. To do this, we need to look at both the borrower and the lender.

INTEREST SUBSIDIZATION

First, how do we encourage the borrower—the businessman willing to locate in unemployment areas—to seek private financing before coming to the Government? One way is through the principle of interest subsidization, proposed by the administration in 1965 but not enacted by Congress. Under this proposal—called "interest rate rebate"—the Federal Government would reduce by two percentage points the interest costs incurred by the private business borrower who was able to find financing for his plant or business from private sources. This is a feature of some of our existing housing laws, which should be made applicable to private business investment as well as private housing.

The system works in Belgium and West Germany. It could well be the kind of inducement a business needs to locate in an area of high unemployment rather than in some other area. Assuming a \$5 million first year cost of such a program over a 10-year period, because of amortization only \$30 million will be ex-

pended—an average of \$3 million annually. According to testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, this amount of money would generate \$2.5 billion of loans.

A Federal investment of \$30 million over a decade that generates \$2.5 billion of private investment is money well spent—especially when you consider the millions poured down the drain on programs. I will introduce such a proposal.

GUARANTEED LOANS

Interest subsidization helps the borrower—but we must also encourage the private lender, so that direct Government loans are truly loans of last resort. A program of Government guarantees—whereby the Federal Government reduces the risk to the lender by undertaking to guarantee repayment of principal—could generate private loans in a ratio of 20 to 1 to appropriated Federal funds.

I will propose the establishment of a program of guaranteed loans by private lenders to businesses willing to locate in areas defined as "economically distressed" by the criteria—including a new title VIII—of the Economic Development Act of 1965. I propose that \$100 million in Federal funds be appropriated to establish a capital reserve, sufficient to guarantee \$2 billion in private loans and new investment capital.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Finally, I would establish a system to encourage regional economic development programs, as suggested by the National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress. As pointed out in the Commission's report:

Federal Reserve Districts have several advantages as bases for regional development programs: The Federal Reserve Districts approximate existing regional economies; they are already established; and, since the Federal Reserve System is closely associated with private banking institutions, it could effectively stimulate the application of private funds to the development of local and regional economies.

The Commission's entire recommendation relating to venture capital banks and technical institutes is far reaching and requires further study. But I do believe that the suggestion relating to a program of economic analysis operated through the Federal Reserve System is sound. This should be pursued by amending the Federal Reserve Act by adding a new section 13(b), establishing a program of economic analysis and evaluation within each Federal Reserve district, and establishing in each district an Advisory Council for Economic Growth.

IMPROVED TRAINING AND MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The involvement of the private sector requires more than direct Federal loans, interest rate rebates, loan guarantees, and economic planning in the Federal Reserve System. The practical businessman knows that all his good intentions coupled with the good intentions of government will not create job opportunities, if there are no trained men and women to fill the jobs when they are created. The lack of trained and skilled

workers is one of the most important obstacles to locating plants in the core city.

While the educated and skilled moved to the suburbs, the poorly educated and unskilled were migrating to the central city. The former Administrator of EDA, Eugene Foley, put it well:

In theory of course, the blue-collar workers in these needy urban areas should have followed the blue-collar jobs out of the city. But in practice this hasn't happened, and there is no indication that it is about to happen. The blue-collar workers in these areas either do not have the motivation—and for very understandable human reasons—to move, or else they do not have the money to move, or some may be barred by discrimination from living near these jobs outside the city. * * * In other words, they do not have easy access to employment at best, and no access at worst.

Therefore, while we encourage the private sector to locate in unemployment areas in our cities, we must also take steps to assure the necessary work force to fill the jobs we are trying to create. Unless we do this we lose credibility with business. The private sector must have confidence in the public official, the public agency, and the public program, if we expect the private sector to play a meaningful role.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Private enterprise itself can play a meaningful role. American business and industry can engage in massive training and basic education programs, both on the job and communitywide. I will introduce legislation to encourage such activity by permitting industry to claim as a credit against their taxes the direct costs of such training programs.

GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES

Still in all, the kind of massive training and basic education we need in this country is the responsibility of the public sector. How is this responsibility being carried out? Since 1961, federally supported manpower programs have increased eightfold and cost \$2.1 billion annually. The Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity now administer manpower programs in 10 separate organizational units. According to Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz:

There are fifteen to thirty separate manpower programs administered by public and private agencies, all supported by Federal funds, in each major U.S. metropolitan area.

One would think that with such a large expenditure of funds we would have a national manpower program in this country. But we do not. Only about one out of every 10 Federal dollars is spent on programs operated by agencies of the Federal Government. The rest is spent through grants and contracts to encourage and assist State and local governments and private institutions to provide employment-related services.

Attempts to coordinate these wide-ranging programs at the Federal level have failed. Until we have a unified manpower program in a unified manpower agency we will continue to dis-

sipate much of the good that flows from our existing training and education efforts. If we learned nothing else during the 6 weeks of hearings, we learned it is not how much you spend that counts—it is how you spend it.

To coordinate our training and education programs at the Federal level, I shall introduce legislation to bring all Federal manpower programs into a single agency located in the Department of Labor. This proposal, which grew out of discussions by the National Manpower Policy Task Force, has been advanced by Sar Levitan and Garth Mangum of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. It makes good sense. As they say in their recent paper entitled "Making Sense of Federal Manpower Policy":

The proposal is not just to bring existing programs under one roof, but to combine all Federal support for manpower programs into one Federal agency, dissolving the current individual programs, but perpetuating their functions in a single integrated program. The new agency should absorb the budgets of the existing programs and with them provide support for state and local proposals concerned with preparation for jobs requiring less than a college education, placement of people within these jobs, provision of employment opportunities to persons unable to compete effectively for existing jobs, experimentation with new approaches, and the gathering and analysis of labor market information. In doing so, all the current functions could be supported more rationally and with less administrative overhead, thus providing more effective administration as well as a "bigger bang for the buck".

A unified, rational, one-stop training program at the Federal level will help local communities, private organizations, and industry to use local funds and training agencies effectively and efficiently. And it will move us further down the road with the private sector in helping to solve the job crisis in our central cities.

COMMUNITY TRAINING CENTERS

The unified manpower program at the Federal level needs a counterpart at the local level. Each community should have a center to provide 2-year technical courses in a wide range of specialties; short, more specialized vocational training courses for those unable or unwilling to undertake the more demanding 2-year program; adult education courses—both to provide basic skills and prepare for specialization; and prevocational guidance and orientation.

Both full-time and part-time courses to upgrade the skills of employed persons should also be available. Those who wish to improve their skills, as well as those with no skills, should be welcomed.

Mr. Levitan, Mr. Mangum, and the National Manpower Policy Task Force deserve a great deal of credit for their proposals, which are worthy of our most serious consideration. I shall introduce legislation to establish a program of community training centers—combining the functions of the community college and the area vocational school with the "skill centers" already underway in some cities—like Hartford and New Haven, in my own State of Connecticut.

But even if we create new job opportunities in the private sector and establish better training programs, there will continue to be those left by the wayside and outside the mainstream of American life.

A compassionate and sensible society must provide assistance for those unable to compete successfully in the free job market.

Some have spoken of a guaranteed annual wage—a negative income tax—or a family allowance. Such proposals may have merit when advanced to assist the aged, the blind, the disabled, the mothers of families—those unable to work.

But I am convinced that the vast majority of Americans—in every income category, of all races, in every part of the Nation—want jobs; not relief. They want employment—not handouts.

"THE EMPLOYER OF LAST RESORT"

Just as the Government can be a "lender of last resort" to the entrepreneur who cannot get investment capital in the private sector for such projects, so the Government can be an "employer of last resort" for men and women who cannot find jobs in the private sector.

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress advanced this concept and it was recommended in the report following the recent White House Conference on Civil Rights. Said the Commission:

In terms of our image of the labor market as a queue, fiscal and monetary policies begin at the front of the queue and work toward the rear. Education and training and labor market policies affect not only relative places in the line, but the depth to which general economic policies can reach without generating inflation. Yet when all that is done, there remains another possibility: to begin at the rear of the line and create employment opportunities tailored to the abilities of those with serious competitive disadvantages.

"At the rear of the line" we see those left behind in an otherwise prosperous economy. We see the paradox—excessive unemployment in a society burdened with a huge backlog of public service needs—in its parks and streets—and slums and countryside; in schools and colleges, libraries, hospitals, nursing homes, public buildings; indeed, throughout the public and nonprofit sectors of the economy.

Estimating that there is a potential of 5.3 million new public service jobs, the Commission pointed out the opportunities in medical institutions with health services, educational institutions, national beautification work, welfare and home care, public protection, urban renewal and sanitation. In the Commission's words: "employing the unemployed is, in an important sense, almost costless. The unemployed consume; they do not produce. To provide them meaningful jobs increases not only their income but that of society."

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACT

I will propose a "Public Service Employment Opportunities Act" to implement the Commission's recommendations. The legislation would establish a 5-year program, with an initial appropriation of \$2 billion, to provide about

500,000 additional full-time public service jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill of Public Service Employment Opportunities be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and, without objection, will be referred as requested.

The bill (S. 585) to provide meaningful public service employment opportunities to unemployed individuals with serious competitive disadvantages, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the wages paid under the act would be no lower than the Federal minimum wage; the program would be linked closely with basic education, training, and counseling—provided in large measure by the proposed Community Training Centers. Such training would be designed to raise the productivity of employees and assist them in moving on to better jobs.

Society needs these jobs done in its medical institutions, its schools and colleges, its beautification projects. Men and women want to learn new and useful jobs. No element of make-work is involved, only commonsense and constructive action.

Therefore, I propose a major national effort to find meaningful work for all Americans able to work and anxious to work, but unable to find jobs—whether their handicap is racial, physical, or educational. I propose guaranteed employment, not a guaranteed dollar. This would bring that dignity and self-respect that comes only from self-sufficiency.

FIVE-YEAR URBAN CENSUS

The more we focus on jobs and the city, the more obvious our lack of information becomes. Employment projections are based on sample surveys conducted at the national, regional—or at best, metropolitan—level. The core of the problem is in the central city and its smaller units—the neighborhoods and the blocks.

Without adequate data, neither the Federal Government nor the local governments can make the most informed policy decisions, especially in a highly mobile society. For as Richard Scammon, former director of the U.S. Census Bureau, told us:

I think it is fair to presume that in 1966 over half of the American population lived in a different house than it did when the 1960 Census count was taken.

So that we do not base our policies on out-of-date information, I shall propose legislation to undertake an urban census every 5 years. We already have a rural census every 5 years. The last one was taken in 1964 at a cost of \$25 million.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM AND DAY CARE CENTERS

There are millions of dependent Americans who cannot work. They are the very old, the very young, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled; they comprise well over 6 million of the 7½ million people now receiving public assistance payments. No one expects a

woman in her eighties, or a little child, or a severely disabled needy person to go out and find a job.

My point is that those dependent adults who could work toward independence—no matter what their number—should be given the opportunity to do so. Those who could gain new freedom and fulfillment from vocational rehabilitative services should be able to get such rehabilitation. And we must work out new, dignified, humane ways of helping other dependent Americans who simply can no longer compete in the labor market. A rational compassionate society can pursue no other goals.

Fortunately, we have a practical way of achieving these goals at hand. Significant changes and revisions in the social security system will be proposed today by the President. I am confident that Congress will respond to constructive suggestions with bipartisan support.

In addition, the programs established by the public welfare amendments of 1962 will expire this year. These programs constitute a major part of our basic public welfare laws; revisions and improvements will be thoroughly considered. The intervening years have brought many changes, not only in our cities, not only in our Government, but in our whole society.

Serious attention should be given to the advisability of transferring the aged, blind, and disabled recipients of public welfare from the welfare rolls to the social security system. As a member of the Finance Committee, I intend to give the matter careful study.

There are now about 1.1 million parents of needy children on the public welfare rolls. The vast majority are women heading households. These women, and other needy mothers not on welfare rolls, should have the opportunity to gain independence through gainful employment. Now most do not have this opportunity because they have no safe, healthy place where they can leave their children, and no responsible person to care for these children.

Therefore, I propose that this Nation undertake a realistic, effective day-care program. Just as we cannot belabor the businessman to locate in the central city unless we assure him a competent work force, so we cannot tell the woman who heads a household to "get a job" unless we assure her competent day care. Such competent day care, like a competent work force, would serve as an investment for the future, preventing juvenile delinquency, crime, and needless accidents.

Right now, we have day-care facilities for about 310,000 children, though we estimate that we have 2.7 million boys and girls in desperate need of day care. I propose that we amend our social security laws to provide an additional \$500 million authorization for day care. This would start us up the proper road, for it would be earmarked for needy young children.

A DECENT ENVIRONMENT

Mr. President, too frequently, our discussions of housing narrow down to a statistical rehashing of the number of units needed to house our growing population. We are constantly reminded

that in the next 34 years, the United States must build more new housing than exists today in the entire country; that there are currently 58.3 million dwelling units; that by the year 2000, the projected need is 68 million additional units, an average of 2 million a year; that we are currently building at the rate of 1.5 million a year; and that this is 25 percent less than needed to keep up with the basic demand.

This is useful information. But this kind of information does not tell us enough about the people we are housing.

The risk of relying too heavily on large-scale statistics is that we overlook the diversity of our society and the need of the individual. For it is the people—and not the buildings—that define an environment. We learned this lesson best from Johnnie Scott, a young author from Watts, who described the ghetto this way:

The ghetto is not the houses. It is the people.

So let us put a rein on our discussion of the year 2000 and look at the realities of today. Let us think in terms of the living environment as well as the living room with a bath and a half. We must think in terms of real goals and objectives—where people are taken into account—not in statistical scorekeeping about how many units we are building or not building.

What are some of the goals and objectives encompassed in a decent environment? They fall into three main categories—physical, social, and planning.

Our physical goal should be to create a clean and attractive environment. We should remove structurally unsound buildings, relieve overcrowding, provide open spaces, improve both the street and mass transportation systems, provide community facilities, remove refuse and vermin and improve the overall appearance of our neighborhoods and cities.

Our social goal should be to improve the quality of that environment. We should offer a variety of housing to choose from, improve health, education, and recreation facilities; provide employment; direct welfare assistance or social service referral according to a person's need; reduce or prevent segregation, encourage community participation by individual citizens and their organizations, and reduce tension and violence in the community.

Our planning goals should tie together our first two goals—to build an attractive America and improve the quality of that America. We need to develop large areas of our cities and include in these endeavors plans for sound, complete and compassionate relocation programs. We must devise systematic programs that achieve several goals simultaneously, that improve the cost-benefit ratios, that strengthen local government, and foster technological advance. In sum, we must effect a major change in both the character and the quality of our environment.

Bearing all this in mind, we turn our attention first to the most serious and most definable aspect of our housing problem—the urban ghetto—those 4½ million substandard urban dwelling units

that are the shame of our Nation. For we must do in housing what we did in employment—go to the end of the line to start rebuilding. Because that is where and what the ghetto is—at the end of the line.

MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION PROGRAM

Our vehicle for the eradication of the ghetto over the next decade is the model cities program now in operation. But first, I would change its name to model neighborhood program, because that is what it is. The bill passed last year by Congress does not deal with cities. It deals with neighborhoods. So let us call it that to insure that we focus our efforts in the right direction.

And second, I think we must realize that it establishes a competition among cities that is basically unfair. A city that can comply with the requirements would be eligible. But as the program now stands, we are going to make some hairline decisions in choosing the few over the many.

So I propose that we reshape the program. We should spend the next 3 years preparing for our brick and mortar requirements in the 1970's by using the entire amount now authorized and uncommitted in this program—\$924 million—for planning, experimentation, and small demonstrations.

With this amount of planning money we can help all urban areas prepare for the elimination of substandard housing and ghettos in an orderly, intelligent fashion rather than experience another pell-mell dash to Washington before the Federal dollars run out. We should say to the local leaders of America, the planners, and the people themselves, that our war on the ghetto is one war that will be backed up by a sound strategy. In the long run, we will save money and time. We may even be able to reduce the cost of this gigantic effort if we go about it systematically.

And the cost is gigantic. An investment of \$50 billion over a 10-year period is required to eliminate substandard housing in urban areas. This is not a haphazard figure. It has been closely calculated, based on a standard area of 80,000 people living in 24,000 dwelling units and shopping at 500 places of business. All costs are included—acquisition, demolition, new housing replacement, rehabilitation, relocation, improvement of business establishments, administration and planning, and community participation.

The gross cost excludes—and this must be clearly understood—the construction costs of new schools, community buildings, health centers, and the other associated services and facilities essential to the well-being of the people of the area. For when we talk about wiping out the ghetto, it is more meaningful to present the housing and social costs independently of the associated services costs.

Thus, we can determine that the total cost of the physical and social effort needed to eliminate substandard housing in the central cities alone is roughly \$27 billion—a figure that does not include the less direct costs of associated services and facilities.

Extending the same program to the entire metropolitan area increases the

cost by \$16 billion to \$43 billion. And extending it to include all our urban areas will raise the cost to a final figure of \$50 billion.

I propose, therefore, that in 1970—after 3 years of careful planning—we begin spending this money at the rate of \$5 billion a year. We should start and continue until all substandard housing is erased from the land and replaced with decent living accommodations. We can eliminate all poor urban housing in a decade at this pace—rid ourselves of the ghetto cancer that destroys so many of our cities and our people.

HOMEOWNERSHIP FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOME

But, Mr. President, we have another basic housing need in this Nation—one that has not been spotlighted as the ghetto has been. And that is homeownership for low and moderate income individuals. The truly overlooked individual in our housing market is the \$5,000 to \$8,000 wage earner. He is priced out of most of the decent housing market and is ineligible for direct Government help or subsidy.

Nothing really helps him—not even the laws already on the books designed to assist private industry in providing housing for low and moderate income families.

But these laws—either already on the books or with minor modification—can help this middle group become homeowners if they are given substance, direction, and proper administration.

Take, for example, the Housing Act's below market rate program for low and moderate income housing—section 221 (d) (3). A merger of more guaranteed special assistance money from the Federal National Mortgage Association with the principles of 221(d) (3) and other sections of our housing law can result in excellent housing for people to buy and to live in—for less than \$90 a month. And that covers principle, interest, taxes, insurance, and utilities.

I intend to seek the enactment of legislation that will allow an individual in the \$5,000 to \$8,000 income category to obtain 3-percent mortgage money so he can buy a home of his own. We already grant similar terms to a builder who constructs rental units for this individual. The time has come to let the occupant buy a house if he wishes instead of renting, and on the same terms.

We should make available each year at least \$270 million to guarantee mortgages for construction of below market rate 221(d) (3) low and moderate income single family dwelling units. The program for homeownership would operate through the private lending institutions as regular mortgage guarantee programs do now. It would offer an important choice to an often overlooked middle group of our society—either to rent or to own in decency and dignity.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE HOUSING STANDARDS

We must make certain that through our public assistance programs we are not subsidizing the slums of America. Estimates are that today, 30 percent of the total welfare dollar is spent on shelter—most of it on housing that clearly is below standards and that comes, Mr. President, to some \$2 billion of Federal,

State, and local funds. In one city, building inspectors found that almost 50 percent of the housing units of persons on public assistance were either deteriorated or dilapidated.

The establishment of minimum housing standards in our Federal welfare laws has been proposed. Some States—such as Pennsylvania—have begun to withhold rent from landlords who refuse to repair substandard buildings occupied by public assistance families. Some cities—such as Baltimore—are starting pilot projects to move families in substandard housing to more adequate homes.

All these efforts deserve the support of the Federal Government. And I will introduce such legislation.

PERSONAL SECURITY

A decent environment includes more than the inside of a person's home. It includes all his physical surroundings and the peace of mind to enjoy those surroundings without fear. He needs security and safety as well.

In many of our urban areas, the environment seems ready made for crime. Dark and poorly lit streets breed crime. Automatic elevators and enclosed stairwells in high-rise buildings often are the scenes of assaults and robberies. So are dark and isolated parking lots that adjoin otherwise attractive apartments. Conversely, the location of walkways inside and outside of buildings can make a difference in detecting possible criminal activities. So our architects and planners have a responsibility to understand these problems when they design new living areas.

But basically, controlling crime is a matter of police protection. And this is what all our citizens want—no matter where they live. The Kraft report—a survey by the John F. Kraft, Inc., research organization on attitudes in Harlem and Watts—found that the people in these communities were as concerned about police protection as they were about police brutality. They wanted more—not less—police.

We understand why many people turn to crime. We heard about it from Claude Brown and Arthur Dunn Meyer. But they did not recommend it as a way of life—and we do not condone it. A knowledge of the causes of crime can help control and reduce crime. We can work to eliminate the conditions that cause crime—and we can strengthen and improve our law enforcement agencies.

Our police forces have been neglected for too long and blamed for too much. We ask our policemen to be supermen—to run the gamut from delivering babies to arresting dangerous criminals—without any increase in compensation, status or training. And we expect them to do all this, as Judge George Edwards, of the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court said, “with the wisdom of Solomon, the concern of a social worker and the prompt courage of a combat soldier.”

Although the policeman is responsible for only part of the administration of justice—the courts and the correction institutions must bear their share as well—we blame him when the system breaks down because he is the visible part of the machinery.

So we ask him to be a scapegoat as well—at a median salary of \$5,843 a year in cities with a population of 25,000 or more and at a salary of \$4,920 in cities where the population is between 10,000 and 25,000.

President Johnson, in his state of the Union message, made a meaningful statement in support of the police and their job. His program deserves the understanding and the support of Congress and the country.

THE HEALTH OF OUR CITIZENS

America is the richest country in the world—but still it lags behind other countries in many areas of personal health. In particular, we have far less information on the health of our young people than we should.

With the exception of some antipov-erty programs such as Headstart and the Job Corps, we must rely exclusively on the Selective Service System for this information.

Not until a young man is 18 years old do we find many defects that should have been identified and treated when he was a child. And we still are missing knowledge about the health of our young women.

NATIONAL CHILD HEALTH CENSUS

We should do better. We need to learn the extent of our health problems so we can provide the resources to treat sickness and disease. One-third of the chronic conditions that handicap children could be corrected in early life if they were discovered.

I propose, therefore, a national child health census to remedy this intolerable situation. My bill would provide grants to the States to conduct a health census survey of preschool children in community centers and schools. Medical teams in mobile units could travel within a single community—the same technique so successful in our fight against polio. I believe \$5 million would be more than enough to start the operation.

Perhaps the most important health question we face in our urban areas is that of delivery of health services. Many who need health services most, cannot get them in an efficient and effective way. Their plight must receive continued and careful consideration. One example of the inadequacy of existing programs is the fact that despite the \$2.5 billion we have expended on hospital construction since 1947, there is still no hospital in Watts.

III. ENCOURAGING PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Our hearings demonstrated that rebuilding American cities is a massive undertaking—far beyond the capacity of Government alone. The testimony also showed that private enterprise—already involved in building and construction—will invest in the cities, if public policy establishes the appropriate conditions and a climate of partnership.

As David Rockefeller testified:

Many of my businessmen friends tell me that they would be glad to get their companies into the field of city problems, but they say government units seem to want that field all to themselves. They get the impression that many government officials tend to look upon them as rivals in competition rather than partners in progress.

The question, then, is this: How do we encourage the involvement of the private sector in the large social problems confronting us?

Let us recognize, first, that there is no simple mechanism—no magic organization—that will automatically generate a significant role of private enterprise in rebuilding our cities. No slogan—no single device—will attract the private sector into what is basically a public function.

Let us recognize, second, that the private sector is already at work building houses, apartments and facilities to accommodate a significant part of the current need—1,600,000 housing units a year.

And let us keep in mind the dual role of private industry in our Nation—its role as private entrepreneur, and its role as contractor to Government. Private industry, acting as contractor to the Federal Government in a public market, is building the spacecraft to take Americans to the moon. Private enterprise is also manufacturing 9 million autos a year to take Americans around the country to shopping, to work, and on pleasure trips—autos which fill a private market's needs.

Similarly, American industry can participate in the rebuilding of our cities.

With guaranteed jobs, millions of Americans will move from consumers of public funds to consumers of private goods and services. Guaranteed employment will create new purchasing power—a new market—for American industry. Since one of the major talents of our free enterprise system is its ability to supply new markets, and since one of the primary needs of people is shelter, it is reasonable to expect that American industry will make new efforts to provide and sell adequate housing to those newly able to afford it.

The action program I have proposed to rebuild the ghettos of America would create a second market for private enterprise. The \$20 billion we have committed to conquer space created an aerospace industry out of the aircraft electronics, and associated industries. The \$50 billion we should commit to wiping out the cancer of our ghettos could create a “cities industry” in addition to disparate segments of what is today a “building industry”—bring greater efficiency and better organization to a highly scattered current effort, and encourage private enterprise to develop new products and techniques. Few Americans would buy the rockets developed in aerospace; a great number of Americans would buy the better houses in our cities.

But we must make Government activity believable to the private sector. The private businessman must have confidence that when he works with the Government cooperatively in a private-public endeavor, the public official or agency knows what it is doing and where it is going. We do not build that kind of trust—that sort of relationship—with the outmoded, inefficient, directionless, and redtape snarled programs of today.

So we must streamline, improve, and tighten Government procedures and techniques, organizing ourselves in the public sector as the private sector must organize itself in our highly competitive

free enterprise system. Much remains to be done—a job which the executive branch and the Congress, working together, must do.

INSTITUTE OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT

An important element in the partnership between Government and business can be the effective transfer of research results and development techniques from Government-sponsored efforts to private enterprise use. We need, therefore, a substantial research and development effort in the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Millions of American families cannot live in decent houses or apartments because they cannot afford them. One element of the problem is, of course, the income of the families themselves. Jobs for those able to work will accomplish much to bring income near need.

But the other element of the problem is cost—the cost of shelter still built with the materials and methods of the 1920's, in an age of technology and science. Responsible experts estimate that the cost of housing could be cut in half—from \$16,000 per unit to \$8,000—by applying modern techniques to increase productivity.

Low-income families are most seriously affected by high costs and poor housing. But middle and upper income families are also paying more for their housing than they should have to pay.

Existing Federal programs have failed to meet this need. Fiscal aids—like FHA, Veterans' Administration efforts, federally supported below-market interest rates—are important. But they cannot alone solve the housing problem. Housing costs continue to rise more rapidly than cost levels in the rest of the economy.

We must focus on housing and other building construction the same research techniques used so successfully in other industries. In fact, no other single field in America holds greater promise for the application of organized research and product development than housing.

The major effort in research and development must be sponsored by the Federal Government. As is well known, the building industry is made up of many small businesses, with even the largest builders unable to spend the kind of money on comprehensive research that needs to be spent.

Even the largest suppliers of building materials are not interested generally in the house as an entity. Each—supplying siding and roofing, or plumbing fixtures, or flooring, or any of the countless other elements of a house—fears that change will make present products obsolete.

Labor should also understand that constructive change would result in more jobs and steadier work, and at the same time lower the cost of housing to everyone including their own union members.

Similarly, the matter of building codes deserves our careful and considered study and evaluation—which it will receive from the Temporary National Commission on Codes, Zoning, Taxation, and Development Standards. I am highly pleased that our former colleague, Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, has

been appointed Chairman of this Commission.

Congress recognized the need for additional research and development in the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966, authorizing the expenditure of \$5 million in fiscal year 1967 and \$10 million in fiscal year 1968 for research and development carried out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This research and development effort already authorized is the ideal task for the Institute of Urban Development—first proposed in early 1965, but still being “structured” in the Bureau of the Budget. The Institute could be established tomorrow by administrative action. I think we have waited long enough for the executive branch to act. I will propose, therefore, the creation of an Institute of Urban Development in the Department of Housing and Urban Development by specific legislation. I would hope enactment of my bill would not be necessary and that the executive branch will act promptly.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR HUD

In addition to an Institute for Urban Development, there should be established in HUD a Business Advisory Committee, as recommended at the hearings by David Rockefeller. He suggested that a group from the business and financial community, similar to the Advisory Committee on International Monetary Arrangements in Treasury, be set up to work closely with the Secretary of HUD.

According to Mr. Rockefeller:

Such a high-level panel could bring fresh insight to the deliberations of HUD, as well as practical expertise in many areas that are vital to its success—areas such as financial policy, management organization, audit and control, and the like. Beyond this, an advisory group of this kind would be able to represent a sector of our economy that is pivotally important to the solution of city problems, and one that does not feel that its views are being given an adequate hearing at present.

This is an eminently sound proposal, which I shall introduce. If we are saying to the private sector that we expect it to invest \$7 for every dollar of Federal investment, then the Federal agency most involved in city rebuilding must be in the mainstream of American economic life. As Mr. Rockefeller points out:

The towering problems that beset our cities . . . cannot—indeed, they should not—be relegated exclusively to government. These are problems calling for action on a broad front and for participation by the entire citizenry, including the business community.

The Institute of Urban Development and the Business Advisory Council in HUD will help foster and create that “better communication and cooperation between our business leaders and our political leaders” called for by the chairman of the board of General Electric, Gerald E. Phillips, when he testified.

NEW TOWNS

While the Federal Government has a major responsibility in urban problems—especially ghetto elimination and low-income housing—I believe that the private sector has a primary developmental responsibility: new town development.

But even the Federal Government can also lend a helping hand.

One of the most interesting witnesses during our 6 weeks of hearings was Mr. James Rouse, the developer of Columbia—a “new town” to be located between Washington and Baltimore. Mr. Rouse was accompanied by representatives of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. who invested some of the original seed money for Columbia—\$25 million private venture capital.

Our existing urban centers, even when revitalized and rebuilt, cannot accommodate all the urban Americans of the next generation. I think we should all be willing to think not only about clearing up our mistakes of the past—the ghetto—but about the new towns of the future. With three million new residents added each year to our present urban population, new communities, and new patterns of land use are inevitable, as the world-renowned city planner, Constantinos Doxiadis, testified.

While new town development is the basic responsibility of the private sector, there are certain “threshold” problems and costs which may fall to the public sector. These may include assistance in land assembly and help in providing capital requirements, particularly in community facilities and initial land purchase; assistance to local governments in the areas involved to plan in anticipation of the impact of new towns; encouraging the development of equal opportunities and helping to solve marketing problems; by coordinating the location of government installations and assuring adequate economic bases for the communities.

“New towns” give government and the private sector another opportunity to work together in a meaningful way on a new venture—at the head of the line—rather than locking horns over who is to blame for the failures of the past. I am preparing legislation to establish a joint Federal-private sector “new town” development program containing, among other things, establishment of State and Federal development corporations. Their purpose is to solve some of the more difficult problems of land assembly and reduce the possibility of unwarranted land speculation; technical assistance in planning, to assure the best quality of design and execution now available; deferred interest charges on loans to reduce the critical start-up costs of such enterprises; and special arrangements for the timely provision of community facilities under existing grant programs.

IV. INVOLVEMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND AN EMPHASIS ON NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

New major outlays, Federal and private, to fund major housing construction and job development in the slums are necessary. But our hearings also showed that any new national effort in our cities must involve the people of the neighborhoods. It is not enough to have new national programs and new major endeavors by private industry if they are simply to rebuild the slums from the top down. To succeed, such programs must involve the people in their neighborhoods.

A new word has entered the picture of urban crisis—neighborhood. We must focus on the neighborhood, a practical human unit of planning and management within our cities. Witnesses such as Doxiadis, Leon Sullivan, and David Rockefeller emphasized greater neighborhood involvement. Milton Kotler, in his testimony on the ECCO project in Columbus, Ohio, gave his entire attention to the fundamental problem of building neighborhood corporations of local decision and management in our cities.

Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY is also engaged in an imaginative and promising neighborhood corporation development effort in the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of New York. His program is based on the same premise: That effective programs of change and new hope—no matter how ingeniously they may employ private industry, private capital and Federal help—must ultimately rest on the people's involvement in decision at the neighborhood level.

We must rebuild our cities for new dignity and prosperity—and in order to make the resources of private enterprise work, we must join grass roots support to their efforts. We must rebuild our slums from the bottom up. This insight is based on our own historic experience of democracy—not only as a shining ideal, but also as a practical way of getting the job done.

We have become so bureaucratic in our thinking—so concerned with metropolitan, regional and national scale—that we have forgotten about the neighborhood and the people who live there.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I recall with a great deal of pleasure the hearings which were chaired last year by my able friend, the Senator from Connecticut, on the general subject of the plight of the urban American.

I congratulate the Senator today on the excellent and provocative statement which he is making to the Senate.

There can be no question that the trend toward urbanization in this country is not going to stop and that the dreadful plight of the municipality in the Nation constitutes a basic problem for all American people and all American society.

My able friend has made an excellent comment with respect to the need of the "private sector" to participate with American government in solving the problem.

As far as I am concerned, I recognize the Senator as a leader in this field.

I shall study very carefully the recommendations he makes.

I salute him as a fellow Senator today for the contribution he makes toward this crucially important public problem.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

The Government cannot do the job by itself. There is no question in my mind that this task is so vast that the Government by itself does not have the money, the capacity, the ability, or the techniques with which to do the job.

We must involve the private sector. We must involve private banking, private industry, private builders, and pri-

vate insurance to do this job. It is a job that must be done.

We have talked about \$1 trillion. That is a lot of money. It is one thousand billion dollars. I estimate that about \$200 billion of this amount will be Government funds. The rest of it will come from the private sector. In involving the private sector, we will be giving America a new age of prosperity such as it has never seen, because the needs are there, and private industry will need to supply an additional 2 million units of housing a year.

Our population is growing so rapidly that in the next 14 years an additional 53 million people will be living in our urban areas. By the year 2000, 95 percent of all Americans will be living in urban America.

This is why I say that we are faced with an urgent problem, because each passing year and each delay compounds the problems—and makes solving the problems that much more difficult.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is eminently correct.

I simply repeat to the Senator on this occasion that the series of bills which he intends to introduce merit the respectful consideration of all Senators. Surely, until we face up to the problem of the cities as the Senator has suggested, the basic obstacle to the success of our way of life will remain.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

Today, some of our cities are larger than our whole Nation was at the time we won independence. Our Founding Fathers drew a constitution to govern people's lives that recognized the need for self-government and local diversity. Authority was given to States; the States spread authority to counties and municipalities—so people would have the means to shape their locality in a way that expressed their particular values.

Today it is said our cities are unmanageable. We can begin to make them manageable by recognizing the diversity that exists within them. We can begin setting up the means for new kinds of local participation in our cities.

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS

I believe that the neighborhood community must be corporately strengthened to cooperate with the public sector and private enterprise. I am therefore proposing new legislation to establish a program of neighborhood development corporations to build neighborhood oriented programs for economic and social improvement.

The neighborhood development corporations would be set up as territorially defined units, not exceeding 50,000 people. With adequate funding, which I propose be administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the neighborhood development corporations would be organized as legal structures on the basis of articles of incorporation and bylaws, dedicated to self-help and rebuilding their local areas. The ECCO project in Columbus, Ohio, is a shining example of the neighborhood development corporation—and an illustration that, in the neighborhoods of our cities, town meetings can work.

The corporation would bring each in-

terested resident into the direct and responsible task of determining the life and public face of his community. With funding to set up these neighborhood development corporations and pay for their administration for a limited period of 2 years the corporation could, through their committees and employed professionals, help develop the kinds of programs they know will work in their neighborhoods. These programs would then be submitted to various agencies—public and private—for funding.

Certain existing Federal programs, especially in manpower training, basic education, vocational rehabilitation, small business assistance, and the like, might need to be amended so that funds from these programs could be made available to neighborhood development corporations—either directly or under arrangements of municipal approval or sponsorship. The neighborhood and the city, cooperating together in rebuilding the neighborhoods, should be the new basis of justice, prosperity, and order in urban America.

TAX INCENTIVES FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The neighborhood organization efforts of ECCO in Columbus and the work of the Reverend Leon Sullivan in Philadelphia are just two examples of responsible activity at the local level. Other ideas have been advanced—such as the Greater Hartford Housing Development Fund, Inc., a nonprofit corporation established to eliminate blight and promote "opportunity housing" in the city of Hartford. The goals and work of this group—and similar groups throughout the country—are impressive. I shall introduce legislation making contributions to such organizations deductible as contributions under our tax laws.

BLOCK GRANTS

We must enhance the capability of individuals—acting for themselves—to solve their own problems. We should also help local governments to build up their ability to administer complex programs and deal with the problems of an urban society.

Here is an ideal opportunity to combine an old problem with a new, experimental solution. In its simplest terms, the problem is how to finance local government. As pointed out by Joseph A. Pechman of the Brookings Institution:

In the past, state and local needs have been met in part by Federal grants-in-aid for particular purposes. These specific Federal grants have helped to finance programs in which the national interest was particularly strong. But it is now clear that the states and local governments also need help to meet the needs of their citizens in areas of traditional state-local responsibility.

It is obvious that State and local governments need help. Between 1953 and 1963 State and local expenditures increased from \$27.9 billion to \$64.8 billion, an increase of 132.2 percent. State and local government debt in the same period went from \$33.8 billion to \$87.5 billion. The fiscal pressure shows no sign of easing.

Many solutions have been offered—including tax rebates from the Federal level to the States. The so-called "block grant" approach makes sense.

The block grant concept takes a little of the past and some of tomorrow—and arrives at a meaningful and understandable method of helping State and local governments function. The block grant is not as rigidly constricted as the usual grant with Federal standards, forms, requirements, and redtape. The block grant would be used to accomplish generally defined goals—such as paying for municipal operating expenditures. The block grant could be described as “general aid” to provide what are considered basic local services—such as police and fire protection, sewerage and sanitation, local parks and recreation.

Federal block grants to urban municipalities would allow local governments to decide priorities of needs. Each city would decide for itself where it should bolster its own system of services. The Federal Government would not dictate which needs of the local government should be met. But the responsibility of deciding which city governments are most in need of aid—and how much should be apportioned to them from available program funds—would remain with the Federal Government. The block grant approach reflects the changing times—it is a reasonable approach between the usual categorical grant method followed since the 1930's and the outright rebate concept advanced by some. Our distinguished colleague, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, chairman of our sister Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has done an outstanding job of exploring the intricacies of this entire matter. His work on Federal grants-in-aid program management has laid the foundation for all programs in this field.

THE ROLE OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES

The hearings clearly demonstrated the need for more trained manpower in municipal and local government. We cannot turn over funds and ask local officials to administer programs without providing the training and skills they need to make sense out of problems and progress in programs.

Senators MUSKIE and CLARK have done yeoman service in bringing this need to the attention of the Senate, the Government, and the Nation. We must have adequate funding for the urban training programs already authorized for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Both Dr. James Hester, president of New York University, and Prof. William Doebele of Harvard University, emphasized in their testimony the need for trained manpower and the role of the urban university.

The urban university can play a major role in filling the need for trained manpower—through graduate fellowships for study in community planning; through special advanced education for young people who show promise for leadership in urban affairs; through urban research in areas of local concern. I shall introduce legislation to establish Federal support for such programs.

The role of the urban university is vital in a city rebuilding effort. There is much the university can do by expanding current efforts and starting new ones.

First. The urban university should offer a program of study that is relevant to the world outside and that will attract the most committed—as well as the most intelligent—young people of our Nation. For many years, Einstein has been our academic model. We still need our Einsteins. But we also need our men of action who can apply their knowledge to the immediate task at hand. That is the first point.

Second. Our universities should offer degree programs in urban studies—in areas in which we will need an increasingly large number of trained personnel in the years ahead. We have just begun to study the whole problem of who will organize and manage our cities and their services.

Third. The university should develop urban extension programs to meet the immediate and pressing needs in a community or a neighborhood. One of the great tragedies of our cities is that we tend to write off a whole generation of adults—those who live in the slums and gray areas—as a lost generation. We have programs for their children, but little beyond the basic literacy courses for the parents.

Fourth. The university should offer refresher, inservice training programs to public officials who want to improve their skills and learn new techniques of administration as well as new theories and discoveries about human behavior.

Fifth. The university should conduct research into the major issues of the day—issues such as crime and violence, pollution, and transportation. The application of systems analysis—used so successfully in our space program—has great potential in the urban area. We must understand that a social system and a large-scale human environment are much more complex than a space capsule environment and a missile system.

Sixth. Our urban universities should pool their research efforts and establish urban action centers in all our major metropolitan areas. The model already is before us—in both the Center for Urban Education and in the Cooperative Project for Educational Development in New York City. These two projects—consortiums of the major institutions of higher learning in the New York area—are making important advances in our knowledge of the educational needs of the poor, and in developing new ways to train both teachers and administrators for our school systems.

V. REORGANIZATION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We began the hearings last August on the “Federal Role in Urban Affairs” to determine how the Federal Government is organized to deal with what has become—not a problem of the cities alone—but of the Nation as well. For the term “urban” no longer holds its old meaning. It no longer means just the city. It no longer has only a geographic connotation.

No matter where we live, we live today in a nation rapidly becoming totally urban—with an urban mentality, an urban society, and overwhelmed with urban problems. As Doxiadis put it:

By the end of the century the structure of our society will be different. Ninety-one percent of the population will be urban, and this percentage will continue to rise. The remaining 9 percent will have many characteristics of an urban population. This entitles us to say that by the end of the century, 95 percent of the population will belong to an urban society, and this percentage will continue to increase. We are heading towards a completely urban society, and we overlook this fact.

So our hearings soon became a look into the very mirror of our national life—past, present, and future. And what we saw was not always pleasant. In the words of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner:

Some of the city's troubles are physical—transportation, water and sewage, pollution, slum dwellings, lack of open space, and so on. But the most menacing ills of the city are at bottom not physical, but social. One could recite the familiar list of specific social ills—crime, poverty, segregation. But beneath and behind all of these we are faced with problems of social organization, of governance, of politics in the Aristotelian sense of the word. . . .

Neither the programs nor the organization of the thirties can cope with problems of such magnitude. Yet we find ourselves facing the problems of today and tomorrow with the programs, policies, and procedures of the past. We need to reorganize for the future or our efforts will be in vain.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

In my view, we need a new and reorganized and reoriented Department of Housing and Urban Development. No longer the insurance office of the past, looking on people as credit risks—good or bad—rather than human beings needing decent housing, HUD has a fundamental stake in the social advances this Nation is capable of making. We are not going to rebuild America if our eye is constantly on FHA's reserve strength. HUD must begin to think and act anew. With men like Secretary Robert Weaver, Under Secretary Robert Wood, Assistant Secretaries Charles Haar, Ralph Taylor, and many others, it has the necessary leadership. But we must strengthen the regional and field offices—the basic working core of the Department. And we must strengthen that core in all other agencies of Government as well.

No matter how good its intentions, HUD is topheavy with brick and mortar, and weak in the social aspect of housing and community development. This is of special concern in view of the fact that the existing model cities program—and the model neighborhood program I have proposed—anticipates not only physical, but social change in the model area. But HUD is not equipped to deal with this phase of rebuilding the city and community.

I recommend, therefore, the eventual transfer of the community action program of OEO to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to operate in close coordination with the model neighborhood program. In short, I believe we must humanize the HUD program.

But for the present we must recognize that OEO needs an effective program to

reach into the communities and neighborhoods of the Nation. The community action program should not, therefore, be transferred to HUD until the new neighborhood development corporation program has been established in OEO.

In the meantime, strong liaison should be established immediately between HUD's model city program and the ongoing community action program—so that meaningful social services are planned for and developed in the model city program.

In addition to a new Institute of Urban Development and a Business Advisory Council, there should be established in HUD a Council on Interdepartmental Coordination, staffed by a Director of Community Program Coordination, to insure that the Federal Government's efforts in improving the physical quality of urban life are run in a coordinated and efficient manner. I would also transfer out of HUD the college housing program and place it in the Office of Education.

I will introduce legislation to reorganize HUD in the manner I have described.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR

The President's proposal to create a single department out of what are now the Departments of Labor and Commerce requires our careful study. Such a department existed from 1903 until 1913 when two separate departments were created by President Woodrow Wilson.

The employment opportunity programs I have proposed should strengthen the authority of both the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce. I have long felt that both agencies have been underutilized as makers and movers of public policy and programs. They have been relegated instead to the role of statistical gathering and reporting.

My proposals contemplate transferring to the Department of Labor programs under titles I, II, and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and manpower training and work-relief programs now in HEW. The Department of Labor would then be able to embark on a massive and meaningful manpower development program—and become a vitally important factor in the years ahead.

So, too, should we strengthen the Department of Commerce. Under my proposals it would become both "the lender of last resort" and "the employer of last resort" in an effort to expand economic opportunity and development in this Nation. Once the Department of Commerce is established as a truly effective arm of economic development, consideration can be given to transferring out of it certain environmental science programs—more logically connected with departments and agencies engaged in similar work.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

I have suggested taking from the Office of Economic Opportunity some of its operating functions. The Job Corps, work training, work study, work experience, and adult basic education programs would be transferred to the Department of Labor. Employment and investment incentives authorized under title IV could

be transferred to the Department of Commerce. Rural programs under title III could be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. The community action program would be eventually transferred to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to work in conjunction with the model neighborhood program in that Department.

One might ask: Why not scrap OEO altogether once its major operating functions have been transferred to other agencies?

OEO should not be scrapped. OEO has been a great success. The programs started there 3 years ago on an experimental basis now have become fully established action programs. Now they are ready to be transferred to the departments with associated functions. We achieve two important goals by this move. First, we avoid an excessive and destructive fragmentation of our urban programs. Second, we free OEO to continue what it can do better than any other agency of Government: innovate and experiment—test new ideas and new techniques before they are put on a full-scale operational basis.

New techniques and new ideas are necessary to accommodate the requirements of our changing society—but the change we seek can only come from the community and the neighborhood. We cannot neatly package and pay for progress in Washington.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I fully agree with the statement that "new techniques and new ideas are necessary to accommodate the requirements of our changing society."

My able colleague the Senator from Connecticut presents a very comprehensive picture in his statement today. The Senator underscores the problem in its many facets, and they are real, and we need to know more about them in this forum and throughout the country.

The Senator from Connecticut indicates that he would wish that the bill which he would present actually would not be passed, but that within the structure of the executive branch we might do something without another legislative measure. Is that correct?

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct. In my opinion, much of the reorganization I have recommended could be done administratively, through reorganization plans, without the passage of additional legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I make this further comment because oftentimes we think only new and creative ideas come from this period in which we live. Senators probably will recall the words of Abraham Lincoln when he said:

The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew. We must act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves.

If Abraham Lincoln could say that then, we should be saying it now, as the Senator from Connecticut is saying so well.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, by funding neighborhood development corporations, OEO would help develop self-managed local organizations to help people begin defining and dealing with their own problems in their own way—and thus continue its role as innovator.

But OEO is not only the "innovator" at the local neighborhood level. It should perform that task at the very highest Federal level as well.

So as new ideas are developed and new techniques discovered, the Office of Economic Opportunity should be the national agency to test their worth. The Office of Economic Opportunity was also charged with the responsibility of insuring that all Federal programs related to poverty are carried out in a coordinated manner. But we learned in our hearings that although "coordination" is subject to a great deal of talk in the executive branch, little actually exists. We were told about coordinators and convenors and interagency groups until it appeared that what was needed most in the executive branch was a coordinator of the coordinators.

But we have not accomplished effective coordination at the Federal level—and the coordination function given OEO has largely been ignored. We cannot exactly ascertain why this happened, but one thing is certain: Once OEO became the administrator of massive national projects, it became in the eyes of other agencies not the coordinator but a competitor. And so a statutory coordinator at the Federal level was lost.

So we also need OEO because only that agency is empowered by Congress to exercise the kind of coordination needed today to assure the effectiveness of the massive Federal effort in our cities. A close reading of the 1964 act discloses a grant of more coordinating authority to a unit of government than ever before in our history. That function has never been adequately performed. OEO has become so identified as an independent agency that many are unaware that the act creating it states: "There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President"—that is OEO's base of power, and it is a greater power than exists in any other agency—it is a greater power than the authority to administer huge sums of grant money. It is the power and prestige of the White House itself that gives OEO its advantage in the Federal bureaucracy. It is time OEO was used to provide direction, and coordination, and effectiveness to the programs Congress has enacted since the New Deal.

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE EVALUATION

The question now becomes: How do we evaluate our efforts? What methods do we have beside taking the word of the department or agency involved that we are succeeding in our social goals?

As Daniel P. Moynihan testified at the hearings:

Up until now the executive branch of the Federal government, and the executive branch in American government in general, has had a virtual monopoly on the product of evaluation research. Congress, the State legislatures, the City Councils, are simply told what have been the results of such research. They do not have to agree, but they are hard put to disagree.

There is nothing sinister about this state of affairs. Serious evaluation research as I have said, is only just reaching the state of a developed, as against an experimental, technique. Inevitably it has been sponsored in the first instance by executive departments. However, because the findings of such research are not neutral it would be almost dangerous to permit this imbalance to persist. There are a number of reasons. First and most importantly, the Congress and other legislative bodies are put at a considerable disadvantage. A major weapon in the "arsenal of persuasion" is in effect denied them. Second, the executive is exposed to the constant temptation to release only those findings that suit its purposes; there is no one to keep them honest. Third, universities and other private groups which often undertake such research on contract are in some measure subject to constant if subtle pressure to produce "positive" findings. The simple fact is that a new source of knowledge is coming into being; while it is as yet an imperfect technique, it is likely to improve, and if it comes to be accepted as a standard element in public discourse it is likely to raise considerably the level of that discourse. This source of knowledge should not remain an executive monopoly.

To correct this situation, Moynihan suggested the creation of an Office of Legislative Evaluation. He compared the function of this new office to the function of the General Accounting Office and contended that the GAO, "has in its 45 years of activity raised the level of financial honesty in the programs of the Federal Government to the point that it is no longer even a remote obstacle to Federal legislation. Federal money may get wasted, but it does not get stolen."

This proposal speaks directly to the cogent issue raised by the distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, in his letter to committee chairmen last December calling for a "concentrated Senate exercise of the oversight function" and for a "major re-examination of new and old Government programs."

As Senator MANSFIELD said:

Few if any of these older legislative structures have had a thorough-going, second-look for many years. These, too, it seems to me, might profitably be subject to complete re-study by the Senate. That kind of study could provide not only a basis for adjustments of legislation, as necessary, to the current needs of the nation but also a check on the equity and efficacy of the administrative interpretations and practices which have developed.

A concerted effort by Congress in the exercise of its oversight function is needed—and needed now. Over the long range, however, Congress needs an agency to perform the task of systematically evaluating the results of the social and economic programs it has enacted and paid for out of public moneys, just as 45 years ago it needed an agency to routinely audit the fiscal activities of Federal agencies.

I propose that we establish an Office of Legislative Evaluation to make sure our money is not wasted and that our programs accomplish their goals. We should place the office in GAO and change that agency's name to the Bureau of General Accounting and Legislative Evaluation. I shall introduce a bill to this effect.

The majority leader has spelled out the need for Congress to exercise its legislative oversight responsibilities. I am confident that the Committee on Government Operations, under the able leadership of Chairman JOHN McCLELLAN, will continue to assume its proper role in assuring that the programs of the Federal Government are carried out in an efficient, economical, and well-coordinated manner. Few other Senators are as cognizant as Chairman McCLELLAN of the need for effective organization in Government, and the changing requirements of Government in our times.

I make this speech on the floor of the Senate as a Senator from Connecticut who has had the privilege of chairing a subcommittee of the full Committee on Government Operations. Needless to say, the programs I recommend and the proposals I advance are my personal beliefs and are not the report of the subcommittee. That report will be forthcoming after the members of the subcommittee have had a chance to review the record in detail.

Inasmuch as the distinguished chairman of the committee Senator McCLELLAN, is in the Chamber, I wish to take this opportunity to publicly and personally thank him for the warm encouragement he has given me throughout our efforts to achieve sound reorganization in the Federal branch. The chairman of the committee has an excellent staff, and I wish to pay tribute to the head of the staff and all the men working on the staff for their encouragement, dedication, and assistance. In connection with everything I have asked to do and wanted to do, the chairman and the staff have been there.

I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that no matter how many years I am a Senator I will always be most appreciative and grateful for his kindness, generosity, encouragement, and understanding.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who is a member of the committee. I assure him that it is and will always be the purpose of the chairman to invite and cooperate with the members of the committee in the study of the Government, with the purpose of determining where reorganizations will promote efficiency and economy. I wish to add that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut performed yeoman service on the committee. He is dedicated to the task, the hope, and purpose of finding solutions to many of our organization problems.

With respect to the Committee on Government Operations, the work that we do is tedious. Much of it is not spectacular. It involves much detail, study, search, research, and evaluation, and any progress that we make toward reorganizing our Government and dealing with some of these vital problems is of immense importance to us.

I appreciate the services of the Senator and his friendship.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the distinguished chairman.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, when we speak of the city we speak of the oldest and newest of mankind's experiments.

It is the oldest because this experiment began thousands of years ago when men first came together in settlements to increase their opportunities by sharing their talents and resources.

It is the newest because the style of urban life has changed constantly throughout history as men have sought to articulate new hopes and dreams and give concrete shape to those hopes and dreams.

Thus, the fundamental aspect of urban life is the concept of change.

The change I have spoken of today is not limited to our large cities—it is occurring in every city and town, large and small, across this land. For when we build new houses, we build them in Chisholm, Minn., as well as in New York City. When we develop new industries and new job opportunities, we develop them in Excelsior Springs, Mo., as well as in Los Angeles. When we seek a deep commitment to individual worth and citizen participation in the community, we seek this commitment in Baker, Oreg., as well as in Chicago.

The most vivid reflection of change in our society may occur in our large cities. But the fastest growing settlement in America today is the city with a population between 10,000 and 50,000.

Tradition teaches us that we are a rural nation. But history shows our basic unit of common destiny has been the small town—what one observer has called the "city upon a hill."

As we attempt to absorb and control the rapid change of the 1960's and the 1970's, let us remember that the society we seek to build is the society based on the principles of the small town—that "city upon a hill"—and the technology of our new megalopolis.

We can achieve this goal—if our starting point is the individual human being. He is the key pressure point in our system. When he moves, society moves. When he can do the job, society can do the job. When he is a competent citizen, our communities become competent communities, our cities become competent cities, and our society becomes a competent society.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I rise to commend with great enthusiasm the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. He has delivered an excellent speech. In my judgment, his speech is one of the three or four most significant speeches I have heard in the 10 years I have been in the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut addressed himself to a major problem that faces this country: the cities; a problem that many people feel is insolvable.

Mr. President, I submit that there are few people in the United States who are better qualified to talk about this problem than the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who has been a distin-

guished Congressman, an outstanding Governor of a heavily urban State, a man with rare experience in urban problems in the Cabinet of President Kennedy as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and an outstanding Senator.

I think that what should be stressed about this speech is its unique quality. It does not simply take programs we have had in the past and suggest that they be polished up and shifted in a different direction. It does not just shift people around in the executive branch.

The Senator from Connecticut has sketched a most ambitious program. He talked in new terms—the “competent” city—and the “model neighborhood.” He proposes “guaranteed jobs,” a far more congenial concept to the overwhelming majority of Senators than guaranteed annual income, yet striking at the same vital and difficult problem of long-term unemployment.

He has talked about an interest subsidization program which may be shocking to many but could provide a great deal of good housing for a small investment and 100 percent private ownership. I think the Senator from Connecticut has given it a new explanation and a new understanding that is most helpful to us. He has talked about loan guarantees, economic planning through the Federal Reserve districts, the availability of 3-percent housing money for those with incomes between \$5,000 and \$8,000; and also research—research to get at the very heavy cost of housing; research which we have not had that we should have and must have, and which will save itself money many times over in the process of developing cheaper methods of producing homes.

Above all, the Senator from Connecticut has given us a rationalized Government reorganization proposal. He has shown how, in spite of the fact that we have competent Presidents who have been deeply concerned with this problem, our urban agencies have grown like Topsy and need the firm touch of the Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the Government Operations Committee, as well as the specific and particular understanding which the Senator from Connecticut brings to this problem.

I should like to ask the Senator two very brief questions. I know that the Senator from Virginia has been waiting, but I shall not take very long.

A series of figures has been given, and I think it would be helpful if we could have them clarified a little more.

As I understand it, the Senator proposes a program of \$50 billion over a 10-year period, beginning in 1970 or 1971—\$5 billion a year—for the purpose of providing for new housing. As I understand it, this would be the cost of what is it?—the Federal Government's, the overall cost?

Mr. RIBICOFF. This is to be the overall cost of supplying the new housing to wipe out 4½ million substandard housing units in all the slums and rundown neighborhoods of America.

Mr. PROXMIRE. And the portion of the Federal Government's outlay would be substantially less than this?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It would be less, but

since much of this housing would be on a nonprofit basis, one could assume that the major portion would be Federal, but it would go on the basis of the model cities program which we passed in demonstration cities, in which is provided that the Federal Government would pay up to 80 per cent to the cities. The cities' contribution would also contemplate investments by private enterprise, but I would assume, in order to do the job right, in fairness to the Senate—that the \$50 billion would be \$50 billion of Federal funds to do this job and do it right, and on a Federal basis we should be prepared to contribute \$5 billion each year for 10 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator cited the overall urban cost for housing and everything else over a period of 12 years, which would be something like \$1 trillion which is, of course, a thousand billion dollars—a fantastic sum of money. He said that approximately 20 percent, as I understand it, of that money, would be Federal funds. As I understand it, the Senator has the notion—with which I believe many economists would wholeheartedly agree—that this \$200 billion of Federal funds would be seed money and would involve \$800 billion expenditures by private enterprise; that this would nurture great economic growth which would result in an enormous increase in income and, therefore, in greater revenues by the Federal Government; that the net cost would be far less than \$200 billion and we would very possibly, not necessarily, have to increase tax rates. This is because the urban investment would increase incomes of individuals and business growth with a corresponding increase in Federal revenues. Is this correct?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe that the Senator is correct. One of the most distinguished bankers in the United States, David Rockefeller, president of one of the largest banks, Chase Manhattan—if it is not the largest bank in America—estimated that it would involve \$5 of private money for every \$1 of Federal Government money. Other economists have put the ratio at 7 to 1—that is, \$7 private money to every \$1 of Government money.

The Senator from Wisconsin is absolutely correct. We should keep in mind—and we must keep in mind—that the gross national product has reached the \$750 billion mark. By 1973, the economists estimate that the gross national product will then reach \$1 trillion.

Thus, we are generating a fantastic, rapidly growing economy. This rapidly growing economy will certainly generate a substantial amount of Federal revenue, even based on the present rate of growth and that a major portion of the program, starting in the year 1970, when I am hopeful—I pray, and I am sure that all of us pray—that the crisis in Vietnam will be over, will free approximately \$25 billion which we are now spending there out of Federal resources. Thus, it could be done without additional taxes. Whether it can be done without additional taxes, naturally, will depend on many other basic problems which America will face. What those commitments will be at that time we cannot foresee,

of course, at this time—which I must say in all honesty.

Mr. PROXMIRE. One last question, one on which the Senator from Connecticut may or may not wish to comment—that is this notion of the guaranteed job. This is not quite so shocking as the guaranteed annual income, which is something to which I am almost instinctively or automatically opposed—but the guaranteed job carries the notion that everyone will get a job whether he is competent or whether he is willing to work hard or whether he is willing to deserve it on merit.

I am sure this is not the position of the Senator from Connecticut because I know how strongly he feels on this matter. At the same time, it does raise certain very difficult questions. It is a new concept. It would be most helpful, I think, to explain this, in view of the guaranteed annual income which has great appeal but is not acceptable.

Mr. RIBICOFF. There has been much debate about it and a great deal of writing in the intellectual community concerning the so-called negative income tax, the guaranteed annual income, and the family allowance. Let me say that I am against all three. I think that what the people in the slums and the people on welfare need and want most is self-respect, their individual worth.

It was most interesting that during the course of hearing testimony, Dr. Kenneth Clark, himself a Negro, chairman of the City College of New York and an outstanding sociologist, was bitterly opposed to the guaranteed income, or the negative income tax concept. The Reverend Leon Sullivan, who has done such yeoman work in Philadelphia told us:

Our people want their self-respect. Do not destroy it. Anything you give to the people on a handout basis, no matter what the sum, will take away their self-respect, will take away their feeling of worth.

This is something we should avoid at all costs. But the guaranteed job, where we say to any man who is able, any man who is employable, any man who is trainable in an employable job of some sort or another, where he earns the dollars he receives, which is the real American concept, that is what our obligation should be as Americans, to come up with a program to guarantee everyone who wants to work a job.

I am unalterably opposed to giving a handout to people either through the negative income tax, the family allowance, or the guaranteed annual income, if they themselves are employable.

It becomes another problem if they are aged, or sick, or cannot work. Then it becomes another problem which we must look at.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I want to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I am impressed and informed by his outstanding speech today. Let me say, incidentally, regarding the Employment Act of 1946, that it provides for high employment. This has been interpreted by many Members of Congress and many economists as providing some basis for an approach to the notion of the guaranteed job.

I think that the fact that the Senator from Connecticut is on that committee

will help us greatly in working out some of the ideas which can advance this program, and advance it swiftly.

As the Senator stated in his speech, quoting Johnnie Scott:

A young author from Watts * * * described the ghetto this way: "The ghetto is not the houses. It is the people."

The way to improve this situation is to improve the opportunity for these people to maintain their self-respect.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut. Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], has made a thoughtful speech dealing with the problems of our cities. I appreciate the opportunity and the privilege I have had of reading it in advance of its delivery today.

The Senator is deeply concerned about the problems of urban America, has devoted long hours to the arduous task of exploring them, and has attracted widespread and useful public attention to them. I congratulate him upon these efforts and will certainly give thoughtful consideration to the specific proposals which he advances to deal with these problems.

I appreciate the thoughtful references which the able Senator makes to the work of my own Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, which has been involved since its creation in the operation of the federal system and the relationships of the Federal, State, and local levels of government.

The work of the two subcommittees—Senator RIBICOFF's dealing with the organization of the Federal Government and mine, dealing with interlevel organization—is obviously complementary.

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, in its staff studies, inquiries to Federal, State, and local officials, hearings, and legislative proposals, has explored the problems of administering Federal grant-in-aid programs, improving the coordination of cooperative Federal-State-local programs, improving the quality of personnel at the State and local level, providing uniform policies in relocation assistance under various Federal aid, strengthening regional and metropolitan planning operations, programs, and developing an improved mechanism for policy planning and coordination of Federal aid programs in the executive branch. All of these areas are intimately concerned with the viability of our metropolitan centers. Some of our recommendations were incorporated in the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

Senator RIBICOFF's concern, and the concern of his Subcommittee on Government Reorganization, has been more directly involved with the internal organization of the Federal departments and agencies with responsibilities for Federal programs affecting our urban areas. I am glad that he is pursuing this concern and I look forward to continued cooperative efforts in this area.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to compliment the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for this thoughtful and

idea-packed presentation. His speech today should stimulate a continuation of the effort to build a better America in our cities.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Connecticut on his comprehensive statement. He has made a number of constructive proposals which deserve the close attention and careful consideration of Congress.

These are not proposals for the distant future. They are not the proposals of a visionary academic, but rather a sober assessment of some hard necessities of life by one of America's most capable public officials. We cannot postpone action. The issues which we face in our cities go to the question of the survival of our society. They deserve the highest priority consideration.

Senator RIBICOFF's statement today is a culmination of an effort over the last 6 months in which he has really educated the entire Nation. The hearings on urban problems which he conducted will be required reading for an understanding of the problems of our cities for years to come. We heard the city and its problems examined from every angle—the Federal officials who have urban responsibilities, mayors of cities large and small, scholars from a variety of different fields, and the people of the cities themselves.

I think every American who is interested in understanding why our cities have staggering financial problems, why they seem to fall further and further behind in dealing with problems of slum housing and inadequate schools, air and water pollution and traffic congestion, and why we have failed to bring millions of Americans into the mainstream of our society was educated by the hearings which Senator RIBICOFF conducted.

We now know much more than we knew before about the nature of the problem, and Senator RIBICOFF, with his thoughtful speech today, offers us some useful suggestions as to what we must do to meet these problems. I was glad to be associated with the Senator from Connecticut in the hearings on urban problems and I am delighted to associate myself with his remarks today on the Senate floor.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills referred to in my remarks be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 581

[Referred to the Committee on Public Works]

A bill to add a new title VIII to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by adding a new Title VIII—

TITLE VIII—URBAN REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 801. (a) In order that additional vitally needed job opportunities may be provided to benefit the areas of concentrated unemployment now existing within the Nation's urban areas, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to designate as "urban redevelopment areas" those urban areas having a minimum population of 20,000 persons which the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, determines manifest the greatest degree of economic distress on the basis of objective criteria which he shall from time to time publish by regulation. In establishing or revising such criteria, the Secretary shall first consult with the Secretaries of Labor and of Housing and Urban Development and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and shall otherwise actively seek the advice and counsel of interested departments and agencies of the Federal Government in ascertaining the most effective means of carrying out the program authorized under this Title within urban areas.

(2) to provide financial assistance in accordance with the authority and criteria of Title II of this Act, except as may be herein otherwise provided, if he finds that (A) the project is located in or near such area and will primarily or substantially benefit the residents of such area by providing new employment opportunities or by substantially furthering the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and (B) such assistance is consistent with a comprehensive plan or program which includes such area and which provides assurance of activities or services which will complement or be complemented by such projects. Before providing such financial assistance, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to insure that the comprehensive plan or program, and the project for which the financial assistance is requested, is consistent with any urban development or anti-poverty that may exist in such area.

(b) The Secretary may waive the requirements of this Act pertaining to overall economic development programs with respect to areas designated or projects approved under the title.

(c) Section 402, but not section 401, of this Act shall apply to urban redevelopment areas designated under this section, except as herein otherwise provided.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "urban redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as an urban redevelopment area.

SEC. 2. Section 202(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by striking out "and (2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2)"; and

(2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and (3) to enter into contracts to pay, and to pay annually, for not more than ten years, to or on behalf of private business entities amounts sufficient to reduce by 2 percentage points the interest paid by such entities on loans which are not obtained from Government sources or guaranteed by any Government agency, provide for annual amortization of principal, and the proceeds of which are used for purposes for which the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness or make loans under this section; except that, subject to limitations in annual appropriation Acts, the annual cost of new contracts entered into under this clause in any one year shall not exceed \$5,000,000."

SEC. 3. Section 201(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is

further amended by striking out all that follows "1966" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and shall not exceed \$1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 and for each fiscal year thereafter through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

S. 582

[Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency]

A bill to establish a program of economic analysis and evaluation in the Federal Reserve System

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Reserve Act is amended by adding after section 13a, a new section as follows:

"Sec. 13b. (a) Each Federal Reserve bank shall undertake on a continuing basis a program of analysis and evaluation of the economic problems and opportunities existing within its district with a view to providing a readily accessible and current source of data to assist in the economic growth and development of the district, the formulation of economic goals for the district, and the shaping of policies necessary for the implementation of such goals.

"(b) There is hereby established in each Federal Reserve district an advisory council for economic growth, to be appointed by the Federal Reserve bank for such district, subject to the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and to be composed of not less than 12 persons who, by experience or training, are eminently well qualified to render service on the council. Insofar as practicable the interests of government, business, labor, the academic community, and the public shall be represented in such council. Each member appointed thereto shall serve without compensation but shall be entitled to receive from the Federal Reserve bank of such district his necessary expenses while engaged in the business of such council, or a per diem allowance in lieu thereof to be fixed by such bank with the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Such council shall analyze and interpret economic factors affecting such district and submit to the Federal Reserve bank, from time to time, such reports and recommendations as it determines to be desirable in furtherance of the economic growth and development of the district. Such bank shall cause any such reports and recommendations to be distributed to interested persons and organizations, public and private."

S. 583

[Referred to the Committee on Finance]

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an incentive for industry to establish programs to educate and train individuals in needed skills and to establish on-the-job-training programs for employees by allowing a credit against income tax for the expenses of conducting such programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 40 as section 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"Sec. 40. Expenses of education and training programs.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to the provisions of subpart C, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year the amount of education and training program expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year.

"(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as

may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section and subpart C."

Sec. 2. Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subpart:

"SUBPART C—RULES FOR COMPUTING CREDIT FOR EXPENSES OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"Sec. 51. Limitation on amount of credit.

"Sec. 52. Definitions.

"Sec. 53. Special rules.

"Sec. 51. Limitation on amount of credit.

"(a) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The credit allowed by section 40 for the taxable year shall not exceed—

"(A) so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as does not exceed \$25,000, plus

"(b) 50 percent of so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as exceeds \$25,000.

"(2) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the liability for tax for the taxable year shall be the tax imposed by this chapter for such year, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under—

"(A) section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit),

"(B) section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest),

"(C) section 37 (relating to retirement income), and

"(D) section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

For purposes of this paragraph, any tax imposed for the taxable year by section 531 (relating to accumulated earnings tax) or by section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax) shall not be considered tax imposed by this chapter for such year.

"(3) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a husband or wife who files a separate return, the amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be \$12,500 in lieu of \$25,000. This paragraph shall not apply if the spouse of the taxpayer has no education and training program expenses for, and no unused credit carryback or carryover to, the taxable year of such spouse which ends within or with the taxpayer's taxable year.

"(4) AFFILIATED GROUPS.—In the case of an affiliated group, the \$25,000 amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) shall be reduced for each member of the group by apportioning \$25,000 among the members of such group in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'affiliated group' has the meaning assigned to such term by section 1504(a), except that all corporations shall be treated as includible corporations (without any exclusion under section 1504(b)).

"(b) CARRYBACK AND CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDITS.—

"(1) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—If the amount of the credit determined under section 40 for any taxable year exceeds the limitation provided by subsection (a) (1) for such taxable year (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as 'unused credit year'), such excess shall be—

"(A) an education and training program credit carryback to each of the 3 taxable years preceding the unused credit year, and

"(B) an education and training program credit carryover to each of the 7 taxable years following the unused credit year, and shall be added to the amount allowable as a credit by section 40 for such years, except that such excess may be a carryback only to a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1966. The entire amount of the unused credit for an unused credit year shall be

carried to the earliest of the 10 taxable years to which (by reason of subparagraphs (A) and (B)) such credit may be carried and then to each of the other 9 taxable years to the extent that, because of the limitation contained in paragraph (2), such unused credit may not be added for a prior taxable year to which such unused credit may be carried.

"(2) LIMITATION.—The amount of the unused credit which may be added under paragraph (1) for any preceding or succeeding taxable year shall not exceed the amount by which the limitation provided by subsection (a) (1) for such taxable year exceeds the sum of—

"(A) the credit allowable under section 40 for such taxable year, and

"(B) the amounts which, by reason of this subsection, are added to the amount allowable for such taxable year and attributable to taxable years preceding the unused credit year.

"(3) EFFECT OF NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYBACK.—To the extent that the excess described in paragraph (1) arises by reason of a net operating loss carryback, subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall not apply.

"Sec. 52. Definitions.

"(a) EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'education and training program expense' means only an expense which, but for the provisions of section 53(a), is allowable as a deduction under this chapter and which—

"(A) is incurred by the taxpayer in providing one or more approved education and training programs and is directly attributable to such a program, or

"(B) is incurred by the taxpayer in providing one or more approved employee training programs and is directly attributable to such a program.

"(2) LIMITATIONS.—An expense shall not be treated as an education and training program expense if such expense would have been incurred by the taxpayer in the conduct of his trade or business without regard to any approved education and training program or approved employee training program provided by him. An expense incurred by the taxpayer in providing an approved employee training program shall not be treated as an education and training program expense to the extent such expense is incurred with respect to an employee who has received training under such program for more than one year.

"(b) APPROVED EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'approved education and training program' means only a program which—

"(A) is designed to afford education or training, or both, in trade, business, industrial, technological, or scientific skills, and

"(B) has been approved by the Secretary of Labor as fulfilling the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart.

"(2) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary of Labor shall not approve any education and training program—

"(A) unless such program is made available (within the limitations of the facilities in which such program is conducted) to all qualified applicants.

"(B) if any fee or charge of any kind is required of individuals applying for or participating in the program; or

"(C) if, in selecting participants in the program, any preference of any kind is given to employees or prospective employees of the taxpayer.

"(2) WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall withdraw his approval of an education and training program pre-

viously approved by him if he determines that such program—

"(A) no longer fulfills the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart, or

"(B) is being conducted contrary to any provision of paragraph (2).

"(c) APPROVED EMPLOYEE TRAINING PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'approved employee training program' means only a program of an employer which—

"(A) is designed to afford training on the job, or to afford education in basic subjects, or both, to his employees, and

"(B) has been approved by the Secretary of Labor as fulfilling the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart.

"(2) WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall withdraw his approval of an employee training program previously approved by him if he determines that such program no longer fulfills the standards, requirements, and conditions prescribed by him for purposes of this subpart.

"Sec. 53. Special rules.

"(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING EXPENSES.—For purposes of the tax imposed by this chapter, no deduction shall be allowed under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) or under any other provision of this chapter for any education and training program expense.

"(b) SUBCHAPTER S CORPORATIONS.—In the case of an electing small business corporation (as defined in section 1371)—

"(1) the education and training program expenses for each taxable year shall be apportioned pro rata among the persons who are shareholders of such corporation on the last day of such taxable year, and

"(2) any person to whom any education and training program expense has been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expense.

"(c) ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—In the case of an estate or trust—

"(1) the education and training program expenses for any taxable year shall be apportioned between the estate or trust and the beneficiaries on the basis of the income of the estate or trust allocable to each,

"(2) any beneficiary to whom any education and training program expense has been apportioned under paragraph (1) shall be treated (for purposes of this subpart) as the taxpayer with respect to such expense, and

"(3) the \$25,000 amount specified under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 51(a) (1) applicable to such estate or trust shall be reduced to an amount which bears the same ratio to \$25,000 as the amount of the education and training program expenses allocated to the estate or trust under paragraph (1) bears to the entire amount of the education and training program expenses.

"(d) LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN PERSONS.—In the case of—

"(1) an organization to which section 593 applies,

"(2) a regulated investment company or a real estate investment trust subject to taxation under subchapter M (sec. 851 and following), and

"(3) a cooperative organization described in section 1381(a), rules similar to the rules provided in section 46(d) shall apply under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(e) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For application of this subpart to certain acquiring corporations, see section 381(c) (24)."

SEC. 3. (a) The table of subparts for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SUBPART C. Rules for computing credit for expenses of education and training programs."

(b) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out

"Sec. 40. Overpayments of tax."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 40. Expenses of education and training programs.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

(c) Section 381(c) of such Code (relating to items taken into account in certain corporate acquisitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(24) CREDIT UNDER SECTION 40 FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.—The acquiring corporation shall take into account (to the extent proper to carry out the purposes of this section and section 40, and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) the items required to be taken into account for purposes of section 40 in respect of the distributor or transferor corporation."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

S. 584

[Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare]

A bill to provide for the development, encouragement, and operation if necessary of Centers for Occupational Education and Training, for the strengthening and improvement of the manpower sources offered by the Department of Labor, 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 "Manpower Services and Educational Opportunity Act".

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER SERVICES

Transfers from the Office of Economic Opportunity

SEC. 101. (a) The functions of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under part A (relating to the Job Corps), part B (relating to the Neighborhood Youth Corps), part D (relating to special impact programs) of title I and title V (relating to Work Experience programs) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

(b) All personnel, property, records, obligations, commitments and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines are used primarily with respect to any function transferred under the provisions of this section, are transferred to the Department of Labor.

Transfer matters

SEC. 102. All laws relating to any office, agency, or function transferred under this Act shall, insofar as such laws are applicable, remain in full force and effect. Any transfer of personnel pursuant to this Act shall be without change in classification or compensation, except that this requirement shall not operate to prevent the adjustment of classification or compensation to conform to the duties to which such transferred personnel may be assigned. All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by any office or agency or in connection with any function transferred by this Act, and in effect at the time of the transfer, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed. No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against any office or agency or any officer of the United States

acting in his official capacity shall abate by reason of any transfer made pursuant to this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such transfer takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the appropriate office or agency or officer of the United States.

Authorization

SEC. 103. The Secretary of Labor shall carry out the programs under title I and title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which are transferred under section 102 of this title, for the period ending June 30, 1968, and for the two succeeding fiscal years.

Effective date

SEC. 104. The provisions of this title shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days following the date on which this title is approved by the President, or on such earlier date as the President shall specify by Executive Order.

TITLE II—CENTERS FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Statement of purpose

SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to develop, encourage, and where necessary operate, Centers for Occupational Education and Training for the purpose of developing and improving the skills of individuals who would benefit thereby and who desire to participate in programs offered by such Centers.

Authority of secretary

SEC. 202. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this title, the Secretary of Labor (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") shall develop, encourage, and assist programs for Centers of Occupational Education and Training, and where necessary establish, operate, and maintain such Centers.

(b) Programs under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) the development of plans for the establishment of such Centers in metropolitan areas:

(2) the encouragement of State or local public agencies or private nonprofit institutions to participate in the development and operation of such Centers in accordance with the provisions of this title;

(3) the development of financial assistance criteria for such agencies or institutions based upon the relative need of the metropolitan area for such a center and the relative ability of any such agency or institution to offer such training and education, and the furnishing of such assistance upon conditions which are consistent with this title;

(4) the establishment, operation, and maintenance of programs (including the lease or construction of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment) for such Centers in accordance with the provisions of this title through agreements with such agencies or institutions;

(5) the establishment, operation or maintenance of such Centers, directly, whenever the Secretary determines that it is necessary because agreements with such an agency or institution is not practicable;

(6) the providing of the following services and activities by such Centers—

(A) educational courses equivalent to the two-year community college curricula, and one or two year vocational or occupational training programs, designed to cover the widest possible range of technical and sub-professional skills;

(B) short training courses designed to develop or improve the skills of individuals unable or unwilling to complete formal education and training;

(C) adult education courses designed to assist individuals to prepare for vocational or occupational training;

(D) prevocational training for individuals who need such training to develop their capacities to choose an appropriate vocation; and

(E) such other activities and services (including guidance, counseling, referral, and health training) as the Secretary deems appropriate for such Centers; and

(7) such other activities and services as the Secretary deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

Limitations

SEC. 203. No funds appropriated pursuant to section 208 of this title may be used for any such Center of Occupational Education and Training unless—

(1) the State or local public agency or private nonprofit institution establishing, operating or maintaining such Center will assure that such agency or institution will pay the non-Federal share, if any, of the cost of a program for such Center;

(2) no tuition or other fees will be charged for individuals participating in any program offered by such Center; and

(3) no entrance requirements except enrollment and regular attendance will be imposed for such Center;

(4) such agency or institution will furnish such reports and follow such fund accounting procedures as the Secretary deems necessary;

(5) where practical and appropriate, residential facilities will be provided at such Center for such individuals as the Secretary determines cannot commute to such Center; and

(6) the activities and services of such Center will be coordinated to the extent possible with any programs of referral, guidance, counseling, training and placement deemed appropriate by the Secretary, particularly programs for which such individuals may be eligible under the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes", approved June 6, 1933, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Adult Education Act of 1966.

Administration

SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions under this title, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Department of Labor and Manpower Services.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or non-profit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

(c) Whenever the Secretary establishes, operates, or maintains a Center for Occupational Education and Training in accordance with section 202 (b) (5), he may exercise any or all of the functions necessary to the establishment, maintenance and operation of such Center in accordance with the provisions of this title.

Advisory Committee on Centers for Occupational Education and Training

SEC. 205. (a) The President shall appoint a National Advisory Committee on Centers for Occupational Education and Training consisting of the Secretary who shall be chairman and nine other members appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and solely on the basis of their fitness to perform the duties of the Committee under this title. At least six of the members so appointed shall be representative of the fields of business, labor, and education.

(b) The Committee shall advise the Secretary with respect to (1) the development and preparation of the plans for Centers for Occupational Education and Training, particularly recommendations concerning the encouragement of State and local public agencies and private nonprofit institutions establishing such Centers, (2) review the administration of this title, and (3) make recommendations for the improvement of the administration of this title.

(c) The Committee shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this Act) to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(d) Members of the Committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding \$75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in government service employed intermittently.

Labor standards

SEC. 206. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors on construction projects which are federally assisted in whole or in part under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (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 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 207. As used in this title—

(a) The term "State" means the several States of the Union and the District of Columbia.

(v) The term "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate for the purposes of this title.

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 208. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title such funds as may be necessary.

S. 585

[Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare]

A bill to provide meaningful public service employment opportunities to unemployed individuals with serious competitive disadvantages, 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 "Public Service Employment Opportunity Act".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that there is a critical need to create employment opportunities for unemployed individuals with serious competitive disadvantages; that at a time of unusual economic prosperity the number of such individuals is increasing at an alarming rate; and that at the same time a huge backlog of public service needs in parks, streets, slums, countryside, schools and colleges, hospitals, nursing homes and rest homes has developed in the United States.

(b) It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide meaningful job opportunities in the public service field for unemployed individuals with serious competitive disadvantages.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall carry out the provisions of this Act through a "Public Service Employment Administration" (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") which he shall establish in the Department of Commerce.

(b) The Administration shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for Level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule under section 5315 of title 5 of the United States Code. The Administrator shall perform such duties relating to the administration of this Act as are delegated to him by the Secretary.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 4. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall initiate, develop and conduct programs to increase meaningful public service employment opportunities for unemployed individuals with serious competitive disadvantages. Such programs shall include—

(1) the development, by means he determines to be appropriate, of public service employment opportunities in Federal, State and local governmental agencies and any other public and private nonprofit agencies;

(2) the development of financial assistance criteria for such agencies and provisions for extending financial assistance (or transfers in the case of a Federal agency) to such agencies;

(3) the encouragement of the submission of proposals by such agencies to carry out the purposes of this Act;

(4) the development and carrying out of proposals by such agencies which contain provisions to assure, that, to the extent practical, such agency will—

(A) share the financial burden of the program proposed;

(B) provide for integrating such individuals into the regular work schedule, and enforcing normal performance standards;

(C) provide for the payment of prevailing wages, but in no case less than the minimum wage prescribed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; and

(D) provide such information, including fund accounting procedures, as the Secretary determines appropriate;

(5) the effective coordination of all activities carried out under the authority of this Act with such other programs designed to assist the referral, training, recruiting, and placement of such individuals as the Secretary determines will be beneficial; and

(6) such other activities or services as the Secretary may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) (1) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions under this Act to any officer or employee of the Administration.

(2) In administering the provisions of this Act the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

STUDY OF HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYMENT

SEC. 5. The Secretary in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and after consultation with appropriate governmental agencies, private organizations and individuals, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation of the nature and cause of hard-core unemployment, which shall include case studies of unemployed individuals. The Secretary

shall report not later than January 31, 1969, the results of such investigation together with such recommendations for additional action (including recommendations for amendments to this Act) as he determines will increase public service employment opportunities for such individuals.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON PUBLIC SERVICE IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 6. (a) The President shall appoint a National Advisory Council on Public Service Employment Opportunities consisting of the Administrator who shall be chairman and nine other members appointed without regard to the civil service laws on the basis of their fitness to perform the duties of the Council under this Act. At least six of the members so appointed shall be representative of the fields of business, labor and social welfare.

(b) The Council shall (1) advise the Administrator with respect to the development of programs and activities designed to carry out the purposes of this Act, including recommendations concerning the study authorized by section 5, (2) review the administration of this Act, and (3) make recommendations for the improvement of the programs and activities carried on pursuant to this Act with particular attention to the encouragement of new public service improvement opportunities.

(c) The Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this Act) to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(d) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding \$75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act \$2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, through June 30, 1973, inclusive.

S. 586

[Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare]

A bill to provide for a census every five years of the Nation's urban area

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 5 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 142 a new section as follows:

"§ 143. URBAN AREAS

"The Secretary shall, in the year 1967 and every five years thereafter, take a census of the Nation's urban areas. Each such census shall include, data on population, housing, employment, welfare recipients, community health facilities, and such other matters as the Secretary shall, after consultation with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, deem appropriate."

SEC. 2. The analysis of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto a new item as follows:

"143. Urban areas."

S. 587

[Referred to the Committee on Finance]

A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide a special day care services program for pre-school children from families whose annual income does not exceed \$6,000

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 526 thereof the following:

"SPECIAL DAY CARE SERVICE PROGRAM

"SEC. 527. (a) In order to assist States which have plans for child-welfare services which have been developed as provided in the provisions of this part (other than this section) to provide day care services under such plans with respect to children under 6 years of age who come from families with an annual income not in excess of \$6,000, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of \$500,000,000.

"(b) The sum appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall be allotted by the Secretary for use by cooperating State public welfare agencies, which have plans developed jointly by the State agency and the Secretary, as follows: He shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sum so appropriated for such year as the special need preschool population (as defined in subsection —) bears to the special need preschool population of all the States.

"(c) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (b) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Secretary will not be required for the purposes for which allotted shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in carrying out such purposes for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under subsection (a), and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts during such fiscal year. Such reallocations shall be made on the basis of the need for additional funds in carrying out such purposes, after taking into consideration the special need preschool population, and the per capita income of each State as compared with the special need preschool population, and the per capita income of all such States with respect to which such a determination by the Secretary has been made. Any amount so reallocated to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (b).

"(d) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a) and allotment available under this part, the Secretary shall from time to time pay to each State that has, in connection with its plan for child-welfare services which has been developed as provided in the provisions of this part (other than this section), a plan for day care services for special need preschool children developed as provided in this section an amount determined under the following sentence of the total sum expended under the plan developed as provided in this section (including the cost of administration of such plan). Amounts paid under this section shall be paid in like manner to that provided for the payment of amounts under section 523 and under like conditions (except to the extent that the Secretary shall otherwise by regulations provide whenever he deems such conditions to be inconsistent with the purposes of this section); except that, with respect to expenditures to carry out the purposes of this section, the Federal share of each State shall be 90 per centum.

"(e) For purposes of this section, the term 'special need preschool population' means the population which consists of chil-

dren under six years of age who are from families with an annual income which does not exceed \$6,000."

S. 588

[Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency]

A bill to amend title I of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 104(a) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In the planning of any such program the city demonstration agency shall conduct studies and research (including the undertaking of specific projects on a trial basis) leading to the development of a comprehensive city demonstration program which will provide for maximum utilization of advanced technology, cost reduction techniques, and such other new and innovative concepts and procedures as may be pertinent to the effective and economical implementation of such program."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 111(a) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended by striking out "\$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$304,000,000 for each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1967, and ending prior to July 1, 1970."

(b) Section 111(b) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows "107," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed \$5,000,000,000 for each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1970, and ending prior to July 1, 1980."

S. 589

[Referred to the Committee on Finance]

A bill to require that State plans under titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act provide for the establishment and maintenance of health and safety standards for rental housing occupied by recipients of assistance under such titles

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2(a) (10) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (B) and by inserting after clause (C) the following new clause:

"(D) provide for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of health and safety for the quarters or other premises in which recipients of such assistance reside and which are secured on a rental basis; and"

(b) Section 1602(a) of such Act is amended by redesignating paragraphs (15), (16), and (17) as paragraphs (16), (17), and (18), and by inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

"(15) provide for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards of health and safety for the quarters or other premises in which recipients of aid to the aged, blind, disabled and dependent children reside and which are secured on a rental basis; and"

(c) The amendments made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1968.

S. 590

[Referred to the Committee on Finance]

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist the States in conducting State health census surveys of pre-school-age children residing in the State

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the Social Security Act is amended by adding after title XIX thereof the following:

"TITLE XX—GRANTS TO STATES TO CONDUCT HEALTH CENSUS SURVEY OF PRE-SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN

"Appropriation

"SEC. 2001. For the purpose of enabling each State to conduct a continuing program of health census surveys of pre-school-age children, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year a sum sufficient to carry out the provisions of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, State plans for a continuing program of health census surveys of pre-school-age children in such State.

"State plans for health census surveys

"SEC. 2002. (a) A State plan for health census surveys of pre-school-age children must—

"(1) provide that the plan will be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;

"(2) provide for financial participation by the State;

"(3) either provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan, or provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to supervise the administration of the plan;

"(4) provide such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods, and including provision for utilization of professional medical and other health-care personnel in the administration of the plan) as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

"(5) provide that health census surveys will be conducted among the pre-school-age children of each community within the State periodically (but not less often than once during each twelve-month period);

"(6) provide that, in carrying out such census surveys, the children who are the subject thereof shall be examined for conditions of vision, hearing, mental retardation, and such other health conditions or defects as the Secretary shall by regulations require;

"(7) provide that the parent of (or other person standing in loco parentis to) any child who is the subject of any health census survey conducted under the State plan shall be apprised of the health condition of such child, as revealed by such survey; and

"(8) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which excludes any child residing in the State from any health census survey authorized under such plan because such child is not a citizen of the United States, is not a citizen of such State, or has not resided for any prescribed length of time within such State.

"Payment to States

"SEC. 2003. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary shall pay to each State which has a plan approved under this title, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing January 1, 1967, an amount equal to 80 per centum of the sums

expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.

"(b) (1) Prior to the beginning of each quarter, the Secretary shall estimate the amount to which a State will be entitled under subsection (a) for such quarter, such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State for expenditures to carry out the State plan in such quarter, and if such amount is less than the State's proportionate share of the total sum necessary to carry out such plan (in accordance with subsection (a)), the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other investigations as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall then pay, in such installments as he may determine, to the State the amount so estimated, reduced or increased to the extent of any overpayment or underpayment which the Secretary determines was made under this section to such State for any prior quarter and with respect to which adjustment has not already been made under this subsection.

"(3) Upon the making of any estimate by the Secretary under this subsection, any appropriations available for payments under this section shall be deemed obligated.

"Operation of State plans

"SEC. 2004. If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under this title, finds—

"(1) that the plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 2002; or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made of the State (or, in his discretion, that payments will be limited to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure), until the Secretary is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied he shall make no further payments to categories under or parts of the State plan not affected by such failure."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "XVI, and XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, XXI, and XX".

(b) Section 1116(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "XVI, or XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, XIX, or XX".

(c) Section 1116(a)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "1604, or 1904" and inserting in lieu thereof "1604, 1904, or 2004".

(d) Section 1116(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "XVI, or XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, XIX, or XX".

(e) Section 1116(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "XVI, or XIX" and inserting in lieu thereof "XVI, XIX, or XX".

S. 591

[Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency]

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance for the control of rodents in urban areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to make grants to States and local public bodies to assist in carrying out local programs for rodent control in urban areas. The Secretary shall es-

tablish criteria for such programs to assure that each program represents a significant and effective community effort which will provide more than a temporary alleviation of the social and economic ills caused by rodents. Such criteria may include provision for the training of personnel in the use of new and improved rodent-control methods and materials. Grants under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the amount by which the cost of the activities carried on by the applicant during a fiscal year under an approved program exceeds its usual expenditures for comparable activities.

(b) As used in this section—

(1) The term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States.

(2) The term "local public bodies" includes municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; and public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under this section such sums as may be necessary.

S. 592

[Referred to the Committee on Finance]

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include as charitable contributions those contributions made to non-profit organizations formed to promote urban renewal

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of charitable contribution) is amended by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) A corporation or organization which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) and—

"(A) which is created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States;

"(B) which is organized and operated exclusively to promote or assist urban renewal; and

"(C) no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

A contribution or gift shall be deductible by reason of this paragraph only if it is to be used within the United States or any of its possessions exclusively to promote or assist urban renewal."

(b) Section 170(b)(1)(A) (relating to contribution which qualify for 30 percent limitation rule) is amended by striking out "subsection (c)(2)" in clause (vi) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)(2) or (c)(6)".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1966.

S. 593

[Referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency]

A bill to expand the provisions of title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 to authorize matching grants with the States in aid of programs to provide special and advanced education to young persons showing unusual promise for leadership in urban affairs, and to carry out research and demonstration projects relating to the training of persons in self-help techniques for the rebuilding of their neighborhoods, and for other purposes

FEDERAL-STATE TRAINING PROGRAMS

SECTION 1. (a) Section 801 of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE"

"SEC. 801. (a) The Congress finds that the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas and urban population has caused severe problems in urban and suburban development and created a national need to (1) provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development, and (2) develop new or improved methods of dealing with community development problems.

"(b) It is the purpose of this part to assist and encourage the States, in cooperation with public or private universities and colleges and urban centers, to (1) organize, initiate, develop, and expand programs which will provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development to those technical and professional people who are, or are training to be, employed by a governmental or public body which has responsibilities for community development, (2) organize, initiate, develop, and expand special programs for advanced training of young persons showing unusual promise for leadership in urban affairs, (3) support State and local research that is needed in connection with housing programs and needs, public improvement programing, code problems, efficient land use, urban transportation, and similar community development problems, and (4) support State and local research, including demonstration projects to determine the most effective way of training residents of deteriorated or deteriorating urban areas in self-help techniques for rebuilding their physical environments."

(b) Section 802(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"MATCHING GRANTS TO STATES"

"SEC. 802. (a) Subject to the provisions of this part and in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, the Secretary may make matching grants to States to assist in—

"(1) (A) organizing, initiating, developing, or expanding programs to providing training in a variety of skills needed for economic and efficient community development to those technical and professional people who are, or are training to be, employed by a governmental or public body which has responsibilities for community development; and

"(B) supporting State and local research that is needed in connection with housing programs and needs, public improvement programing, code problems, efficient land use, urban transportation, and similar community development problems, and collecting, collating, and publishing statistics and information relating to such research;

"(2) organizing, initiating, developing, or expanding special programs to provide advanced training for young persons showing unusual promise for leadership in urban affairs; and

"(3) supporting State and local research, including demonstration projects, to determine the most effective way of training residents of deteriorated or deteriorating urban areas in self-help techniques for the rebuilding of their physical environments, and publishing statistics and information relating to such research and projects."

(c) Section 802(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated for grants to assist training and research activities described in subsection (a) (1) of this section not to exceed \$10,000,000.

"(2) There is authorized to be appropriated for grants to assist training activities described in subsection (a) (2) not to exceed \$5,000,000 for each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1967, and ending prior to July 1, 1972.

"(3) There is authorized to be appropriated for grants to assist research and demonstration projects described in subsection (a) (3) not to exceed \$5,000,000 for each fiscal

year commencing after June 30, 1967, and ending prior to July 1, 1972.

"(4) Appropriations authorized under this subsection shall remain available until expended."

(d) Section 803 of such Act is amended by striking out "the total" and inserting in lieu thereof "any".

(e) Section 804 of such Act is amended by striking out "Administrator" in inserting "Secretary".

(f) Section 805(a) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof "and the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

SEC. 2. Section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) striking out the first sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 annually to be used by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of providing fellowships in urban studies, including the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians and specialists";

(2) striking out "Housing and Home Finance Administrator" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Housing and Urban Development"; and

(3) striking out "the Administrator" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary".

URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

SEC. 3. Section 1011(e) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows:

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this section. At least one-half of the funds so appropriated shall be available only for studies, surveys, research, and analysis to be carried out under contract with public or private universities or colleges. All funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended."

SENATOR RIBICOFF'S REAFFIRMED SUPPORT OF HUMAN INVESTMENT CONCEPT APPLAUD

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] for his comprehensive presentation of "an action program for urban America," and in particular for his advocacy of tax credits to encourage job training by private business and industry.

In the 89th Congress I had the honor of being the Senate sponsor of the Human Investment Act, carefully conceived and drafted over a period of nearly a year to encourage high quality job training by private business through tax credits. Some 22 other Senators joined me in sponsoring the act. The Senator from Connecticut had his own bill along the same lines. In the other body, 85 Members joined Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS in introducing a companion measure. I am proud to state, Mr. President, that all 12 members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership have introduced the Human Investment Act, and that it has won the support of the Republican coordinating committee.

I applaud the reaffirmed support of the Senator from Connecticut for this important concept. I have now completed an improved and refined version of the Human Investment Act and expect to introduce it in a few days. I in-

tend to seek a wide base of sponsorship for the new bill, and hope that my friend from Connecticut will lend it his very influential support.

RESOLUTION BY ARKANSAS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the Arkansas Law Enforcement Officers Association at Hot Springs, Ark., on December 1, a resolution was adopted stating the association's position in the following areas:

First. Deploring decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which have rewritten the Bill of Rights in favor of the criminal and drastically limiting the rights and freedoms of law-abiding citizens.

Second. Commending my work and the work of others who have waged a fight against such decisions and practices which seriously handicap law enforcement.

Third. Urging fellow law enforcement officers to point out to the law-abiding public that they are the real victims of the bludgeon which is being wielded indiscriminately by the Nation's highest court over the heads of the Nation's police forces.

Fourth. Joining with law enforcement organizations across the country in a campaign to point up to Congress that it has the duty and power to curb the U.S. Supreme Court's extremism which is hampering the fair, efficient, effective, and impartial administration of justice.

Mr. President, I commend this association for its long history of outstanding work and service to the administration of justice in Arkansas and for its wisdom which is so ably reflected in this resolution.

As evidence that the fourth point of the above resolution is having an effect, the Arkansas Association of Chiefs of Police enacted a resolution similar to the one above on January 5, 1967. Later in the week, I shall make a speech on the Senate floor on our national crime problem and shall make further reference to this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the Arkansas Law Enforcement Officers Association inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas, a series of rulings during the past nine years by the U.S. Supreme Court has progressively handcuffed the police and made an impossible farce at times, of the American justice, all to the immense benefit of criminals, and

Whereas, on June 13, 1966, the Court went further than ever before in an overhasty trespass into the legislative area by announcing a new interpretation of the 175-year-old Fifth Amendment which requires law enforcement officers, in questioning suspects, not only first to warn them of their right to silence, but even to furnish him a lawyer to sit in on the interrogation if the suspect wishes, and

Whereas, the ruling makes it mandatory upon the police to stop questioning the suspect if the suspect indicates in any manner

that he does not desire to be questioned, and

Whereas, the Court is pursuing defensible doctrines beyond the realm of rationality and common sense, causing such extremism to spread through the Federal and State Appellate Courts, and

Whereas, holdups, purse-snatchings and muggings have now increased 305 percent in Washington, D.C., and the rate of success of police in solving crimes has been cut in half since the infamous Mallory decision which effectively handcuffed federal officers,

Now, therefore be it resolved by the executive committee of the Arkansas Law Enforcement Officers Association that we:

1. Go on record as deploring decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which have re-written the Bill of Rights in favor of the criminal and drastically limiting the rights and freedoms of law-abiding citizens.

2. Commend U.S. Senator John L. McClellan and others who have waged a fight against such decisions and practices which seriously handicap law enforcement and place our people at the mercy of criminals.

3. Urge our fellow law enforcement officers to point out to the law-abiding public that they are the real victims of the bludgeon which is being wielded indiscriminately by the nation's highest court over the heads of the nation's police forces.

4. Join with law enforcement organizations of Arkansas and other states in a campaign to point up to Congress that it has the duty and power to curb the U.S. Supreme Court's extremism which is hampering the fair, efficient, effective and impartial administration of justice.

Adopted this First Day of December, 1966, at Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas.

Signed:

FRED HAYES,
President.

Attest:

CARL L. MILLER,
Secretary.

"WORLD AIR TRAVEL IN THE FUTURE"—SPEECH BY JOHN C. BRIZENDINE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on October 27, 1966, at the Second International Congress on Air Technology at Hot Springs, Ark., Mr. John C. Brizendine, vice president for engineering of the Douglas Aircraft Division, spoke on world air travel in the future.

His remarks indicate that we are truly on the threshold of a revolutionary age in supersonic transportation. Knowledge of the contents of the speech will be a necessity to any Senator who is concerned with our ever-shrinking world and the closeness in time to which we have been brought by our supersonic travel to literally every part of the globe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brizendine's speech be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WORLD AIR TRAVEL IN THE FUTURE

The attendance at this Congress is impressive, and heartening.

It is heartening because this Congress recognizes that air technology has become a vital force in world social and economic development.

The fact that all of you could take the time to come here and participate in this forum is a tribute to our common interest.

We are able to be here because we are the recipients of the gift of time—made possible by air technology.

Today we are concerned with air transportation. And for our purposes today, it is irrelevant whether we are transporting people, or cargo, or communications.

For one viewpoint we could say our ultimate product is time—time gained through air transportation.

Our progress in improving this product has been remarkable. And perhaps just as remarkable is the fact that, when we compare our achievements with the promises air transportation holds for the future, we are still in a somewhat primitive stage.

Suppose, for instance, I opened my remarks today with these words:

Gentlemen, as I said in my talk in Tokyo tomorrow...

Fantastic? It certainly sounds fantastic, that a man could quote today from a talk he had already given tomorrow on the other side of the globe.

But it is not impossible. It is not even improbable.

The air vehicle that could sustain such a remark already is pretty well defined conceptually. It is an orbital-global rocket transport that could take you anywhere on earth in less than 1 hour.

This rocket transport, which we call Pegasus, would cut the Los Angeles-Tokyo trip time to 30 minutes, making it possible to leave the United States on Monday, conduct business in Tokyo on Tuesday, and arrive back in the United States on Monday, before—according to the calendar—you had kept your appointments in Tokyo.

But there is much more history of "World Air Travel in the Future" to be written before we step into a Pegasus transport.

And since it is the intent of this Congress to focus on the time period thru 1975, it will help our perspective to consider that, over the next decade, more than ninety-nine per cent of all air passengers will travel on subsonic aircraft.

A large portion of the profits the air transportation industry needs to grow and develop will come from subsonic aircraft for many years following that period.

But we must plan for the Pegasus age. To deny it is coming would be to deny progress.

We must plan for it within the framework of today's economic and technological realities, and with an eye to the more immediate needs bearing strongly on world air travel's future.

The impact of air travel on the world today—social, industrial, economic—is in itself strong testimony to the progress we have made in equipment, in airports, in operations, in new concepts, in regulation, and in gaining and maintaining public confidence and support.

In the United States and other industrially advanced countries, air travel has become a compatible and complementary communications mode, enhancing business and social advancements that have sprung from earlier railroad and highway systems of communications.

On the lesser developed continents and in the emerging nations, the railroads and highways which made our great development possible simply do not exist.

In Africa, for example, air transportation will become the primary communications medium in the movement of people and goods—the catalyst to stimulate economic and social development.

It is evident from the immediate past and from the current trends in the field of air transportation that this medium will play an ever-increasing role of importance in the future development of all the world's areas.

Let's consider briefly what is happening in the technology side:

Short and medium range jetliners are bringing jet travel to many of our smaller

cities with an efficiency that was not thought possible a few years ago.

Within a few weeks, huge new DC-8 Series 60 jetliners with 250 passenger capacity will be entering airline service. This is about double the number of passengers DC-8's and 707's carried when they were first introduced only eight years ago.

Before the end of the 1960's a new generation of subsonic jets will double the capacity again to 500 passengers. The day of the 1000 passenger transport is not waiting on technology—but on a number of other things.

Giant cargo airplanes, already on the drawing boards, will move freight across continents and oceans overnight, hundreds of tons at a time.

Before 1975 will come the supersonic transport which is of prime interest to this congress—and after them the hypersonic transports—six, seven, ten times the speed of sound, with new kinds of engines using hydrogen for fuel.

Also will come more exotic propulsion techniques, including use of nuclear energy and electrically charged particles.

And the Pegasus will come too.

Gentlemen, we are going to do all of these things I have mentioned.

(After all, to ridicule Dick Tracy and Diet Smith today is to risk putting oneself in the same position as those who made fun of the Buck Rogers and space travel in earlier comic strip days!)

In fact, we already have the technological capability to do most of them. And according to a formula developed by our educators, our total store of knowledge will grow as much in the next five years as it did in the first one thousand, seven hundred fifty years of our current calendar.

I am convinced that nothing can stop us technically. I am convinced that time is the only pacing element in our scientific advance.

Competition is likely to guarantee that the advances that serve us in air travel will be economical, efficient, comfortable, safe and profitable. And this competition, between individuals, companies, nations—all types of groups—is the catalyst of our progress.

But there comes a place in the scheme of our advance where we must operate as a group rather than as competitors, just as we are doing at this Congress, in order to attack and overcome some of the obstacles in the path of the advancement of air transportation.

Most of our modern technical advances have come about as a result of cooperation—a result of cross-feed of information. It is only the specific applications of these advances that become proprietary to individuals and companies.

Finding solutions to our non-technical problems will be just as important to the future of world air travel as any individual advances we make in equipment design and development.

Ours is the most rapidly growing major industry in the world, yet the world may not be prepared to cope with its growth. If we intend to continue to grow and advance, we must see to it that our environment keeps pace with the rate of change.

There is much evidence in recent history that should warn us that a great deal of teamwork will be required of all of us if we are to meet successfully the challenges our future poses.

In the United States alone, all the airlines combined flew about seven billion passenger miles in 1947. In 1965 this passenger mile total for the United States was 52 billion.

Nearly half of the total growth over that 18-year period occurred in the last four years.

Current forecasts of United States domestic air passenger miles indicate that the 52 billion total for 1965 will double before 1975 and quadruple by 1980. How would you like to have to fight your way through some

of today's crowded terminals with four times as many people in them?

And these growth projections are considered conservative by some in the industry.

Another interesting facet of the growth picture is that world passenger traffic outside the United States is growing even more rapidly than United States domestic traffic.

The world picture is this:

The International Civil Aviation Organization world passenger mile total including the United States, which was just over 100 billions in 1965, will grow some 400 per cent by 1975.

All of this relates to certificated air carrier traffic. It does not include the rapidly growing executive aircraft use—which is the subject of other sessions of this Congress.

The problems that this rapid growth poses for us are many. Some are technical; some have social and political implications. All require good management and foresight to gain the most from our available resources.

There are broad problem areas which can be defined, in which all of us here have a common interest in solving.

Major among these are community noise problems; the limiting effects of weather; saturation of airports; congestion of the airways, and need for rapid transportation between city centers and airports.

Again, we have been making, and we are making, progress in all of these areas.

We are attacking the noise problem on a cooperative industry-government basis.

Less than three per cent of scheduled flights are cancelled or diverted by weather.

The capacity and efficiency of our modern airports have been vastly increased in recent years.

The Federal Aviation Agency and similar agencies abroad are performing extraordinary feats in the control and development of airways traffic.

Experiments and studies are under way which may lead to varied acceptable solutions to the city center-airport movement problem.

But still, our progress must be accelerated. The growth is outpacing us.

Just one of the world's major airlines now boards more than 60,000 air travelers each day. Five years from now this one airline expects to be boarding more than 120,000 passengers a day. And this rate of growth is not out of line with the average rate of growth for the world industry.

How will the airlines board and debark up to 2000 people at a time on a single airplane turn-around in the future?

Despite our modern airports and despite laudable airline efficiency, airport saturation is common and occurs in several manifestations at our major terminals.

At New York's John F. Kennedy Airport, during peak traffic, incoming flights may have to hold as much as an hour to get clearance to land, even in clear weather.

Have you been on a jet taxiing out on-time for take-off, only to find your airplane is 33rd in line?

Or how long have you had to wait on the field at Chicago for a terminal gate vacancy for your flight to park and unload?

About three weeks ago, Los Angeles radio stations announced that the airport parking lot was completely filled and cars were backed-up for a mile in all directions. The condition was expected to continue for 24 hours. This was an ordinary weekend, with the cause thought to be L.A. residents traveling to Palo Alto for football game.

These examples only illustrate the marginal capacity of some of the major U.S. terminals today. Heathrow, Schipol and Orly may also face such narrow margins, often complicated by weather.

These problems are not the fault of these cities and their airport authorities. They are the result of very rapid, almost explosive growth.

This growth is continuing, and it will continue to magnify the problems for the future—problems for which we should be planning solutions now.

Where will the airports, already crowded and restricted by metropolitan growth, be located when Chicago reaches all the way to Buffalo, New York covers the entire Northeast seaboard, and Los Angeles stretches all the way from San Diego to San Francisco? Or when London and Tokyo have doubled in size?

Will traffic lights and reciprocal agreements among nations allow the development of new routes, new city pairs, new gateways?

The airlines have demonstrated their belief in the future by placing orders for over three billion dollars worth of new aircraft.

Unit revenues are being held stable and even decreasing, while costs continue to rise, yet the airline operators still must manage the capital for a future rate of expansion in both passenger and cargo movement that will make our present-day boom look small by comparison.

And air cargo traffic is growing even faster than passenger traffic, while many of our cargo handling facilities and processing procedures remain in a relative horse-and-buggy stage.

It is true that much is being done now to modernize these facilities and procedures. But it also is true that current improvements, generally, represent attempts to catch up with demand rather than attempts to anticipate—and take full advantage—of demand. And the air cargo side of the industry has only begun to grow.

By 1980 air cargo revenues may very well surpass passenger revenues, and thereby create an industry eight times its size today—and I believe it will, provided we create an environment in which it can continue to thrive.

These few specific growth pains are representative of the myriad of obstacles, affecting many segments of our society, which must be removed as we progress in world air transportation. And we have in attendance at this Congress representatives of almost every team we need to win this common battle.

We have an international gathering of government officials. This group must provide us with a sympathetic political climate.

By this I mean well-planned, progressive national and international travel agreements, regulations and legislation that will accommodate the overall growth of air commerce.

We have local government executives. This group must stimulate development of the airports, land use concepts around their airports, and local transportation facilities and services.

We have airline and other travel executives. This group must continue its improvement of equipment and operations within existing facilities, and continue to support immediate development of new facilities and handling procedures.

For example, Mr. George Keck, President of United Airlines, said recently in California that this nation alone will need at least 200,000 feet (40 miles) of new runways and 335,000 feet (over 60 miles) of runway extensions in the next five years. This amounts to 500 million dollars worth of runway construction alone, and Mr. Keck estimates that total airport construction costs by 1980 would approach five billion dollars.

At this Congress, we have manufacturers, such as I represent. This group does not simply build the equipment that carries people and cargo. In addition to providing more technical progress for such purposes as overcoming weather delays, improving noise levels and constantly enhancing over-

all operational safety, we, the manufacturers, must take an active lead in working with Federal agencies, local airport authorities and airline operators to plan for and accommodate the growth of which we are a part.

We have an international military contingent at this Congress, and the group it represents has done a great deal to enhance the progress to our current status. This group's leadership in technological and conceptual innovation must be continued, for its pioneering developments are basic to our technology for future application for public benefit. Above all, this military group must provide us with a workable peace, without which orderly progress of any kind is impossible.

We have educators in this gathering, and they have what is perhaps the toughest job. Not only must they pace our thinking, they must provide us with the human raw materials through which the rest of us perpetuate our progress.

The young men and women that the educators shape for us must be not only more competent specialists than ever before, they also must be capable of rising above their specialties to positions of stronger, more effective leadership in general fields than we have been able to develop to date.

And we have with us the press and other informational media, without whom we would be trying to function in a vacuum. These journalists, and the organizations they represent, are important in removing the obstacles to our progress, for they also represent the public.

Abraham Lincoln's words on this subject could hardly be applied more appropriately than to the solution of the problems facing air travel. To quote Mr. Lincoln:

"With public support, anything is possible; without it, nothing is possible."

As individuals, as groups, as companies, as states and as nations, we are making progress on the individual and the collective, the specific and the general problems we face.

But we are going to have to accelerate this progress in all fields if we are to keep pace with the growth of world air transportation.

There is no doubt that technology is important, that it is essential. But if society is to realize the progress and benefits technology can offer, we as leaders of large segments of society also must display increasing unity of purpose in striving to overcome the major environmental problems that are common to all of us.

To some it may seem that these problems are too fragmented, too varied and too numerous for an organized, united approach. This feeling could be a result of looking at the problems themselves, rather than looking at the desired solutions.

When our industrial and scientific might is directed toward a major, complex undertaking such as a space program, we start by defining our objective. We then must back away and examine the critical path to successfully accomplishing our objective. We must plan and schedule thousands of events—or problem solutions—which lie on this critical path, each related to the previous event in terms of time and accomplishment and each related to the overall project in terms of objective.

There is no reason why we can't plan our attack—and solve our common problems relating to the future of world air transportation in a similar manner.

Certainly each of the groups represented here has broad and often overlapping responsibilities. Some coordination of effort, obviously, is required.

But we have, in existence, the organizations and agencies necessary to handle this coordination.

Where can we find the focal point necessary to the planning we must do?

When President Johnson called upon the Congress of the United States to establish a Department of Transportation, he said the purpose was, and I quote, in part:

"To modernize and streamline . . . to bring together our transportation activities . . . to serve the growing demands of this great Nation . . . to serve the needs of industry, and the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and real frugality."

I am not suggesting that we should drop our problems in the lap of the government. The responsibility is ours, and we must step up to it. But it is entirely possible that such a department could serve as that focal point we need for our teamwork in the United States. Perhaps ICAO can serve in a similar role internationally.

The more effective our teamwork is, the sooner our joint efforts will accommodate the explosive growth of air transportation.

You have heard repeatedly at this Congress, forecasts of air traffic growth and technology advancements of magnitudes that tax the imagination. But our perspective is relative.

When the airline pilots saw DC-3's for the first time little more than 30 years ago, their reactions were almost unanimous:

"Fantastic." "The thing's too big." "It'll never fly."

The word "fantastic" also could be applied to the number of events that lie on the critical path toward realization of the full potential of air transportation.

But there is no reason why we should let the number of these events stagger us. Nor is there any reason why we should be content to allow these events to occur haphazardly or out of phase with orderly development.

Each event can be accomplished in its proper time, and in proper conformity to our common whole objective.

And we, the groups represented here today, have the brainpower, the motivation and the machinery to handle this job.

A good effort, on our part now, will assure the future environment for world air travel.

As to the future technology of world air travel, Donald W. Douglas summed it up recently. I quote Mr. Douglas:

"The future of flight is as broad as any man's dream, and as capable of being brought to reality as that man's ability to translate his dream into a successful and competitive design."

Thank you.

SPEECH BY LAURENCE K. WALRATH, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER, BEFORE SOUTHEAST SHIPPERS ADVISORY BOARD.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for several years the Senate has been struggling with the many problems of the transportation industry. Last year the Congress created a new Cabinet level Department of Transportation in an attempt to secure an overall coordinated Federal approach to our many forms of transportation.

On December 7, in a speech before the Southeast Shippers Advisory Board in Orlando, Fla., Interstate Commerce Commissioner, Laurence K. Walrath, outlined the role Congress has played in developing a uniform transportation policy. Mr. Walrath said:

I believe the new Department of Transportation will prove to be as significant to the economy of our nation as was the original act to regulate commerce in 1887. Like that act the Department of Transportation is, doubtless, only a beginning—not a panacea in itself for all our problems.

He speaks very highly of the man the Senate recently confirmed to become the first Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd.

I commend this speech to the attention of every Senator who is searching for an enlightened overall view of our past and present transportation policy, and also for knowledgeable insight for the potential which the new Department of Transportation holds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Walrath's speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

ALL 10 YEARS AND TOMORROW, TOO

Ten years ago your Board gave me the privilege of speaking to you at a time when I had scarcely warmed my ICC chair. Many of the same problems are with us today—which for you add up to "the problem of car supply." Tonight I prefer to emphasize the affirmatives, as did Stuart Saunders when he addressed your national board meeting in Pittsburgh on October 19th.

You will recall he highlighted the improved atmosphere and dialogue between shippers, carriers, and government. He was even generous in his references to the enlightened attitudes of the Interstate Commerce Commission—and at that point I felt like giving him resounding applause!

I believe he was substantially correct on all counts. At the same time, there are some negatives which should not be overlooked if we are to gain the most from our national transportation system. You in the Southeast have a special stake in sound resolution of these problems—which could be called "frustrations"—of the past decade.

Most, if not all, of the "plus" factors in transportation have been realized as the result of more effective communication and understanding at all levels. This had its real impetus in Congress during the 1958-60 period, under the leadership of Warren Magnuson as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce and George Smathers as the able and effective Chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, together with their House colleagues under the Chairmanship of Oren Harris. You will recall that 1958 was the year in which the nation recognized the then "deteriorating common carrier system." From this evolved a clear record that excessive taxation, too rigid regulation, adverse court decisions and the mushrooming of unregulated carriage were combining toward ultimate destruction or nationalization of our railroad industry and even threatening motor common carriers. Some significant steps were taken in an effort to stem the trend.

As an interim measure, the rail loan-guaranty law was passed and eased cash crises for some whose commercial credit was strained.

The Congress next rolled back the court-expanded exemptions on highly processed, frozen, and imported agricultural commodities, so that these items which had lost their identity as the direct produce of farmers again became available for fair competition.

In the same 1958-1960 period, recognizing the drain on rail revenues from many obsolete passenger operations, the Congress passed the well-known amendments to Section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act. Since then passenger deficits have been reduced from three quarters of a billion dollars annually to something around half that amount.

In 1958, a significant amendment to the rule of ratemaking became law. Still highly controversial, through hard-fought evolution

and court construction, this rule now provides carrier management with greater flexibility in adjusting rates to meet both competition and shipper requirements. Today, a proper cost record can win rate adjustments which would not even have been proposed 10 years ago.

Following these legal changes the Senate proved its concern for the future by authorizing intensive staff study of transportation and publication of the Doyle report in 1961. I recommend this report for intensive study in the light of developing new problems. In many respects General Doyle's report was prophetic.

The next great breakthrough indicating government's concern for the future was President Kennedy's 1962 special message on transportation in which he urged changes in the law to achieve "equality of competitive opportunity" as between all surface transport modes. That message pointed to the inequities which spring from existing agricultural commodity and water bulk exemptions. You are all familiar with his expressed preference for deregulation as a solution, as well as his suggested alternative of rollback or repeal of the exemptions. It is not my purpose tonight to deal with the merits of these choices, but rather to document the fact that in the past decade government at every level has become fully aware of the necessity for improvements and planning for the future.

The next 3 years saw a frustrating battle in Congress over conflicting views. President Johnson affirmed the importance of the issues—but the legislative attempt failed despite a real effort on the part of Oren Harris' House Committee to effect a compromise of divergent views.

I am sure that the search for equality of competitive opportunity is not forgotten, but my guess is that nothing affirmative will be done until the new Department of Transportation is organized and has had an opportunity to restudy the situation. We have been assured the basic issues are pushed no further than the "back burner."

I believe the new Department of Transportation will prove to be as significant to the economy of our nation as was the original Act to Regulate Commerce in 1887. Like that Act, DOT is, doubtless, only a beginning—not a panacea in itself for all our problems.

If any of us had any remaining doubts as to the wisdom of the DOT bill, the President removed most of them when he named the new Secretary-to-be. Virtually every trade and financial journal spontaneously acclaimed Alan Boyd as the best qualified man to tackle the formidable job. His task will not be easy, even for a man who is as knowledgeable, unshakable (once he feels he is right), and respected as he is; nor will progress be possible, unless all transportation interests lay aside petty self-concern and actively assist him.

The new Secretary starts with uniquely clear basic premises. His several public addresses and press conferences since he was "tapped" are revealing:

(1) His first year will be devoted largely to organization, internal coordination, research and planning. No policy changes or legislative proposals from that source are expected until the responsible views of all interested parties have been obtained and carefully weighed.

(2) He intends the Department to assume a major role of leadership in preserving, promoting and strengthening the country's private-enterprise transport system. DOT, at least under his leadership, will not become a "Big Daddy" (his phrase) to "take over" transportation in any sense.

(3) DOT will not try to insert its "prejudices" (again his term) in current merger cases. It may participate as a party of record in future major merger cases, but will

do this by offering in evidence broad economic studies directed toward policy issues. It will stop short of supporting or opposing particular mergers unless broad public policy issues are apparent. DOT may or may not interest itself in future rate adjustments, depending again. I suppose, on the impact its studies show they may have on the national economy and viability of our national transportation system.

(4) DOT will develop a labor-economist staff so that the Secretary may be aware of and forecast the impact of labor development on private-enterprise carrier operations. It will not usurp functions of existing mediation agencies (but my prediction is that these agencies will find DOT's views helpful and persuasive).

(5) When asked whether he favored "less regulation" or "more regulation," Secretary Boyd wisely refused to be pinned down. He likened that issue to mergers, and in his words, "There are some good mergers and some that are not good, but you can't generalize on it."

(6) When asked if the ICC and CAB should route their legislative recommendations through DOT, his answer was: " * * * No, I think the CAB and ICC, the FMC, are independent agencies and they should act as independent agencies."

Later asked if he favored eventual transfer of ICC, Maritime and CAB to his department, the Secretary-to-be closed the subject with a resounding "No, sir."

(7) As a final key to his basic views, he answered questions on the subjects of user charges and on compensatory toll levels for the St. Lawrence Seaway. He favors both, but is realistic enough to qualify in this fashion:

"My philosophy of transportation is that to the extent possible, those who benefit from the system should pay the cost of providing the service. . . ."

Clearly, Secretary Boyd's forthright statements on these questions—key questions as far as you and I are concerned—give us no excuse for withholding affirmative support and wholehearted assistance.

One final thought on the "pluses" before turning to some old and new "negatives." We are making measurable advances in the area of chronic freight car shortages. Some of that progress, strangely, lies in some of the divergent views which have been expressed on the record in our Ex Parte proceedings Nos. 241 and 252. For example, cross-examination of the Commission staff witness has concentrated on certain alleged inaccuracies in the statistical data received. To the extent valid, this will point the way to more accurate reporting for the future.

The record in Ex Parte 252 (which now contains almost as many divergent views as there are witnesses, should at least challenge the nation's railroads to resolve many of their differences by self-help. If so, we expect to be aided by their voluntary agreements, and thus our ultimate decision will be more palatable than it otherwise might. Does this sound like Bureaucratic double talk? It is, but only to a point.

The very fact that the railroads have these proceedings hanging overhead by the proverbial thread has, in itself, begun to produce more responsiveness to shippers' requirements. There are ground swells to indicate the railroads may offer some new approaches in three key areas:

(1) A practical formula for determining adequacy of ownership by each railroad of various types of cars. (Ex Parte 241)

(2) A basis for promulgation of fair, uniform and enforceable car service rules designed to achieve maximum utilization of equipment whether on or off the owner's line.

We are hopeful such rules, if soundly conceived, can avoid the routine issuance of numerous service orders. This is not to say it would render ICC orders unnecessary, but, hopefully, they could be used sparingly and

be of shorter duration to meet specific peak crises. Logically, too, we should better be able to avoid inadvertent injury to shippers in areas other than the critical spots. (Ex Parte 241)

(3) A completely new approach to per diem charges may be developed—perhaps even a sliding percentage formula of depreciated value, rather than a fixed charge, but with the percentage high enough to include an incentive to encourage most efficient utilization by all and continued upgrading of cars by owner lines. (Ex Parte 252)

These generalizations are not in any sense a prejudgment nor a reflection of Commission views—our hearings are far from finished and new ideas, all deserving of careful consideration, are being presented almost daily. We continue to have open and receptive minds, so if any of you have a flash of genius, please—in some way—get it on our record before we must make a decision.

I am aware of the "record" position of the Shippers Advisory Boards in Ex Parte 241, but I believe even you will agree that railroads are truly being given a fair chance to correct their own problems. There is no power or desire, on my part, to tell them in what specific equipment they must invest. Our only concern is that they satisfy your reasonable requirements as shippers. I'd much prefer that they wear the good guys' "white hats."

You have recently had clear proof in a car shortage crisis that a mutually happy result can be achieved if—but only if—we all work together. The men in this audience who this year faced up to the cotton situation in the late summer and early fall will vouch for this. With little warning you suddenly were confronted with government pressures (not ICC) to move out a tremendous amount of warehoused cotton during a 30-day period. The early indications were that each of many shippers would order all of the rail cars needed for his total movement at the earliest date shipments were to start. There was also evidence that some would request more cars than needed in order to assure that enough were spotted. From the outset it was obvious the rail carriers simply could not respond.

Instead of issuing service orders right and left to meet an alleged shortage—(artificial, as history reveals)—my esteemed colleague, Commissioner Murphy, who spent a career in the cotton and textile industry, came down personally and talked directly with the people he knew best—cotton shippers (not the carriers) and convinced you that discretion in asking only for such cars as could be loaded on a particular day—and spreading total car orders over the full 30-day period—would give the carriers a reasonable chance of meeting the demands.

I have oversimplified the story, but, as you know even better than I, your needs were met, we issued no service orders, and no railroad was required to deny a single shipper his minimum requirements. Within the past several weeks southeastern soybean shippers have, in similar fashion, avoided a potential crisis. The moral, I think, is so clear I need not elaborate. In past years in numerous similar situations involving almost any other volume commodity you could mention (except "Yak Fat") we have been besieged by Congressmen, Senators, trade associations and irate citizens to punish the railroad who fails to provide at the time requested all cars ordered by shippers. When our orders were violated, we did just this but collecting penalties from railroads after the fact doesn't help the shipper. The cotton and soybean shippers of the Southeast this year have demonstrated what can be done when they, the ICC and the carriers calmly worked together in harmony. No one gets hurt.

Recent research in the areas of piggyback and containerization compel me to the conclusion that there is a rapidly growing need

for increased use of these innovations—not just in domestic transportation, but also in foreign commerce as a necessary means of expanding outlets for American goods. I wish time permitted a thorough discussion because there can be no longer any doubt that we must move quickly to resolve the knotty problems of standardization of sizes and hardware thereby to permit flexible interchange of containers between trucks, railroads, water carriers and aircraft. In many respects the Dutch, Belgians, Scandinavians, and Japanese—just to mention a few—appear to be moving in this direction more than we.

On the subject of piggyback and container shipping the printed report of your Chattanooga meeting was fascinating reading, and your scheduled agenda for today's session indicates the Southeast is on top of its regional problems. But what gives me concern is that most of the study and research being done involves go-it-alone efforts by railroads, truckers, airlines and water carriers to serve their own competitive challenges—and we may well end up with interchange problems comparable to those of the South's 19th century railroads before standardization of track gauge. Then, too, if we finally achieve uniformity, another major problem concerns who is to own this vast pool of containers for domestic and international use. Alan Boyd has indicated DOT intends to give both these issues close attention.

A new problem looms on the horizon as the result of a recent court decision concerning for-hire transportation by agricultural cooperatives. This problem was intensified when the Department of Defense announced on the 8th of November that, beginning December 1, 1966:

"Farm cooperative trucks will be used. . . . when their use would result in the lowest overall cost to the government." (Emphasis supplied)

DOD added that Farm Co-ops already have submitted rates on military traffic "lower than the rates of regulated common carriers."

Considering that military transportation provides now an annual gross revenue of more than 600 million to rail and motor common carriers, the potential diversion could have a severe impact on our national transportation system. If, to stem this diversion your carriers resort to lower and lower Section 22 quotations to DOD, the effect their reduced revenues could have on commercial shippers' rates is something you could ponder better than I. The transportation industry and the ICC generally feel that remedial clarifying legislation is urgently needed. Here, too, we may have to hope that DOT will eventually take the lead. Meanwhile, I recommend that your Advisory Boards give this priority consideration before the next Congress convenes.

We've covered a multitude of subjects and you have been a most patient audience. I can only hope that all we've talked about is of interest to some and that some of it is of interest to all.

As Mr. Saunders said to you in Pittsburgh, the present is better than the past and the future promises improved rail service to shippers, more efficient utilization of cars, and better profits for both carriers and shippers. Third quarter rail records for 1966 reveal the best net-revenue picture in 13 years, with nationally improved operating ratios, now averaging 75.5. As *Railway Age* this week stated it: "If railroad men cannot be heartened by such a year as '66 has been, what in the world does it take?" The Southern Region has made the most dramatic improvement of all—moving from 78.8 in 1965 down to 75.6 for 1966.

But, as indicated, some of the old problems have continued and some disturbing new ones have appeared. These, coupled with rising costs, possible tax increases, and

the current moratorium on investment tax credits, could in 1967 adversely affect the rosy outlook of 1966. So, if there be an underlying text to this "sermon," I'd express it this way: "Give thanks for our many blessings, work more closely together in brotherly love, but *man the outposts!*"

"PERSPECTIVE FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT" — SPEECH BY MARVIN HURLEY, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, HOUSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on November 17, 1966, at the 38th anniversary meeting of the Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce and the Associated Industries of Arkansas in Hot Springs, Ark., Mr. Marvin Hurley, the executive vice president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, gave a speech entitled "Perspective for Community Development."

Mr. Hurley points out that in this day and time it is very easy for us to lose our perspective for community development. Among the realities which he indicates must be reckoned with are:

First. Fantastic compression of time and space.

Second. The "information revolution," which is best summed up by noting that some educators indicate that 50 percent of what we are now teaching in college will not be true 5 years from now.

Third. A rebellion of rising expectations in which emerging nations are finding that independence and nationalism are not automatic cures for poverty, illiteracy, illness, and bad government—that freedom from imperial yoke may be a luxury some of them can yet ill afford.

Fourth. The population explosion; a reality best brought home for the fact that there are 1 billion more people in the world today than there were in 1945.

Mr. Hurley then goes into an extremely well conceived analysis of the need for foresight and planning for the fantastic growth of urban development which is now upon us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hurley's speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

PERSPECTIVE FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
(By Marvin Hurley, executive vice president, Houston Chamber of Commerce)

I appreciate this opportunity to be back home in Arkansas, and to visit with so many old friends who are leaders in community and economic development—the architects of this State's tomorrow.

As a third-generation Arkansan, I have had a life-long interest in the affairs of this state—and more especially since 1923 when my father represented Pope County in the State Legislature.

In more recent years, I have watched the economic, social and recreational progress here with pride and admiration. (Razorbacks) On every hand I see evidence of the revolution that has focused the attention of an interested nation on Arkansas. The total value added by manufacture here is now three times what it was when I went to Houston in 1945; and during this decade, you are joining the ranks of the urban

states. By 1970, you will be well over 50 per cent urban.

It's good to be back in Hot Springs. My first visit here was in mid-1928, for the notification ceremonies for Senator Joseph T. Robinson as the Democratic nominee for Vice President of the United States. (And, may I remind you, incidentally, that he was nominated in Houston.)

Senator Robinson and Al Smith lost their race; and not many months later, I lost my heart right here in Hot Springs—to a beautiful little 16-year-old blonde. When she got old enough, she became my wife; and to this day retains all the endearing qualities I found in her at Sweet Sixteen.

Coming home is always a sentimental journey. Home is truly the seminary of all other institutions and the rallying place of the affections.

It is well known to my acquaintances throughout the country that my home town is Hector, Arkansas. That little Pope County community does not have a Chamber of Commerce; but, long ago, I volunteered my services—until they can do better.

The Arkansas Gazette said in a feature story last fall that Hector is a place where a traveler finds "something of the past that is lost for all purposes to the Twentieth Century". The implication was that time has passed my home town by.

To be perfectly frank, Hector has not experienced a really explosive growth situation. When I left there 40 years ago, the population was 281—and today it is just under 300. (That may not reflect much dynamism, but it represents tremendous stability.)

Hector has little knowledge of traffic congestion, smog, sonic booms and topless waitresses. And it has not seriously missed these accoutrements of our urbanized and motorized and industrialized society. It has retained the beauty of its countryside, the impressiveness of its mountain vistas, the serenity of its community environment, and the reserved friendliness of its people. These have not changed—but Hector has changed.

When I left there, the row-crop economy was largely based on cotton and corn, but now the economy is based more on livestock and poultry, with a number of the people of the community commuting to jobs in the industrial plants in Russellville. Then Hector had coal-oil lamps and woodburning fireplaces, but now it has electric lights and butane heating. Then it had a two-room school, and now it has a consolidated high school serving much of northern Pope County. Then, it had a party-line telephone system, and now it has an automatic dial system. Then, its roads were largely unimproved, but now it has connections with the world, over all-weather roads.

Our generation, as a matter of fact, has experienced the most dynamic period in the long history of mankind. Since 1945, for example, we have found ourselves living in a new economic and social world, marked by mechanization, large-scale organization and remorseless change. The atomic age has already proven its arresting portent, and the peaceful uses of atomic energy are mushrooming beyond all forecasts. The space age, born within this decade, is already revealing some of the age-old mysteries of the universe, as we probe the only limitless frontier. Oceanography is opening up the frontier of the seas that cover 70 per cent of the earth's surface, giving us a new horizon of promise not only for the production of potable water but also for mining the resources of the seas for food, minerals and other essentials of our civilization. We have seen mass markets develop for jet travel, television, air conditioning, miracle drugs, frozen foods, synthetic fibres and electronic devices.

Every generation, I suppose, has felt it was living in a revolutionary period, but we in our time are especially aware of fundamental

change. It is not surprising to find those who feel that the Twentieth Century began in 1945, and that the period of two world wars with the intervening depression was in reality the liquidation of the nineteenth century. Today's technological revolution forecasts even greater miracles and more revolutionary changes in the decades ahead than we have experienced during the past decisive decades.

The history of our civilization has brought a variety of periods—the Dark Ages, the Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, and so on. It is entirely possible that when the historians of the future evaluate our interval of history, they may call this the Age of Concern. We are truly living in a period when the forces of ill-will are working overtime to foster distrusts, dissension and division.

We meet today in an environment of harmony and good will, but our daily lives are spent in an atmosphere of uncertainty. Although the lands and the peoples are strangers to us, we find ourselves deeply involved in the affairs of a hopelessly troubled Southeast Asia. Science has given us a new world in which we are not sure we are yet equipped to live. We have learned to control elemental forces before we have learned to control ourselves. A rising tide of immorality and violence suggests that we are living in a period of moral fatigue. We have draped the sordid life of the criminal with an artificial cloak of glamor, with mawkish sentimentality and hollow romance.

We are living in a cynical age. It seems increasingly unpopular to find anything good in our country or in our people. While this cynical attitude is disturbing, there may be a constructive reason for it. In the long run, it may be a normal response to conditions that are not improving as fast as are the standards we consider acceptable.

This is a period when we have to adopt our concepts, our goals and our methods to the harsh realities of the changing world in which we are living. Whether our work is with a unit of government, a commercial enterprise, an educational institution or a voluntary association, it has become increasingly difficult to keep geared to the requirements of today and to anticipate the needs of tomorrow. For this reason, I have elected to use the subject: "Perspective for Community Development".

The future seems to have arrived ahead of schedule—before we have been able to put out the welcome mat to tomorrow. It is a time when it is very easy for us to lose our perspective. This is an age when we have to be conditioned but not calloused to change, and our perspective must continually be adjusted to changing conditions.

One of the realities of our changing world is the fantastic compression of time and space. With near-instant sight and sound linking people everywhere, and with the supersonic age at hand for the transportation of people and goods, we have just about abolished the barriers of geography and distance. We share a shrinking world neighborhood with strangers, and the boundaries of our day-to-day contacts have been expanded enormously. We are closer in time today to three continents of the world than Hot Springs was to Houston when Senator Robinson was nominated for the vice presidency. Our industrial markets are not restricted geographically as they once were. As a matter of fact, Arkansas has an improving location to produce for national and world markets.

A second current reality is an information revolution. At times I wonder if we are not arming the students in our schools and colleges of today with the facts of yesterday to cope with the needs of tomorrow. It has been said that 50 per cent of what we are now teaching in college will not be true five years from now. Unfortunately, we do not

have the faintest idea which 50 per cent this is. The fruitful years since World War II have seen man's knowledge expanded with more daring success than during all known history before our time. It is increasingly difficult for any of us to keep current on the information we need in our daily responsibilities. It is increasingly important for every person to maintain a continuing program of education and personal development. But, still, if some of us fed our stomachs as we do our minds, we would soon die of starvation or stomach ulcers.

Our economy here in the Southwest is increasingly science oriented. We have to give the same thought today to attracting brains to our communities as we do to the attraction of new industries; and we have to stop, and reverse, the "brain drain" of some of our brightest young people to other regions. Industry locations are increasingly geared to human resources. During the years ahead, industries will survive and regional economies will prosper substantially in proportion to their utilization of scientific and technological discoveries. We are going to have to train more scientists and engineers to advanced degrees in our colleges and universities. We are going to have to develop more opportunities for creative minds, and we are going to have to develop conditions more attractive to scholars and scientists.

One able and creative individual may have more economic worth to a community than a new industry. The opportunities of many with less educational attainments will depend increasingly upon the number we train to the limits of their scientific knowledge—those with the vision and creativity and knowledge to capture ideas and to devise inventions that offer opportunity of gainful employment for others. There was a time when we could be reasonably sure that we could prepare students for lifetime careers. Most jobs and their requirements were fairly constant. But, because of the rate of change in contemporary business and industry, it is increasingly difficult to prepare students for specific classifications of jobs.

A third reality of our time can be termed a rebellion of rising expectations. Long submerged nations and races are engaged in an almost hysterical drive for their place in the sun. Emerging nations are finding that independence and nationalism are not automatic cures for poverty, illiteracy, illness and bad government—that freedom from imperial yoke may be a luxury some of them can yet ill afford. Yet the nations of the world are multiplying in terms so great that the recently emerged countries already hold a numerical balance of power in world councils. We are no longer isolated from developments in remote parts of the world.

Neither the Southwest nor any other region can longer ignore the rights of minority groups. We find ourselves already experiencing the agony of trying to find ways to guarantee human rights to all citizens without jeopardizing states' rights, property rights and other human rights. We will never, though, achieve the goal of an understanding and workable common unity of races, colors and creeds by statements and actions that intensify group prejudices. The extremism of either "black power" or "white supremacy" does not solve anything. We build effective understanding and unity by working together in mutually helpful teamwork toward common objectives. The final decisions on civil rights must be made in human hearts and not in the streets.

We are dealing with a changing concept of what constitutes a satisfactory way of life. With the highest standard of living in history, we are more concerned about poverty than ever before. With the highest percentage of employment in history, we are more concerned about unemployment. No country in the world has anything like our educational level, and yet we are more concerned about the quality of education than ever

before. We expect the city of today to meet more fully our needs and to satisfy more completely our wants than did the residents of cities in the past. Much of our urban concern today results from this revolution in our expectations and not from any degeneration from some prior urban utopia.

A fourth reality of our age is a world population explosion. We have a billion more people in the world today than we had in 1945. Population is growing faster than production in many countries, and the hungry two-thirds of the world are getting hungrier. The population problem is one of quality as well as quantity. Quality considerations include such problems as illegitimacy and the disproportionate rate of reproduction on the part of economically and socially irresponsible persons. We may be breeding poverty and delinquency faster than we have the ability in money, personnel, or know-how to cope with them. Arkansas will feel increasingly the pinch of the population problem.

A fifth reality of our changing world is the fantastic rate of urbanization. To people who move to town from the country, the growth of the city soon brings a realization that an increasing number of problems of the individual and of the family become problems of the community. Life in the city calls for a greater sense of mutual responsibility and a greater capacity for teamwork effort. Here in the Southwest, our change from country living to city living has been so recent that many of our people still demonstrate in many ways their rural origins. Many have not yet been educated to city life, to the art of living beneficially in close proximity to other people. They have little commitment to their responsibilities for personal conduct, noise conditions, care of waste, respect for neighbors and the like.

We will have at least 140 million more urbanites in this country by the year 2000, and that is little more than 33 years away. Such an increase is the equivalent of building a city the size of Hot Springs every four days for the next 33 years. It will cost between \$2,000 billion and \$3,000 billion of private and public investment to house these additional Americans, and to provide them with roads, schools, and places to work. At the same time, we will have to rebuild practically the entire physical plant of our existing cities. Our plans in Houston are projected on taking care of a doubling of our population, not in 33 years, but in 15 years.

Urbanization is easily our most important domestic issue because it more directly affects more people in more different ways. The character and shape of our cities is determined by many forces, but we are only beginning to develop an overall strategy for our urban times. A city brings together within a limited space a diverse and varied community of people so they may achieve a better life through the teamwork of a common unity. The future of our cities and towns is a matter of such pressing concern because 90 per cent of our people are destined to live out their days under urban conditions. Urban development and industrial development are so closely related that they cannot be considered independently. This, I am sure, needs no elaboration here in Arkansas where municipalities have had such a key role in industrial development.

Urbanization brings new categories of problems. We have to think in terms of revitalizing entire areas of blight and slums; of overcoming the ugliness and smells of the city; of preventing overcrowding; and of combating the indifferent and selfish disregard for esthetics that can destroy community values. We have to think in terms of proper provision for public services and facilities, and for encouraging high standards of civic participation, education, ethics and morality. Neither the pattern of local government nor the methods of local taxation have kept pace with the changing urban pattern.

The easiest part of urban development is the tabulation of our urban problems and needs. Almost as easy is the enumeration of possible solutions for these needs. More difficult, however, is the analysis necessary to determine which of these solutions give the greatest promise of being effective. And still more difficult is the process of putting these solutions into effect. The technical problems and capital costs involved in many answers to urban needs are so formidable that they seem beyond the innovating spirit, the financial capacity or the legal scope of existing agencies.

The changing pattern of the city makes it more necessary than ever before for people to identify themselves with the metropolis as a whole—to the totality of their environment, as well as with their own neighborhoods and groups. Every community should be vitally concerned economically and socially about the welfare of the entire region in which it is located.

It is no longer possible for individual cities and towns in an urbanized area to make separate provision for all of their needs. It is wholly impractical for each separate jurisdiction in a metropolitan area to attempt to handle its problems with complete independence from neighboring areas that will be affected by such action. You will feel this situation increasingly at the state grows in population density and urbanization, although you still have a chance to avoid many of the problems of our older cities.

The haphazard and isolated approach to community and area development that got some results in the past is no longer suited to the more complicated needs of today. The complexities and inter-relationships of urban development are so involved that despite all the present-day concern about them, the solutions for urban problems continue highly elusive. In part, at least, this is due to a failure to comprehend the relationship of specific needs or possibilities to a total concept of urban development.

The Apostle Paul, centuries ago, made effective use of the human body to illustrate the totality of a concept. This same illustration can be applied to the urban body. We can think in terms of four major categories of physical systems in the urban body in your home town—systems that are not fragmented by jurisdictional boundaries.

There is a structural system of buildings, houses, schools, churches, factories, and the like.

There is a circulatory system of freeways and streets, railroads and transit, sidewalks and waterways, elevators and escalators.

There is a nervous system of telephone, electrical and natural gas distribution lines, traffic control signals, street signs, and the like.

And, there is a digestive system consisting of a network that brings in food, water, and supplies, and another network that removes garbage, sewage, and trash, and other forms of air, water and land pollutants.

But the total concept of the urban body is not limited to these four systems. Working through this combination of physical systems, we have an economic system, an educational system, a political system, and various aspects of a life-support system. These systems, in turn, are qualified by such influences as public attitude, including philosophical, moral, religious and other emotion-related qualities. The entire urban complex, with all its systems and influences, is interdependent and interrelated.

Thus, it is important to recognize the totality of the urban environment in our community development efforts as well as the relationships within an urbanized area. The interactions among all these urban systems and influences are continuous. Therefore, any master plan for a city or any system of goals should be developed on the basis of such a total concept. The implementation of an urban development program must be done

in parts and in stages, but goals and plans should truly be based on this total concept, and not be developed as partial patches on the urban entity. Band-aid treatment of urban ills is a cosmetic approach that does not get to basic causes.

Urban development is nothing like as impossible, though, as some people become impossible in trying to cope with it. In the broader framework, the race is not between renewal and obsolescence in our communities. The real no-man's-land lies between *what can be done* and *what will be done*. The most significant factor is not our knowledge of techniques and technology but rather it is *what we will do*. The challenge is not met by complaint, concern, and criticism, but rather by recognizing the total situation as it is and by having the will to meet the issue.

The lines of responsibility for urban development are quite clearly drawn, and there should be no confusion, but often there is. There are basically three sectors of responsibility that share the obligations for urban development. We have the public sector, which we call government. We have the private sector, which we call our enterprise economy. And we have a volunteer sector, in which individuals share their time, talents and means unselfishly in the public interest.

No one of these can fill the role of either of the others. For a dynamic system, in the building of a community, we need strength and effectiveness in all three of these sectors. We need the desire for power or influence that fundamentally motivates the public sector, or government. We need the desire for profit that motivates the private or commercial sector. And we need the desire to serve others, which, in its purest form, motivates the volunteer sector.

The public sector is playing an increasing role in the affairs of our communities. Evidence is conclusive that we are experiencing the effects of a new federalism in our urban affairs; but now, as in the past, local initiative is still the decisive factor in the future of our communities. Our urban future does not rest in our national and state capitols as much as it does along our own city streets. No matter how much we share in federal or state programs, the initiative has to begin at home.

The great cities of the past have been built by governments with the power and the will to impose any social regulations and any land-use restrictions they wished on their servile people. Many of the urban treasures we travel the world to see were built by methods mankind will no longer condone. Many of the finer features of our American cities, such as art museums and music halls and libraries, were built with funds amassed by methods now frowned upon by federal and state laws and regulations.

We must build greatness into our cities and towns, however, under currently approved democratic processes. The private sector of business and industry as well as the active efforts of volunteer groups such as the Chamber of Commerce have important responsibilities in these processes. Yet the strength and will of local government must still be sufficient to cope with unpalatable developments in our urban environment. Any plan that seeks to control the growth of the city must have the support of government with the strength and will to resolve conflicts with self-serving vested interests. If local government does not meet such responsibilities, the new federalism will be because there is a ground-swell among the people for improvement.

The private sector of business and industry has a basic role in the future of our communities. Without the profits of our enterprise economy, there would be no funds for private investment and no expansion of tax revenue for essential public works and services. The forgotten element in many urban master plans is the necessity for people to make a living. No alternative has proved

nearly as effective as the profit motive in stimulating and regulating economic activity.

Since industry is the segment of our creative wealth group that offers the most substantial expansion possibilities, the industrial climate becomes an increasingly important factor in the state's future. Industrial climate is the sum total influence of the attitude of citizens toward business and industry and the reflection of such attitudes in government controls, regulations and taxes.

The volunteer sector meets its public responsibility primarily through the teamwork of voluntarily organized action. Its dimensions are far greater than most people realize, in such organizations as the Chamber of Commerce, churches, trade and professional groups, labor unions, welfare agencies, fraternal and service groups, private foundations, and a thousand-and-one other classifications.

Through the application of voluntary teamwork at the local level, the Chamber of Commerce provides a mechanism for demonstrating democracy in action. It is a voluntary association of public spirited people who are willing to invest some of their personal services and resources to help build a greater community and a more prosperous area. The basic purpose of the city has not changed—it is still to provide a better life for a growing population. Neither has the basic purpose of the Chamber of Commerce changed—it is still to supply much of the initiative, the continuity of effort and the unifying influence to accomplish community goals. It harnesses the talent and imagination of community leaders in planning and performing sound programs for the economic and civic well-being of the community. The Chamber of Commerce is the vehicle through which voluntary manpower in effective teamwork helps to make our communities better places to live and work.

I stressed change in my opening remarks, and this fact of change is a constant challenge in the field of Chamber of Commerce service. Progress comes through change, and in providing the teamwork for voluntary effort in our communities, the Chamber of Commerce is a partner in this progress. If C. of C.'s are to continue to be effective, we must be shapers of change rather than caretakers of emergencies resulting from change. We have to be able to cope with change and turn it to the benefit of our communities.

Evidence of the changing role of the Chamber of Commerce is found in its increasing emphasis on long-range planning. We know the faster we drive an automobile, the farther down the road we have to look to avoid disaster. To meet the accelerating rate of change in today's world, we have to look farther ahead in our community goal-setting.

Evidence of the changing role of the Chamber of Commerce is also found in its increasing emphasis on area-wide coordination. Community issues are no longer confined to the boundaries of local governmental jurisdictions. The Chamber of Commerce has to provide leadership for finding area-wide answers for area-wide needs. Few community problems can be solved today in municipal isolation.

Evidence of the changing role of the Chamber of Commerce is found, third, in the increasing depth of our activities. The muckrakers of the past pictured the Chamber of Commerce as a publicity-seeking, booster type of organization characterized by empty claims. Today we have changed to such an extent that we have been defined as "the organizations which do those things for their communities that most people think just happen". Research, statistics, investigation, analysis, and problem-solving are typical of our current bag of tricks.

Evidence of the changing role of the Chamber of Commerce is found, fourth, in our more sustained efforts to achieve long-range

goals. Long-range planning is one thing, but sustained efforts to achieve the goals established through long-range planning is something else. It is not unusual for a Chamber of Commerce to work through a half-dozen different city administrations in the achievement of some major community objective.

Out of the wealth of your resources and the skills of your people, Arkansas has brought to fulfillment many of the dreams of yesterday's leaders. Now it is for you, rather than for your children or their children, to determine what kind of a place this State and your communities will be in the future. Failure to meet this challenge most likely will condemn those who follow you to spreading problems of congested decadence, because you will grow in population and you will become more urbanized.

I know you have better hopes for your children than to have them impoverished by decadent business and industry, than to have their health periled by polluted water and air and inadequate sanitation, than to have their culture and character stunted by crowded schools, uninspired music and art, and churches lacking leadership and programs.

In summary, we are living in a new urbanized industrial age under rapidly changing conditions. But it should still be our goal to build our communities with vision and understanding, to give them nobility, safety and beauty, as well as utility, comfort and convenience. To do this, we have to believe in things of the spirit as well as in material things—in ideals, principles and character as well as in science, inventions and skyscrapers—in the willing acceptance of responsibility, not merely in the calm assumption of rights—in sympathy, love and understanding rather than in pride, arrogance and bigotry.

A community is people, and its development will largely result from the attitude, ability and action of its people.

VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the dominant problem facing the United States today is Vietnam.

We now have within the border of that small Asian nation more than 400,000 Americans. If naval units are included, the number is 500,000.

Besides these, 300,000 have returned from service there.

The United States has suffered 44,000 casualties.

The lives of all young Americans—and their parents—are being seriously affected by the Vietnam war.

During the past 12 months the number of American military personnel in Vietnam has more than doubled.

Let us examine, briefly, the U.S. troop involvement in Vietnam.

A little less than 5 years ago, in March 1962, we had only 6,000 troops there—as military advisers. By the end of 1964 the total was only 23,300. But in mid-1965—less than 2 years ago—our commitment was sharply increased and at year's end the total stood at 181,000. Only 3 months later that number had grown to 240,000.

In fact, in one short year, from March 1965 to April 1966, U.S. troop commitments increased nearly tenfold—from 29,000 to 240,000. Within the last week we have seen this figure ominously pass the 400,000 mark.

I review these figures to show that no one can say what the future holds for us in additional troop commitments. But we can say, unpleasant though it may be,

that the Nation is involved in a full-scale war. Already we have more troops in Vietnam than we had in Korea at the height of that war.

I, along with the Congress, have voted for every dollar asked in behalf of the American soldier in Vietnam. Men asked to risk their lives in the cause of freedom deserve every ounce of support their Nation can give them. Although I feel that the handling of the taxpayers' money is important, it is not the money that causes me concern; it is the lives of American troops that does.

But, while Congress has provided the dollars for the military supplies, the food, the medical necessities, our men require, we do not find this full support of the American soldier on every front.

This lack of support is reflected in Executive decisions that find our military commanders restricted in their efforts to cut the supply lines supporting the enemy on Vietnam battlegrounds and, also, in the councils of our allies who continue to trade with that enemy.

Is it the plan of our Government for us to continue in 1967 as we did in 1966?

Do we plan to send more and more troops to Vietnam and simultaneously prevent the military commanders in the field from taking adequate steps to cut off the supplies, the petroleum, the ammunition, the weapons, and eliminate the steel mills and the enemy airfields?

While the great buildup of American manpower in Vietnam was taking place, let us see what was taking place in regard to shipping into North Vietnam.

During the latter months of 1965, when the number of American troops in South Vietnam was being increased from 60,000 to 181,000, 44 allied ships, of which 35 were British, entered North Vietnam harbors during the months of October, November, and December.

Mr. President, it was not until the spring of 1966, and I submit as a result of speeches made on the floor of the Senate, including speeches by the Senator from Virginia, that there was any appreciable decrease of this allied shipping into the North Vietnamese harbors.

But as late as this past November—December figures are not available—ships flying the flag of Great Britain still were carrying cargo into and out of Haiphong.

Now, let us consider the role of the United Nations and our representative to the United Nations.

First, let me say this: The facts show that the appointment of Ambassador Goldberg to the U.S. Supreme Court and to the United Nations had my approval. My feeling about the United Nations has been recorded many times: Having returned from Okinawa to San Francisco at the time the United Nations was formed, it held for me high hopes that another generation of Americans would not be called upon to offer their lives for their country in war.

Now, let us consider the attitude of the United Nations toward American involvement in Vietnam.

The Senator from Virginia recently put this question to Ambassador Goldberg:

Is the war in Viet Nam a United Nations war, or as it a United States war only?

Ambassador Goldberg's reply said this:

The war in Viet Nam is neither a United Nations war nor a "United States only" war.

And then he added:

While we are making the major contribution, substantial contributions have been made by a number of South Viet Nam's closest neighbors who are most directly concerned with the conflict. Some 50,000 men are in the field from five of these nations.

Let us analyze the 50,000 troops of "Vietnam's closest neighbors who are most directly concerned with the conflict."

The total figure, other than Americans, as of January 19, 1967, is 52,450. Of these, 45,440 come from Korea.

The other troops involved in Vietnam are as follows: Australian, 4,700; Philipines, 4,000; and New Zealand, 150.

According to the President of the United States in his message to the Congress, the United States has 500,000 men involved in Vietnam. Four other nations have a total of 52,450, of which 45,440 are Korean. I do not belittle the efforts of the four nations; I praise them for taking a stand alongside the United States.

A second question I put to Ambassador Goldberg is this:

Does the United Nations consider North Vietnam an aggressor nation?

He replied that the United Nations "has taken no formal position on the Vietnamese war."

My next question to Ambassador Goldberg:

Has the delegation of the United States to the United Nations officially sought United Nations military help in Vietnam?

Ambassador Goldberg replied thusly:

Because of the sharply divided opinions of United Nations members, it is not realistic to seek a United Nations military role.

So the U.S. Government, while committing hundreds of thousands of troops to Vietnam, and while paying 31 percent of the cost of the United Nations, has not persisted in efforts to brand North Vietnam an aggressor nation saying: It is not realistic to seek military help from the United Nations.

Our representative does not even ask for United Nations help. He does not take to the floor of the U.N. Assembly or stand in the councils of the United Nations Security Council and officially demand that this world organization, which was designed to keep the peace, give some help to the United States.

The next question the Senator from Virginia asked Ambassador Goldberg was this:

Has the United States delegation advocated economic sanctions against North Vietnam?

His answer amounted to "No."

The U.S. representative to the United Nations has, however, demanded economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

Our Government has not sought sanctions against North Vietnam through whose ports flow many of the war materials killing Americans in South Vietnam. No, we have not done that.

But our representative in the United Nations has demanded sanctions against the peaceful little country of Rhodesia. The Socialist Government of Great Britain cracked the whip and the representative of the U.S. Government at the United Nations jumped to his feet and demanded that sanctions be applied against Rhodesia, whose crime is that she is seeking independence from Great Britain, the crime that the United States itself committed in 1775.

In discussing this, Ambassador Goldberg said:

The United Kingdom, which has primary responsibility for this problem, has turned to the United Nations for assistance.

I ask this question Mr. President: Why does not the United States seek United Nations assistance in Vietnam?

Because, Mr. Goldberg says, of "sharply divided opinions of United Nations members" concerning Vietnam.

So, because of "sharply divided opinions of United Nations members" our representative remains officially silent about economic sanctions against North Vietnam, yet speaks out for economic sanctions against a country that is threatening no other nation.

Is it logical to demand sanctions against a country at peace while being unwilling to demand the same sanctions against a country at whose hands the American people have suffered 44,000 casualties and whose sons' very lives are involved?

While a worldwide embargo has been put on the flow of oil to Rhodesia, the oil for war continues to flow freely to North Vietnam.

Perhaps this makes sense, but the Senator from Virginia is finding it difficult to reach that conclusion.

Another question I put to Ambassador Goldberg was this:

Does the United States delegation to the United Nations think the United Nations should adopt sanctions against North Vietnam?

Ambassador Goldberg said, "We would naturally welcome" such a decision, "but as a practical matter we know that this cannot be done."

I say, Mr. President, that whether or not this objective can be accomplished, Mr. Goldberg has an obligation to strive constantly for it.

But why does not he stand up in council and demand a rollcall vote? Let us see where Great Britain stands. Let us see if Great Britain is willing to vote sanctions against North Vietnam after demanding that we vote sanctions against Rhodesia. British ships, as I mentioned earlier, carried on a brisk trade with North Vietnam during the year 1966.

Why should not the other U.N. members be called on to cast a vote of "yea" or "nay" on a proposal to adopt sanctions against North Vietnam?

Maybe Mr. Goldberg can not accomplish this objective in the United Nations, but I am inclined to think that if he would spend half the time trying to help the American military effort in Vietnam that he did in seeking sanctions against Rhodesia, then the American people and their sons would be better off.

In arguing the case in favor of sanctions against Rhodesia, Ambassador Goldberg said this:

What is happening in Rhodesia now is an effort to perpetuate the control of 6% of the population over the other 94%...

Is it not a fact that in the Soviet Union the members of the Communist Party, comprising about 1 percent of the population and acting through a few leaders, control the other 99 percent of the people of that nation of nearly 200 million?

Is it not a fact that a handful of men control the destinies of all the people of Albania?

Is it not a fact that a handful of men control all the people in Bulgaria and in Rumania and in Yugoslavia?

Is it not a fact that Fidel Castro almost singlehanded, operating through a small Communist cadre, controls the lives and fortunes of nearly 7 million Cubans?

Is it not a fact that in the world's largest nation, China, the lives of nearly 700 million persons are controlled by a small Communist dictatorship?

Does Mr. Goldberg plan to advocate economic sanctions against any of these Communist countries?

I think the American people should be aware of this fact: That during 1966, 240 ships flying the flags of members of the United Nations carried cargo to and from the North Vietnamese port of Haiphong.

When I returned from Okinawa to San Francisco on that day in May in 1945 on which the United Nations was born, I had in my heart a hope that such a world organization would make it unnecessary for another generation of Americans to risk their lives overseas.

Yet, today, 22 years later, we find the United Nations concerning itself not with the aggressions of a nation killing Americans, but rather confining its activities to a nation at peace.

I speak not as one who is unfriendly to the British people. They have, in ages past and in the 20th century, given the world a full measure of the lesson of real democracy.

But I am alarmed over events in Vietnam. I am deeply concerned because every day more and more Americans die there. And while that conflict increasingly becomes an American war, the rest of the world, our friends included, are indifferent or even hostile.

The extent of its American nature was dramatized just this month by the removal of 100,000 South Vietnamese troops from our fighting ranks in their own country. They were given more peaceful roles; their replacement in combat are Americans.

I have three purposes in this speech today:

First, to put together in one place certain facts I feel the people of the United States should know.

Second, I feel, so long as we have great masses of American troops in Vietnam, that more freedom must be given our military leaders in determining how best to protect American troops and to bring the war to an early and honorable conclusion.

Third, I feel the time has come for the American people and their representa-

tives to speak frankly and strongly in seeking military support from other nations. Too long has the United States submitted to pressure from other nations for help from us, but never do we seem willing to apply pressure in our behalf.

DEFERMENT OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the United States of America, as has been said by several Senators earlier today, is in a period of rapid and challenging change. Those of us in the Senate, who are responsible for giving very careful attention to our highway construction programs, have the responsibility to rise on the floor of the Senate and speak to a problem that has arisen in the past several months; namely, the deferment by the President of the United States of the highway construction program.

I think it important at the outset to state, Mr. President, that we are a little more than halfway through the program of 41,000 miles of interstate and defense highways in the United States of America.

Although it was the largest public works program, in the history of the world, the job involves a program that is still to be brought to fruition.

I share the concern expressed by Members of the Senate over the November announcement freezing the obligation of Federal highway funds at a level of \$3.3 billion during fiscal year 1967. Representatives of the American highway construction industry have placed the industry's case before the newly confirmed Secretary of Transportation, the Honorable Alan S. Boyd, who will now be substantially responsible for the Nation's road program. As a matter of fact, the huge highway obligation deferment was the subject of much discussion at Mr. Boyd's confirmation hearing on January 11.

Our concern is shared by Governors, by State highway officials, by those who represent the American Automobile Association, and by those who speak for the unions involved in highway construction. Unfortunately, it is not within my power to make the problems created by this action disappear with a wave of the hand. But I can and do express my concern and call for corrective actions.

The decision to cut back the obligation of highway funds was made at the highest level of the executive branch of Government. The President's decision was, he announced, based on the state of our economy. The President has indicated that the action taken was necessary to ease the inflationary pressures which have resulted from our involvement in Vietnam and the resulting competition for available materials and labor.

The members of our Public Works Committee share the distress of the highway team over the fund deferments. Individually and collectively they have expressed their interest in doing something to alleviate this problem. I have counseled with the President three times, as recently as last Thursday night in a White House conference. I dispatched

two messages to him from which I will quote.

Both Senate and House Public Works Committees will call for testimony from Federal Government representatives responsible for administration of our national highway system. We will discuss with them the ramifications of the deferment decision in an effort to determine the economic and program impacts of the President's orders.

The following brief message was sent to the President on Friday:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As stated at the White House last night, the November Executive Order freezing obligation of Federal-Aid Highway funds at a 3.3 billion dollar level, and the proposed additional 400 million dollar deferment of highway fund obligations have become sources of deep concern to members of the Senate. A substantial number of them have expressed their concern to me and to other members of the Public Works Committee and its Subcommittee on Roads, both of which I chair.

It was helpful to have had the opportunity to discuss this subject again with you and the Director of the Budget. I appreciated your understanding attitude, and I feel reassured that the period of effectiveness of the highway obligation deferments will be held to a minimum.

Nevertheless, it is incumbent to convey to you the feeling of many persons in both public and private sectors of highway programming and construction that severe damage to the program impends.

Those who tooled up in response to the Federal admonition that the national system of Interstate and Defense Highways be completed as expeditiously as possible, feel frustrated and discouraged in degree.

Our highways are vital to the long range economic development of the United States and to its growing population. Progress in highway program expansion and in highway construction technology are also essential in reducing the traffic accident and fatality rates.

The Senate Public Works Committee will hold public hearings on this matter in late February. The Committee will desire that officials of the Executive Branch responsible for the highway program be available for discussions and counseling.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Chairman, Public Works Committee.

In a more detailed communication to the executive department we anticipate expressing these views:

We have studied the transcript of the President's press conference No. 94, held Tuesday, January 17, 1967, in the President's Office, the White House. He discussed what he described as "the deferments and the withholding that we indicated to Chairman MILLS and others back in September we would attempt to make from last year's authorizations and appropriations." In the transcript, I read these explanations:

We stated at that time that we would attempt * * * to withhold or defer or stretch out and postpone the equivalent of \$3 billion, or at least \$3 billion. It was \$3 billion in Federal programs, and not expenditures.

The President pointed out that most of the newspaper and periodical articles referred to \$3 billion in expenditure postponement or deferment, rather than to program withholding or stretch out. He emphasized that there is much difference between actions on slowing down pro-

grams and deferring expenditures. I note the comment that "in order to get the \$3 billion in expenditures, it was necessary to go to \$5 billion-plus in programs," and "we are still working to that end." By way of further explanation, the President said:

We propose to reduce the program level not by \$3 billion, but by \$5.3 billion. We propose to reduce the expenditures by \$3 billion.

Those explanations afford us a better insight into the background of the administration's efforts to defer \$5.3 billion of Federal program, equivalent to approximately \$3 billion in expenditures.

The President mentioned that "One of the bigger items is the obligation for roads," and reiterated that "we do plan definitely to withhold \$1.1 billion, or to defer it" for "how long I don't know, but that depends on the economic situation."

Then the President added what I believe to be too much further uncertainty to the highway situation by stating:

We have under consideration an additional \$400 million.

Presumably—I am not sure that I am correct—this means \$400 million of highway obligation deferments in addition to the \$1.1 billion previously announced and reiterated at the Tuesday news conference.

There is encouragement in the statement that this contemplated \$400 million "is not included in any of these figures"—the \$5.3 billion of reductions in program level and the deferred expenditures in the amount of \$3 billion.

The President stated further that "no determination has been made on it"—namely, the possible \$400 million of additional highway obligation deferments.

As a Member of Congress, I have been made thoroughly cognizant, as have other Members of Congress, of our country's highway problems, status, and needs, through lengthy service on the old Committee on Roads in the House and now on the Subcommittee on Roads of the Senate Committee on Public Works—both of which I chair—and I doubt the need for the original \$1.1 billion program of deferments. In my judgment, it is an unfortunate action. Accordingly, I feel it would be even more unfortunate and equally as unnecessary to defer obligations authorized for the States in an additional amount of \$400 million. I urge that this further reduction be dropped. I do not believe the state of the economy makes these deferments necessary.

I am not convinced that the state of the economy demands the dislocations, delays, and depreciation that the proposed program and expenditure deferments will cause.

It is my belief that the proposed new surtax at a 6-percent rate, or some other suitable rate, would be a means of deflating an inflated economy without the need to interfere with progress toward meeting our Nation's highway needs. Those who advocate the so-called cutbacks on public works, or their deferment for unspecified periods, are not programing wisely, in my opinion.

Willingness on my part to support the surtax proposals—or any other new taxes—would be offset and perhaps dis-

couraged by deferment of such programs so vital to America as keeping current with highway needs. We cannot safely defer attacking, through highway construction, the pyramiding problems of traffic density, urban area congestion, and traffic safety.

The argument is made that the authorized and appropriated funds affected by the program and expenditure deferments will accrue eventually to the programs and the projects for which the expenditures were authorized. Insofar as this argument is used to seek to justify highway construction deferments I believe it to be in error.

The deferrals and possible later massive restarts will create chaotic problems for highway administrators, engineers, road builders, contractors, labor unions, suppliers, and numerous other elements of both the public and private sectors of the economy. These conditions will illogically and adversely affect orderly progress, and may also create economic recession.

The President also stated:

In case we wanted to, or in case we needed to, if the men should come home (from military service) and if we should have a need for extra jobs, we could immediately come up to Congress and say, "You have already authorized this. Give us some money now." He will come in with a supplemental for it. "We are now prepared," he said, "In case we do need jobs for our men, we will have projects that are available to them. We will not have to work them up over night."

I commend this purpose and this explanation, but it is difficult to rationalize a necessity to defer highway progress so extensively now in order to make jobs later. There are millions on millions of dollars involved in projects in public works and economic development program files which can be brought into being to make jobs without cutting back on highways.

The paradox of this cutback is that it comes at a time when the money being spent buys fewer miles of roads. And it occurs during a period when we seem to be falling behind in meeting our highway needs. In addition, the full economic effect of the withholding of these funds will not be felt until late this year and in early 1968.

The total highway program, which this year was expected to maintain the \$15 billion level reached last year, will be 4½ percent under expectations. It is less than the level of activity for which plans had been made. However, it is not a precipitously sharp reduction. Hence, with proper adjustments, the lag could be overcome. I cannot predict an early termination of the cutback as long as there continues to be inferences from the White House that there will be additional withholding of highway funds from the states as anti-inflation measures.

Once the "freeze" is lifted, the highway team will have a responsibility to help place the Nation's highway program back on a reasonable schedule. As it is now, the program cannot be completed by the original target date. I do not need to tell my colleagues how important it is in terms of safety and human life, in national growth, and in public convenience

that we complete the interstate highway program portion as soon as possible.

In the closing minutes, I would recall to Senators, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has done in conversations with other Senators, that these funds are now within the highway trust fund, committed for highway construction. These funds have come into being through taxes which the highway users pay on tires, gasoline, oil, or other accessories. These funds are the funds of the people. They are committed to the orderly development of highways.

I hope that our hearings, beginning late in February, will be penetrating in nature and that Senators generally will assist members of the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Roads in doing a constructive, objective, but necessary job in connection with this greatest of all public works programs. We must insure the development of a highway system commensurate with the strength, growth, and the future well-being of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the able Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am in complete and thorough agreement with much of what has been said by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. Many of us have discussed this subject with him within the past 2 or 3 weeks.

I believe the reference of the Senator to the fact that this is a trust fund is true. The words literally mean "trust." We intended it to be a trust fund. These funds are not funds of the Federal Government in the sense that they are deposited in the Treasury, to be used according to the policymakers on the budget of Government expenditures or reflected in what should be done about Government taxes. These funds were deposited in the Treasury for trust keeping. In a sense they are not Government funds. They are funds of the people.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Every person who drives a car pays, and he has a definite understanding that the money will be used to make better traveling conditions, as far as roads are concerned.

I derived a little more encouragement from the colloquy at the White House with the President on this matter than I did after the statement was issued. The Senator from West Virginia will recall that at the hearings in connection with the appointment of Alan Boyd to be Secretary of Transportation this matter was gone into by members of the Committee on Commerce. A statement was made that the reason for freezing the trust fund—putting it in a temporary freeze, so to speak—was so that the Government could borrow on the fund at a very low interest rate.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from West Virginia, as it is my understanding, that the President and the Director of the Budget gave us some assurance last Thursday night that there has been no intention to borrow from these

funds? I got that understanding. I got the understanding that even though they might be putting them in the temporary freeze, or the icebox, as it were, no one was going to touch the fund, in that respect.

I believe that is encouraging, for if the Treasury gets into the habit of borrowing from the trust fund at a low interest rate, it could encourage the duration of the freeze.

The Senator has made a contribution in that respect. I believe that all of us are happy that the subcommittee of which the Senator is chairman is going to hold hearings on this matter, because keeping up with roadbuilding in this country is a most difficult problem.

There are several Senators who will appear to discuss the Interstate Highway System with the distinguished committee, wherein there may be a little problem, sometimes involving less than 50 miles in order to make the Interstate Highway a much more efficient one, due to the fact that many of the programs laying out the Interstate Highway System were submitted 10 or 12 years ago. Populations may have shifted and conditions may be different, and we may be coming in to ask for modest, very modest extensions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Extensions of 1,000 miles perhaps.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Perhaps 1,000 miles would take care of the matter; perhaps 41,000 miles instead of 42,000 miles. The Senator from Alaska indicated that he would like 1 mile in Alaska, and we said we would give 2, which would mean an increase of 100 percent.

There is a serious problem in that respect and it is going to be much more difficult to settle if there is no light at the end of the tunnel; that is, that we are going to use these funds for the purpose for which it was stated they were going to be used.

I do not think that we can keep up with the traffic problem. We are always behind. Thus, I compliment the Senator on his talk. I think he is doing a service to point out the unique character of the highway funds. They are a little different from ordinary taxpayers' funds.

Mr. RANDOLPH. As the Senator has said so well, the President is concerned—as are we—about this situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I would think that if they borrowed from the highway trust fund, if contemplated, and the President indicated that it was not, that would defeat the anti-inflationary feature.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I agree. Of course, it would be getting money at a much cheaper rate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would be limited to the short term, but the Senator and I know, after all these years in the Senate, that once we start to find sources of cheaper money, it will be difficult to get the trust fund to open up again. Too often it might be used for that purpose. But, however, I am encouraged. I think the Senator from West Virginia understands that we can get this matter taken care of.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. I think that section 209(e), of the Trust Fund Act

requires that. It allows the Government to borrow money at a low rate of interest for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I think it was emphatic that there was no intention to do that. I hope that they carry it out.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sure that we can find areas of affirmative action, even though the order of November has caused concern among Members of the Senate with respect to the continuation of the highway building programs in their States.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL—APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, and other Members, a bill to supplement and amend the Appalachian regional development program. This legislation is designed to reauthorize the programs developed to assist in the economic revival of the 12-State region known as Appalachia.

What we are proposing is an authorization on the same scale as that which was approved by Congress in 1965. At that time, excluding the Appalachian highway system, we authorized \$252,400,000 to carry out the program. This year we will consider a bill which would authorize the expenditure of \$263,150,000. These authorizations would cover fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

The concept of Appalachia as a working partnership between the States and the Federal Government has proven itself in the 2 years the program has been in existence. Experience has indicated the need for certain changes.

The bill, which we introduced today, is designed to effect changes within the framework of original legislation. There are certain additional Federal programs which will be included under the umbrella of the Appalachian Regional Commission. Among these are low-income housing under the provisions of section 221 of the Housing Act of 1954, the extension of the availability of planning money under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to the so-called local development districts, and planning under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Pursuant to a recent note of the State members of the Commission 26 counties located in Mississippi would be added to the definition of the term "Appalachian Region."

The major change which we are presenting for comment would provide that the appropriation of funds for Appalachian regional development would be made directly to the Commission.

Based on the experience of the past 2 years, especially in view of the modest nature of the program when broken down into its constituent elements, the inclusion of appropriation requests for particular Appalachian programs in the larger budgets of executive departments which are responsible for implementing the individual programs, has deprived the Commission of the ability to propose, prepare, present and fight for the money it needs to make the total program work.

Another suggested amendment which would give the Commission itself the authority to approve programs likewise appears necessary if the program is to fulfill the promise it now holds for the revitalization of the Appalachian region. The partnership which I mentioned before is such that once any State involved has requested a particular project—and the Commission, including the Federal Cochairman—reviews and recommends it, it seems unnecessary and somewhat cumbersome for the agency carrying out the Federal portion of the program to have the final word on whether or not the program will in fact become a reality.

We undertook this program in 1965, in part, as an experiment in creative federalism. We looked to it as a test of the ability of State and local governments to more adequately meet their needs. If they are to do this, it seems to sponsors that we must give them the final word. The Federal interests in these programs will be properly and fully protected by the Federal cochairman, as has been so ably demonstrated by Federal Cochairman John Sweeney.

The Special Subcommittee on Economic Development will begin hearings on this legislation next week. These hearings will begin on January 24, and extend through January 25, 26 and 31, and February 1 and 2.

We will hear from the State cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Honorable Hulett Smith, Governor of West Virginia, and from the Honorable John Sweeney, the Federal Cochairman, Members of the Senate, as well as from representatives of the Federal agencies who are involved in the Appalachian effort. These representatives, I might add, will be those members of the agencies who have the direct line responsibilities for carrying out the projects which heretofore have been recommended by the Appalachian Regional Commission. In addition, we will hear from a number of interested private citizens and groups.

The committee looks forward to these hearings as an opportunity to measure the success of the program, to test its strengths and to review its weaknesses. When we have completed our deliberations, we will report legislation which we are hopeful will enlist the full support of Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, we are glad that the President formally recommended such an extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, in a message to the Congress last week, and I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the President's letter to the Vice President printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 20, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recommend that the Congress extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The Act was conceived in a true spirit of partnership. It was originated by the Governors of the Appalachian states. It was formed in close cooperation with the Execu-

tive Branch. And it was approved by the Congress of all the people.

That partnership has flourished. Working together through the Appalachian Regional Commission, the 12 Governors and the Federal Co-Chairman are bringing new hope—human and economic—to the 18 million people who live in Appalachia.

Today, there is a spirit of opportunity and purpose in a region where once prospects were bleak and hopes were dim.

Because of the work done by the Commission and cooperating Federal, state and local agencies—

51 hospitals have been completed or are under construction;

52 vocational education schools are being built;

Work is underway on 790 miles of the development highway system;

New libraries, airports, college classrooms and water resource projects are being pursued to completion;

Thousands of workers have been trained, hired and added to the payrolls.

During the past 2 years, the Appalachian partnership has proved the wisdom of cooperative Federal-state relationships. Let us continue that partnership for there is still much to be done to bring into Appalachia a full share of America's prosperity.

I therefore urge an extension of the Appalachian program in substantially the same form as it was enacted in 1965. I hope that the Commission's success in the past will insure its continuance in the future.

In my State of the Union Message, I expressed by intention to submit to the Congress a proposal to merge the present Departments of Commerce and Labor into a single Cabinet-level Department. When that proposal is forwarded to the Congress, it will contain a recommendation that Federal activities relating to regional economic development and depressed areas be coordinated through the new Department. This Department would then have the basic responsibility for the Federal government's efforts in all of the regional commissions that have been or soon will be established, including the Appalachian Regional Commission.

In the meantime, I urge the Congress to extend the authorization for the Appalachian regional program.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I also ask that the bill lie on the desk for 10 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk for 10 days, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join in introducing the Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967 with my good friend the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has exercised great leadership in this field, not only on behalf of his own State and for the people of the Appalachian region, but also as a member and now chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works.

A great deal of the support which led to the Appalachian regional development program came from Kentucky, and following the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission to President John F. Kennedy, containing the recommendations of the Governors, legis-

lation was recommended, which I cosponsored with the Senator from West Virginia, and which was passed by the Senate in 1964.

President Johnson has taken great interest in the problems of the region, and we are glad that he has given the Appalachian development program full support. In 1965, I again joined Senator RANDOLPH in introducing S. 3, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which was cosponsored by 45 other Members of the Senate, and which became law March 9, 1965.

The Appalachian program has brought new hope to the people of the region, and stands today as an outstanding example of State initiative, and cooperation with the Federal Government. In Kentucky work is already underway on 341 miles of roads within the Appalachian development highway system, of which 61 miles is in construction, and for which \$60 million of the \$300 million appropriated for this system has been allocated to Kentucky.

There has also been approved for Kentucky nearly \$6 million in supplemental grant funds for vocational education, hospitals, libraries and other projects. The State has chosen to devote chief emphasis under the Appalachian program to construction of vocational educational facilities, and is also participating effectively in the land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control program.

One of the greatest accomplishments under the act, I think, is its demonstration that a group of States, different in many characteristics but having problems in common, can work so effectively, through their Governors, toward the solution of those problems with Federal cooperation and assistance.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 included authorization for 6 years for its principal program, the Appalachian development highway system. However, authorization for appropriations through June 30, 1967, was provided for the other programs to be carried out under the act. Therefore, it is necessary to renew that authorization this year, and the Public Works Committee has scheduled hearings to begin tomorrow on the extension of the Appalachian program.

The bill Senator RANDOLPH and I introduce today, entitled "The Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1967," will continue for 2 years the programs for demonstration health facilities; land stabilization, conservation and erosion control; mining area restoration; vocational educational facilities; sewage treatment works, and grant-in-aid supplements. It proposes an authorization of \$263 million, compared to \$252 million authorized for the first 2 years, for these and all other programs under the act, except the highway system.

The second chief effect of the bill would be to provide that the appropriation of funds would be made directly to the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, which would then transfer funds to the operating agencies which carry out its programs.

The bill as it has been prepared proposes certain other changes, to be con-

sidered during the hearings and by our committee, and I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the proposed bill and a summary of Appalachian program funds be printed in the Record following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Appalachian regional development program is directed to a great and evident need, recognized by the Congress and the people of our country. The 18 million people living in the hills and valleys in the Appalachian region of a dozen States—including eastern Kentucky—have already seen the first results of this program providing support for transportation and flood protection, and for education and community development. As the Congress gives evidence of its continued support for this program, we know they will continue to work to make their contribution, and achieve a level of productivity and of living in which they and the Nation will take pride.

I am grateful to my friend from West Virginia, Senator RANDOLPH, for his work and for his kind words. I will join him in the Public Works Committee, and during the hearings of our Special Subcommittee on Economic Development, to secure full consideration of these proposals, and to bring a bill before the Senate.

I hope that other Members of the Senate will again join us in support of the Appalachian regional development program. It will benefit the Appalachian States, it is true, but it will also benefit the Nation.

EXHIBIT 1

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The bill would—

1. Authorize appropriations for the period ending June 30, 1969, for all programs under the Act except the Appalachian Development Highway System—in effect continuing for two years financial assistance for Demonstration Health Facilities (Sec. 202); Land Stabilization, Conservation, and Erosion Control (Sec. 203); Timber Development Organizations (Sec. 204); Mining Area Restoration (Sec. 205); Vocational Educational Facilities (Sec. 211); Sewage Treatment Works (Sec. 212), and Supplements to Federal Grant-in-Aid Programs (Sec. 214).

The new authorization proposed for Section 401, which provides funds for these programs, is \$263,150,000. This compares to \$252,400,000 authorized for the period ending June 30, 1967.

2. Increase from 2,350 to 2,700 miles the length of the Appalachian development highway system, and from 1,000 to 2,000 the mileage of local access roads to be constructed. (Appropriation authority for this program is already provided in Sec. 201, effective through June 30, 1971 when the Act terminates.) The existing authorization of \$840 million would be increased \$175 million by providing, in addition to the \$300 million already appropriated, specific fiscal year authorizations as follows: 1968—\$110 million; 1969—\$255 million; 1970—\$245 million; 1971—\$105 million.

The 350 miles added to the development highway system would provide for a highway corridor in New York State (added to the Region following a Senate amendment), and a connecting link in Pennsylvania. \$140 million of the new authorization is for this purpose; the remaining \$35 million is for the local access roads.

3. Authorize the Appalachian Regional Development Commission to approve for assistance the programs and projects authorized by the Act, and to advance funds appropriated under the Act to the departments and agencies implementing those programs and projects.

Applications for programs and projects are now approved for assistance by the Commission, following approval by the State member (Sec. 303). Programs and projects may not be implemented until plans for them have been recommended by the Commission, submitted to and approved or modified by the President or his designate (Sec. 223).

The amendments would permit the Commission to testify to the appropriations for the Appalachian program (now within the agency budgets at Commerce, HEW, Agriculture and Interior) by directing the appropriation to the Commission, which would then advance funds for its programs to the operational agencies.

4. Authorize a loan program under Section 221 of the National Housing Act, limited to \$5 million of the funds authorized

by Section 401, to be deposited in a revolving fund.

5. Add 26 counties in Mississippi to the Appalachian region.

6. Also include provisions to: Authorize the States to construct segments of the development highway system in advance of appropriations. Provide Commission employees certain Federal service credits. Reimburse the cost of attracting, training and retaining personnel at a demonstration health project. Add abandoned oil and gas wells, waste piles, and land acquisition costs, to the mining area restoration authority. Add "equipment" to the vocational educational facilities grant authority. Make local development districts eligible for planning grants under Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954. Authorize grants under the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 to local education agencies and the Commission for educational planning and research. Transfer from the Secretary of Commerce to the Commission the authority to make grants for administrative expenses (and technical services) of local development districts.

(Summary prepared for Senator Cooper.)

Appalachian program funds (except development highways)

[In millions of dollars]

	Authorized, first 2 years ¹	Appropriated	Proposed, next 2 years ²
Sec. 105. Administration.....	2.4	2.39	2
Sec. 202. Demonstration health facilities.....	69.0	23.5	70
Sec. 203. Land stabilization, conservation, erosion control.....	17.0	10	17
Sec. 204. Timber development organizations.....	5.0	1	4
Sec. 205. Mining area restoration.....	38.5	24.85	39.15
Sec. 206. Water resource survey.....	5.0	3.3	2
Sec. 207. Housing.....			5
Sec. 211. Vocational education facilities.....	18.0	16	18
Sec. 212. Sewage treatment works.....	6.0	6	6
Sec. 214. Grant-in-aid supplements.....	90.0	75	90
Sec. 302. Local development districts.....	5.5	5.25	10
Total under sec. 401.....	252.4	167.29	263.15

¹ Authorized by act of Mar. 9, 1965, for period through June 30, 1967.

² Proposed by amendments of 1967, for period through June 30, 1969.

NOTE.—Does not include 6-year total of \$840,000,000 for development highway system authorized by act of 1965 proposed to be increased \$175,000,000 by amendments of 1967.
(Prepared for Senator Cooper.)

SENATE RULES—AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII, RELATING TO CLO- TURE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, at the advent of Telstar, someone remarked, Was it not a shame that the greatest breakthrough in communications in the history of man should come at a time when man had nothing to say?

Called upon to make my maiden address, it also comes at a time when I have nothing to say that has not been said before—far more eloquently and with greater authority.

One significant thing should be observed first, however, and that is that the Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States, has put to rest the doubt with respect to the U.S. Senate being a continuing body.

It has been stated that the entire matter of rule XXII began with the introduction by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], of Resolution 6. However, I should like to think that the controversy really began on December 20 of last year, in a memorandum prepared by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, entitled "Revision of Senate Rules at the Opening of a New Congress," and signed by Vincent

A. Doyle, legislative attorney, referring to the fact that the Presiding Officer could really rule that the Senate could set aside, by majority vote, its present rules of itself being a continuing body without the Presiding Officer taking a stand.

Referring to the memorandum, it states on page 1:

You have asked what procedures and suggested rulings seem to be most defensible and logical for placing before the Senate at the opening of a new Congress the question of the constitutional right of the majority to terminate debate on modification of Rule XXII. There is general agreement that the Presiding Officer cannot and should not decide the constitutional issue. There is, however, some disagreement about whether, in the absence of a unanimous consent agreement, there is any way, short of adopting a cloture petition, for the Senate to decide the issue unless the Presiding Officer simply puts the question to the Senate for a vote without debate.

There are some who argue that any ruling of the Chair which permits a vote on the constitutional issue without following Rule XXII is in effect a decision by the Chair on the constitutional issue.

Not so, says the memorandum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorandum printed in the RECORD.

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

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,

Washington, D.C., December 20, 1966.

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Revision of Senate Rules at the Opening of a New Congress.

You have asked what procedures and suggested rulings seem to be most defensible and logical for placing before the Senate at the opening of a new Congress the question of the constitutional right of the majority to terminate debate on modification of Rule XXII. There is general agreement that the Presiding Officer cannot and should not decide the constitutional issue. There is, however, some disagreement about whether, in the absence of a unanimous-consent agreement, there is any way, short of adopting a cloture petition, for the Senate to decide the issue unless the Presiding Officer simply puts the question to the Senate for a vote without debate.

There are some who argue that any ruling of the Chair which permits a vote on the constitutional issue without following Rule XXII is in effect a decision by the Chair on the constitutional issue. Not so. Given an opportunity to vote, the majority might decide that Rule XXII was not unconstitutional. A ruling that debate must continue until cloture be invoked under Rule XXII is more nearly characterized as a decision by the Chair on the constitutional issue because it might effectively prevent the Senate from deciding the issue. Ideally, however, the parliamentary situation should develop so that the Vice President need give no ruling, nor even an opinion, on the constitutional issue. Such a development seems possible, though, to be sure, a new trail would be blazed. It is a trail, however, marked by some favorable precedents.

One parliamentary fact of life sometimes overlooked is that the Rule XXII procedure is not the only one available for limiting or terminating debate on a matter. Watkins and Riddick in *Senate Procedure* list 27 non-debatable matters (S. Doc. No. 44, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 325-327). If the constitutional issue were so framed that the Senate could vote upon it as a non-debatable matter, there would be no need for a decision of the Chair on the issue. In his remarks at the opening of the 85th, 86th and 87th Congresses, Vice President Nixon pointed the way. Perhaps the most significant of his comments were made in 1959:

"If, for example, during the course of the debate on the motion of the Senator from Texas, which deals with changing the rules, a Senator believes that action should be taken and debate closed, such Senator at that time could, in the opinion of the Chair, raise the constitutional question by moving to cut off debate. The Chair would indicate his opinion that such a motion was in order but would submit the question to the Senate for its decision." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 1, page 9.

And later in that session he said:

"A constitutional question would be presented if the time should come during the course of the debate when action on changing the rules should seem unlikely because of extended debate. At that point any Member of the Senate, in the opinion of the Chair, would have the right to move to cut off debate. Such a motion would be questioned by raising a point of order. At that point the Chair would submit the question to the Senate on the ground that a constitutional question had been raised because of the Chair's opinion that the Senate, at the commencement of a new Congress, has the power to make its rules. That power, in the Chair's opinion, cannot be restricted even by action of the Senate itself, which would be the case where the membership of the

Senate in one Congress has attempted to curtail the constitutional right of the membership of the Senate in another Congress to adopt its rules." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 1, page 103 (emphasis added).

Although these statements pointed the way, we cannot know for certain where Vice President Nixon's path might have led because that year the Senate voted on a resolution to amend Rule XXII under the terms of a unanimous consent agreement. The Nixon path was not followed in 1961 because the rules change resolution was referred to committee and by the time it reached the floor again Vice President Johnson was in the Chair and a vote to invoke cloture failed by a vote of 37-43.

The Senate proceedings in 1963, in connection with S. Res. 9, deserve careful consideration. As the situation was described by Joseph L. Rauh in his memorandum of October 14, 1966, prepared for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights:

"In January 1963, the times were ripe for victory. A clear majority of the Senators favored changing Rule XXII at the opening of the Senate of the 88th Congress. With this majority behind him, Senator Anderson, the floor leader of the effort to change Rule XXII, moved to close debate under the Constitution and the Nixon advisory rulings; this move was frustrated when Vice President Johnson put the Anderson motion to close debate to the Senate for debate instead of for a vote (as Vice President Nixon had indicated he would have done). Putting the Anderson motion to close debate to the Senate for debate, of course, had the effect of killing the motion; this forced the supporters of a change in Rule XXII to a cloture motion which was lost 54-42 (less than two-thirds)." Rauh memo, *supra*, p. 3.

There are at least two observations to be made about this account. First, from Vice President Nixon's remarks, it is not at all certain that he would have proceeded to put the motion to close debate to an immediate vote. What he said at CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 1, page 103 was that when the motion to cut off debate was made, "Such a motion would be questioned by raising a point of order" (emphasis added). Second, what Vice President Johnson did in 1963 was to decide himself that the Anderson motion raised a constitutional question rather than wait for a Member of the Senate to make a point of order against the motion. Senator Anderson sent the following motion to the desk:

"I move under the Constitution that without further debate the Chair submit the pending question to the Senate for a vote." (The pending question was the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 9 to amend Rule XXII).

Immediately, the Vice President spoke as follows:

"The VICE PRESIDENT. This motion raises explicitly a constitutional question. There have been 38 previous occupants of this chair, and the Parliamentarian informs me that all of the decisions have been uniform, that the Presiding Officer does not have the authority to rule on a constitutional matter. The Chair is in full agreement with those precedents, because the Vice President cannot make a decision for 100 Senators, unless he has previously been granted the authority to make that decision. . . .

"This the Senate can do by a majority vote. Therefore, the Chair submits the question:

"Does a majority of the Senate have the right under the Constitution to terminate debate at the beginning of a session and proceed to an immediate vote on a rule change notwithstanding the provisions of existing Senate rules?" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, page 1214.

The Vice President was not required to make his own determination that the Ander-

son motion presented a constitutional question. He could have, and on many occasions other Presiding Officers have, waited until a Senator had made a point of order against the motion. Had he waited for a point of order, the question submitted to the Senate (for debate because points of order submitted to the Senate are ordinarily debatable) would have been something like:

"Shall the point of order against the Anderson motion on the grounds that it is authorized by neither the Constitution nor the rules of the Senate be sustained?"

This difference in the manner in which the question arises and the way it is framed for the Senate's decision makes all the difference in the world in what a majority can decide. As you know, a motion to table is not debatable. A motion to table a question like that presented to the Senate in 1963 is in effect a motion to table the Anderson motion. A motion to table the point of order against the Anderson motion, if successful, however, would in effect be a rejection by the Senate of the point of order. As Senator Russell said in 1957, after Vice President Nixon had submitted to the Senate for debate and decision a point of order made by Senator Russell and had ruled that a motion to table would be in order:

"I wish to make it perfectly clear that there is a rule, of course, that when a point of order to a ruling is pending, if a motion to table is made and the motion prevails, it is the sense that the point of order was not well taken and the precedent would be established against the point of order." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 7, page 9817.

His colloquy with the Vice President continued:

"The Chair rules, as I understand, that were the Chair by his own action has submitted a point of order to the Senate for determination, that a motion to table would lie?"

"The VICE PRESIDENT. Under Rule XXII, in the opinion of the Chair, that is a question to which a point of order would lie.

"Mr. RUSSELL. When the motion is made, a Senator could protect himself by a point of order against a motion to table. Is that correct?"

"The VICE PRESIDENT. A Senator can always appeal from the decision of the Chair, if that is what the Senator from Georgia refers to."

If we assume that debate on a rules change at the beginning of the 90th Congress proceeds as it did in the 89th Congress, a different result can be reached if a proponent of the change makes a motion something like:

I move that the Senate, immediately and without further debate (or with a specific time for debate, perhaps allowing one hour for each Senator) direct the Chair to submit to the Senate for a vote the following questions:

1. Shall the Senate adopt the X amendment to the Y substitute for the Z motion to change the Senate rules? (majority of those present and voting);

2. Shall the Senate adopt the Y substitute (as amended or not by the preceding vote) to the Z motion to change the Senate rules? (constitutional majority);

3. Shall the Senate adopt the Z motion (as amended or not by the preceding votes) to change the Senate rules? (three-fifths of those present and voting);

and, that the Senate further direct the Chair to put to the Senate for a vote the question on the adoption of this motion, without further debate, immediately after the Senate has decided that this motion is proper by refusing to sustain a point of order against it, whether by approving a motion to table the point of order or otherwise.

Immediately after the motion was made, the Vice President could recognize a Senator whom he knew would make a point of order

against the motion in language something like:

I make the point of order that this motion is improper and not authorized by the Constitution or rules of the Senate.

The Vice President would submit the point of order to the Senate for debate because it raises a constitutional question. The question he would submit is: "Shall the point of order that the motion is improper because not authorized by the Constitution or rules of the Senate be sustained?"

To parliamentary inquiries, the Vice President would reply that the majority of the Senate by failing to sustain the point of order would be directing him to proceed as the motion provides.

After debate had proceeded for some time a proponent of the rules change would make a motion to table. "A motion to lay on the table a point of order submitted to the Senate is in order and not debatable." Watkins and Riddick, *supra*, p. 473. As Senator Russell acknowledged (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 7, p. 9817), "if a motion to table is made and the motion prevails, it is the sense that the point of order was not well taken, and the precedent would be established against the point of order." If a point of order were made against the motion to table, the Vice President would rule the point of order not well taken, for which ruling there is precedent as indicated above. If an appeal were taken from the Vice President's ruling, any subsequent questions of order would be decided without debate and "any appeal may be laid on the table without prejudice to the pending proposition, and thereupon shall be held as affirming the decision of the Presiding Officer". Rule XX, par. 1.

If the motion to table the point of order against the motion to vote on the rules without further debate (or with limited debate) prevailed, the Vice President would then proceed as the motion, which the Senate had decided was not improper, directed him to proceed. The Senate would have decided the constitutional question and the Vice President would not have had to give an opinion upon it, nor would he have had to make any ruling not grounded in Senate precedents.

[From hearings, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, 82d Cong., 1951]

WRITTEN STATEMENT FROM THE LIBERAL PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE RESPECTING ITS POSITION ON PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE SENATE CLOTURE RULE

The 1951 national legislative program of the Liberal Party is founded upon the conviction that our country is in a total emergency and that we are confronted with a struggle for survival and for the preservation of our democratic way of life. It is the further profound belief of the Liberal Party that it would be the height of folly and danger to regard the communist aggression in Korea as a self-contained phenomenon. On the contrary, we view the Communist adventure in Korea as a symptom of and testimony to the entire Soviet program of expansionism toward world domination. It is upon the basis of these convictions that we have urged upon our government a program of total preparedness. To us this means a mobilization of our spiritual as well as our material resources.

Very properly, we are endeavoring to secure allies in our ideological battle between the democracy in which we believe and the totalitarian philosophy of communism. This means we must practice democracy to the fullest possible extent or our preachments will be to no avail. It behooves us therefore, to strengthen our democratic structure by shoring up such weak spots as still exist. One such weakness is evident in Senate cloture rules to date which through the years have proved unsuccessful in breaking filibusters thereby preventing Senate action on the

merits of various legislative proposals. We cannot hope to convince the rest of the world of the greatness of our democratic forms in the face of a situation in which the world sees the Senate of the United States unable to function on important occasions because of filibustering tactics.

The Liberal Party would jealously guard the right of a minority of the Senate to adequate time within which to present its side of every issue and toward this end sufficient safeguards must be a part of any Senate rule to limit debate. Adequate debate, however, does not mean interminable debates. The former is necessary to preserve our democratic institutions. The latter not only reflects unfavorably upon the prestige of the Senate and its members, but causes irreparable moral, spiritual and economic harm to our country.

We have consistently called for a majority cloture rule applicable to procedural and legislative measures alike. Among the four resolutions under consideration, we support Senate Resolution No. 105 which, if adopted, would serve to break filibusters, while at the same time providing for full and adequate time for debate. Limiting debate by a majority of those Senators present and voting 14 days after a petition for cloture has been filed by 16 Senators, and thereafter allowing an additional 96 hours of debate on the basis of 1 hour of relevant debate for each Senator, appears to us to be fair and equitable to both the minority and majority points of view on any given issue.

Respectfully yours,

MARK LEWIS,

Chairman, National Legislative Committee, Liberal Party.

BEN DAVIDSON,

Executive Director, Liberal Party.

SUPPLEMENTAL WRITTEN STATEMENT SETTING FORTH TWO PROPOSALS FOR BREAKING FILIBUSTERS BY A SIMPLE MAJORITY VOTE

(Presented by Walter P. Reuther, president and director of the fair practices and anti-discrimination department, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO))

During my testimony before this committee October 3, 1951, in the course of which I had presented a statement and brief supporting our contention that Senate rule XXII violates the Constitution of the United States by—

(1) Substituting minority rule for the majority rule intended by the Constitution, and

(2) Attempting to bind the present Senate and future Senates with the dead hand of past Senates and to deprive them of their constitutional rulemaking power,

it was asked as to how the Senate could rid itself of the guaranty of unlimited debate provided in rule XXII for all discussions of motions to take up proposed changes in this or any other Senate rule.

In compliance with the chairman's request made then for a supplemental statement regarding the two proposals offered by me as to methods whereby the Senate by simple majority vote can get itself out of the dead end of filibuster alley, we present the following matter for inclusion in the record of the hearings.

On October 2, while Senator Humphrey was testifying in support of limiting debate by simple majority vote, as provided in the Morse-Humphrey and Lehman resolutions, Senator Benton observed that "the logic is on your side; the guns are on the other side."

We do not believe the filibusterers have the only guns. We believe it possible to disarm them. This can be done whenever the majority of the Senate and the President of the Senate make up their minds to do so.

We believe that the surest and most powerful weapon, the Constitution of the United States, is on the side of those who want ac-

tion by majority vote, not talk by a minority of Senators that vetoes necessary action and dictates unsatisfactory and dangerous compromises.

Majority rule can be made an operating fact in the United States Senate whenever a majority of the Senate, assisted by the President of the Senate, decide they want majority vote.

In the following restatement of the proposals made by me October 3, 1951, which were based on the contention in our brief that the present rule XXII contains the two fatal constitutional defects described above, we have met some of the questions raised in the October 3 discussion and, recognizing one obstacle pointed out by Senator Monroney, we are suggesting a way to avoid it.

Proposal No. 1.—When the new Senate of the Eighty-third Congress convenes January 3, 1953, the following procedure can be adopted:

(1) After the credentials have been submitted and accepted, a Senator can rise and move the adoption of the Rules of the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress which he will then submit to the body. These rules may include a new rule XXII providing for limitation of debate by majority vote. He may state, in making his submission, that there are no existing rules of the Senate because the rules of one Senate cannot bind a succeeding Senate. Also, he may point out that, until adoption of rules, there is no committee to which his motion can be referred.

(2) It can be expected that a point of order will be made that the motion is out of order since, it will be contended, there are existing rules which can only be amended as provided through the present rules.

(3) The President of the Senate must rule on this point of order.

(4) His ruling, if he rejects the point of order,¹ is subject to an appeal. Under general parliamentary rules, which would be in effect during the period prior to the adoption of specific rules, the appeal can be debated, although most parliamentary authorities limit the debate to one speech by each person.

Should the minority group attempt to turn the debate on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair into a filibuster, the debate can be cut off either by a motion to lay on the table or by moving the previous question. A majority vote in favor of the motion to table would operate to affirm the Chair's ruling. A majority vote in favor of the call for the previous question would permit an immediate vote on the appeal.

(5) If the ruling of the Chair is sustained by a majority vote, the Senate will be able to adopt rules for the Senate of the Eighty-third Congress by regular parliamentary procedure of majority vote. If a filibuster should be attempted at this point, it can again be dealt with by the parliamentary device of moving the previous question outlined in step 4, above. It is significant that the Speaker of the House, at the time of an attempt to prevent the adoption of rules by repeated dilatory motions, ruled that he would not refuse to recognize Members attempting these delaying tactics as they were interfering with the constitutional right of the House to determine its rules (Cannon, Precedents, vol. 5, secs. 5706, 5707).

¹ If the Vice President should support the point of order, thereby declaring rule XXII adopted by the 81st Senate binding upon the 83rd Senate, there would be the possibility of unlimited debate on the appeal, as Senator Monroney pointed out in the hearings October 3. Such a ruling, together with a filibuster, could prevent the majority from expressing its will. For practical purposes, the 83rd Senate would be deprived of the rule-making power assigned to it by art. I, sec. 5 of the Constitution. (See pp. 19-20 of our brief.)

Proposal No. 2.—This committee has had eloquent warnings that it cannot wait until 1953 to solve vital problems before the Nation.

The world is looking to us for evidence of our sincerity on the issue of human freedom and equality.

As set forth in our statement, our manpower needs in defense mobilization and production and equal justice require the establishment and enforcement, without further delay, of fair employment practices.

Action should be taken now. A way to do so is as follows:

(1) The Senate Rules Committee should report out a new rule XXII providing for majority cloture. In so doing, it would state that the present rule XXII is unconstitutional; therefore, it would report, not an amendment to that rule, but a new rule.

(2) A motion is made to take up the proposed majority cloture rule.

(3) A point of order that there is an existing rule can be expected.

(4) The President of the Senate must rule on this point of order.

(5) His ruling, if he rejects the point of order² is subject to an appeal. That appeal would be governed by Senate rule XX, and, under that rule, any abuse of debate could be ended by a motion to lay the appeal on the table. This motion, if carried, would be an affirmation of the Chair's ruling.

(6) The motion to take up the consideration of the cloture rule now being in order, a filibuster will, in all probability, commence against the motion to take up the rule.

(7) There being no rule on cloture, normal parliamentary practices will prevail in determining what the cloture rule should be. The new cloture rule could be adopted by a majority vote and the regular parliamentary devices of a motion to close debate or motion for the previous question would be available to cut off any attempt to filibuster the adoption of the new rule.

These two proposals are made on these basic assumptions:

(1) That a majority of the Senate and its President want an effective cloture rule, want cloture to be determined by majority vote, want the Senate to be able to come to a vote on the crucial issues facing it today; and

(2) That the American people want the Senate to be an acting, not talking legislative body and that in 1953, if not now, there will be a majority of the Senate ready to take necessary steps such as those we have outlined for ending rule by a Senate minority and for procuring an effective cloture rule that will make possible the establishment and practice of majority rule in the United States Senate.

We recommend and urge a trial of proposal No. 2 in the present Senate, accompanied by full delineation of the grave constitutional crisis that exists and the important substantive issues, such as civil rights legislation, that are at stake.

Should the attempt succeed, the Senate by majority vote will have cured itself of its own infirmity which the Eighty-first Senate unconstitutionally sought to impose upon all future Senates to the end of time.

Should the attempt fail, the American people will have a clear understanding of the great fundamental issues at stake; they will have a roll call for use in the 1952 political campaign.

In any event, whether the attempt succeeds, fails, or is not made in the present Senate, we recognize and welcome the fact that majority rule in the Senate of the United States is now and will be the No. 1 civil rights issue in the 1952 campaign and elections.

This is as it should be. For both major political parties, to continue to give lip serv-

² See footnote 1.

ice to civil rights legislation, including FEPC, antilynch, anti-poll-tax, and other long overdue measures while acquiescing in continued strangulation of such legislation by veto of a minority under the unconstitutional rule XXII would be to continue a colossal hoax upon the American people; they would continue to condone costly and tragic economic and political injustice for Negroes and members of other minority groups whose sons fight and die to defend freedoms and rights they do not now have in full and equal measure.

Majority rule must be established in the United States Senate. A rule that will make it possible must be substituted for the present antidemocratic, unconstitutional rule XXII adopted by the Eighty-first Senate and presumptuously intended to bind and limit all future Senates.

A Vice President and a majority of the Senate determined to use majority rule to put into practice the oft-repeated pledges of civil rights in the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic Parties can accomplish that end.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, referring, again, to page 2:

Given an opportunity to vote, the majority might decide that Rule XXII was not unconstitutional. A ruling that debate must continue until cloture be invoked under Rule XXII is more nearly characterized as a decision by the Chair on the constitutional issue because it might effectively prevent the Senate from deciding the issue. Ideally, however, the parliamentary situation should develop so that the Vice President need give no ruling, nor even an opinion, on the constitutional issue. Such a development seems possible, though, to be sure, a new trail would be blazed. It is a trail, however, marked by some favorable precedents.

The author concludes in the final paragraph:

If the motion to table the point of order against the motion to vote on the rules without further debate (or with limited debate) prevailed, the Vice President would then proceed as the motion, which the Senate had decided was not improper, directed him to proceed. The Senate would have decided the constitutional question and the Vice President would not have had to give an opinion upon it, nor would he have had to make any ruling not grounded in Senate precedents.

I am pleased, that the Vice President did not see fit to duck the issue, as was suggested by those who were trying to change in a unique fashion the rules of the Senate and the precedents of the Senate itself as a continuing body.

But, rather, on January 18, on page 925 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there appears a statement made by me at the time that the Chair had made a ruling on the point of order by the distinguished Senator from Georgia as to a division of the question, that the Chair ruled in accordance with rule XVIII and that subsequently, during the morning, the Chair ruled in confirming rule XX of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

When I asked what the position of the Chair was as to whether this body was presently operating under the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Vice President ruled as follows:

The answer to the Senator's question is that the rules of the Senate shall continue from one Congress to the next unless changed as provided in these rules.

Obviously, this was a ruling in support of rule XXXII as to the Senate

being a continuing body; and, having once ruled that way, it must be agreed that the various gaps in the rulings of Vice President Nixon and other Presiding Officers, as referred to in the memorandum of Mr. Doyle, have now been filled. The Presiding Officer, at the beginning of a session, when the subject was raised, and while a point of order as to the constitutionality of a particular section was raised, answered that rule XXXII held and controlled; that is, that the Senate is a continuing body and that the rules could be changed only in accordance with the provisions of the rules.

It is certainly obvious that a Senator cannot merely amend a single rule by saying, "I raise a constitutional question, Mr. President, as to the constitutionality of rule I"—or rule XV, or rule XXII.

Obviously, the Standing Rules of the Senate were enacted in accordance with section I, article 5, of the U.S. Constitution; and if any one of the rules is constitutional, then all the rules are constitutional; and the way to amend or change those rules at the beginning of a session is in accordance with those rules.

I am proud that the Presiding Officer saw fit to rule on January 18 as he did and filled in the gap in the understanding of the proponents that the rules could be changed merely by raising a constitutional question. It has also been so held by the Senate, by a substantial vote of 61 to 37, raised on the question as to whether or not a majority of this body believes, constitutionally or not, that a single change can be made in the rules only by a temporary majority. It found that is not constitutional, and accordingly, now we are at the point of the proposed rule change to change the rule from a requirement of two-thirds to a three-fifths majority of Senators present and voting.

The most respected Senator from Georgia, RICHARD RUSSELL, at the beginning of this debate emphasized that all the arguments employed over the years for advocating the change of rule XXII have now been answered. The proponents have no civil rights bill to point to—that the rights of the individual have been lost in a parliamentary maze. And the Senator has also pointed out with equal eloquence the fact that on the one hand no legislation can be pointed to as having been blocked by rule XXII. On the other hand, in his 30 years' experience, precipitous action on the part of our Government has been avoided by the safeguard of rule XXII of this body.

With the on-rush of speed in communications in everyday life, I hope in my remarks to emphasize rule XXII as a safeguard to precipitous action. I would emphasize the rules as a safeguard to minority rights and freedom of speech. And I would emphasize the history of this Senate as a continuing body, and its value as a continuing body.

I was for freedom of speech, the right to talk and—on behalf of new Members—the right to listen.

I had pledged, in becoming a Member of the Senate, as all new Members are told, to listen and to get the feeling of things.

We respect the experience of our senior colleagues, and it is very interesting that in the early days I would be asked to talk in an effort to protect that right to listen, because here in the Senate we are separated by seniority and by party. Unless this right of free speech is protected, how else can a new Member on my side of the aisle know the feelings of the people in Kentucky, California, Delaware, or Kansas?

If in the beginning days we had a temporary majority controlling, debate would easily have been cut off before these Senators could have heard these speeches and represented their States; and the primary duty of a U.S. Senator to reflect the feeling of his State and vote for the good of the entire country would have been somewhat stultified because there were many things that, in the normal course of doing business in this wonderful body, a newcomer or one separated by party could not have heard from other sections of this Nation.

For if by simple majority rule the proponents prevail today, then a temporary majority can create havoc and cut off practically half of the Senate from being heard at any time. The right of that minority to represent their States would be eliminated. Their views would not be heard. And the paramount duty of acting for the good of the country could never be done. A temporary majority, restless of "wasting time," could call for a vote and a vote there would be, and States not represented in the combine would never be heard. I would like to listen to these States.

But even the realization that whatever I say has been said better does not diminish the need I feel for defending what I genuinely believe to be a basic premise upon which this U.S. Senate and, indeed, this Nation as a whole is predicated—majority leadership assured, but never at the expense of minority rights.

The remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from my sister State on last Thursday expressed brilliantly the position I believe to be the only constitutionally sound one.

Senator RUSSELL said:

It has been demonstrated that they (the majority) can pass their bills under the present rules. Not only that, but a determined majority in the Senate has passed every bill they desired to pass when in the hearts and minds of the majority of the Senators they wanted the bill, since I became a Member of this body.

Why, then? Why, when the proof of the possible is so evident for anyone to see? Why, when the weight of evidence contradicts so forcefully the contentions of the opponents to minority guarantees must we sit now and genuinely fear for the preservation of so sacred a principle?

One of the proponents of changing rule XXII has said on the floor of the Senate within the past week that the Constitution of the United States provides for majority rule—not by a majority of the whole body—but by a majority of those present and voting.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is wrong. I submit that this interpretation of the intent of the sacred document

that has guided all the actions of all Senators since the inception of this great body cannot be justified.

As I read the Constitution, Mr. President, it says in the very first amendment:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances * * * or abridging the freedom of speech.

That phrase demands special attention because no phrase in all of our history has more universally been discussed, defended, rediscussed, and redefended.

I submit, Mr. President, that just as politics is our forte, so words and semantics are the game of the staff that comprises the G. & C. Merriam Co., which writes what must surely be the official dictionary of the Federal Government, and indeed the entire Nation—Webster's Unabridged.

That book, Mr. President, defines "abridge" as "(1) (a) to deprive; (1) (b) to diminish (as a right) by reducing; (2) to shorten in duration. To shorten or cut down in extent."

I believe, then, that the Constitution itself specifically prohibits total rule by a simple majority and the deprivation of anyone's right to full expression, and I believe those who fought the first battle—the framing of an acceptable document to weld a jealous, loosely knit set of far-flung colonies together—recognized this. There is ample evidence that this is so.

They provided in many instances for votes requiring a majority of two-thirds.

No person shall be convicted on impeachment without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present. That can be found in article I, section 3.

Each House, with the concurrence of two-thirds, may expel a Member. That, too, is in article I, section 5.

In section 7 of this same article, it is provided that a bill returned by the President with his objections may be re-passed by each House by a vote of two-thirds.

The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. The Constitution provides for this in article II, section 2.

The Constitution further provides that Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments to this document on the application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several States.

The 12th amendment to the Constitution provides that when the choice of a President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, a quorum shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the various States of the Union. This same amendment further provides that a quorum of the Senate when choosing a Vice President shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators.

So, Mr. President, I say again, to argue that the Constitution of these United States provides for rule by a simple majority is not found within the provisions of the Constitution itself.

There are too many instances where much more than a simple majority was specifically required for constitutional acceptance for this not to be so. If the framers of the Constitution—men who spent much more time than we in debating the merits and demerits of each word, every phrase and every idea—had intended that a simple majority should rule, they would have said so.

What, then are the arguments of those who would silence the sound of the few, in order to more quickly magnify the voice of the many?

The Constitution says "no" to their charade.

The basic choice of right from wrong cries "no" to their demands.

The precedents set by those who have traveled the long road we now embark upon refute the claims of the impatient ones among us who feel that their beliefs must prevail now, that their will must be worked without interference from those of a different will.

Mr. President, I, as did all of those who now sit in this august body, worked hard to get here. I do not maintain that my will shall be done, but I do maintain that my thoughts, my beliefs, my ideas, and my position on the important issues we will confront have just as much right to full expression as those of any Member of this Senate.

I have traveled my State well over these past 12 months. I have talked with my people. They have talked genuinely to me about the principles they feel must be defended by us in the Senate; and I intend to see that their confidence in me, their trust in my ability to guarantee expression of those principles, is justified.

Some years ago before I presided in the senate of the State of South Carolina, the ruling had been made—and as presiding officer I was able to sustain the precedent—that the senate of the State of South Carolina was a continuing body, as the Senate of the United States is a continuing body. It cannot be said that in the senate of the State of South Carolina we have a substantial liberal bloc. Whether this situation is good or bad is another question. Other bodies of the several colonies, and later States, of this great Union, following the precedents made in the Senate of the United States, have ruled that their State senates are continuing bodies, without reference to a conservative or liberal wing, thought, or influence.

A great but obscure writer once said that the strength of this great Nation lies not in the views of her manageable majority but in the ideas of her unmanageable minority.

Somewhere, Mr. President, there must be a solid line of defense against total rule by a simple majority.

There must be a safeguard somewhere to assure that the strength of an emotional majority can be tempered with the reflections of a differing minority.

It makes no difference, Mr. President, what the issue is or who constitutes the minority. That consideration is irrelevant to this discussion.

I would defend just as vigorously the right of minorities who differ with me to

engage in extended debate as I would the rights of those who agree with me.

I cannot help recalling the conflicts that raged in this Chamber on the one-man, one-vote principle; on section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; on the so-called prayer amendment. All of these, Mr. President, are issues I personally would have supported and would have wanted to vote upon. And they are issues upon which I would have diligently tried, after an acceptable period of time, to generate sufficient support to invoke cloture and terminate debate.

But never, never, Mr. President, would I have supported an attempt to reduce the number of Senators necessary to terminate that debate through the invocation of cloture.

I do not believe that the Senate could devise a rule which better insures both full and free debate and the possibility of bringing to a vote legislation supported by a genuine consensus of the American people than does rule XXII.

The framers of the Constitution regarded the power to make laws as a power to be exercised only with the greatest deliberation. They understood that government ought to govern by the consent of the people, rather than by force. They understand that laws, to be truly effective, must take effect in the minds of the people through their recognition of what is just. They understood that laws must, therefore, express a consensus—a general agreement about what is just and right—among people everywhere in our great country. They wished to preclude the danger to order and tranquility of radical, sweeping, arbitrary legislation unsupported by a matured consensus among the people and rammed through the legislative branch without the adequate consideration which would have revealed that people everywhere in the country were not with it. For the framers knew that laws which do not command the consent of people through their recognition of what is just must be given effect, if at all, by force or threat of force.

When we say that democracy presupposes a great faith in the people, we mean that democracy is founded on the belief that people are truly capable of a moral and political consensus, an agreement about what is just and right. If this faith in the popular conscience is without foundation, then democracy—government by the people—is without foundation.

Laws have been passed from time to time having great bearing upon the lives of the people which nevertheless have not commanded the consent of people everywhere and which have been effected by force or threat of force. At such a time the cry is raised that the law ought to be obeyed because it is the law. I agree wholeheartedly that law should be obeyed because it is law. I suggest, nevertheless, that it is a bad sign for democracy, for government by the consent of the governed, when it is necessary to enjoin respect for law as law because the purpose of the law does not elicit the moral recognition of the people. In proportion as laws can be executed only by means of calling for obedience to law for no better reason than that it is the

law, we can be sure that a general, popular consensus is lacking and that the threat of force is imminent.

Careful, thorough, and prolonged debate in the Senate provides the best insurance that laws, which must be obeyed, correspond with the prevailing judgment of people in all parts of the country about what men owe to other men.

Those who urge modification of rule XXII may say that the majority of the people give their mandate at every election for certain policies and programs and that rule XXII permits a minority of Senators to obstruct the popular will expressed at the polls.

To this dangerous contention I should like to say that the parliamentary process in Congress is not merely a procedure to be used by the majority to register its will on the assumption that its will has a popular mandate and should not therefore encounter effective opposition within the legislative chamber. American democracy is representative in essence. Specific, legislative issues are not, and cannot, be decided directly by the voters in voting for the candidates of their choice. Discussion of issues in political campaigns is not meant to replace full debate and consideration of such issues in Congress. It is quite alien to our political tradition that a majority of lawmakers should feel justified in denying to the minority means of effective opposition on the theory that the majority is carrying out the will of the people expressed at election time. This theory is operative in other countries, and has made it possible for a parliamentary majority to cut off almost all debate on its legislative program and to make profound changes in its country's legal order overnight.

I hope that we shall never permit this possibility to develop in America. We shall not so long as we preserve inviolate the right to full and free debate in the Senate. Such debate allows for the explicit confrontation of opposing claims represented by different Members. Through such confrontation of opposing claims, through extended and thorough arguments for and against such claims, Members may come to recognize rights which they had not sufficiently considered before. And when argument on both or all sides of an issue elicits recognition of differing claims, adjustment by law of opposing interests may be achieved and a more comprehensive level of justice realized.

This is the business of the Senate. And in this connection, I should like to mention that one right of every Senator which must be defended is the right to listen, the right to hear both or all sides of an issue argued with the maximum of thought and the minimum of haste. The right to listen is particularly indispensable to me as a new Member. I suspect that other Senators beginning their first terms may feel as I do. Those of us who are new to the Senate must feel the tremendous responsibility which our constituents have given us—the responsibility to represent their rights in the legislative process. I know, for my own part, that I have a great deal to learn before I can be an effective participant

in the legislative process. To modify the rules of debate in the Senate would deny to those of us who are new the right to listen and the right to learn.

Mr. President, the primary argument made by those who wish to make it easier to close off debate in the Senate is that no minority should be able to hinder the majority in carrying through its legislative will.

Against this contention, I should like to point out that the framers of the Constitution did not mean to establish that kind of government which would best facilitate the unobstructed rule of a national majority or of a parliamentary majority. Indeed, they deliberately placed obstacles in the way of majority despotism. They intended, rather, to establish a government designed to give security to the rights of people. And they knew that the greater number does not make right because it is the majority. Law is meant to secure to every man what belongs to him, and no majority on earth has the right to take from him what is his own.

As I see it, Mr. President, legislators on every level of government, Federal, State, and local—represent not merely numbers of nameless and homogeneous people. Legislators are meant to represent the rights and legitimate interests of their constituents. Rights ought to be represented in the legislative process and secured by law because they are rights and not merely because of the numbers of people whose rights and interests they are.

The present requirement for cloture under rule XXII insures that a minority of Senators shall not be denied the right to represent the legitimate interests of their constituents in opposition to a numerical majority determined to effect its will in disregard of those interests. Surely, any Member who hesitates to assert that the majority makes right must hesitate likewise to facilitate cloture by modifying rule XXII.

Before any change in the present cloture rule is made, I suggest that Members consider also that they, as Senators, represent the people in a somewhat different way than do Members of the House of Representatives. Seats in the House are apportioned among the States on the basis of population, and the House may be said therefore to represent the American people as such, on a national basis. The Senate also represents the people, but it represents the people of the States, and the people of each one of the States have the same number of Senators to represent them as the people in every other one of the States. The Senate is not only a national, but also a Federal, body. It is representative at once of the people and of the States as States.

Every Member knows that communities of interest arise within geographical areas such as counties, cities, and States. It seems to me, then, that Senators have the duty to represent the communities of interest in their States. There are genuine, important, and very different interests throughout our country. Freedom of debate in the Senate should insure that each of these interests receives due consideration in the business

of making national laws affecting those having such interests. No national majority should have power to override minority rights. The freedom of Senators to speak on behalf of the rights and interests which concern the people of their States should make possible the salutary defense of minority rights against majoritarian despotism.

I said a moment ago that I am concerned that the Senate preserve for its Members the right to listen and the right to learn. I said that these rights are particularly important to new Members with less experience. But the very fact that it is the business of Congress to formulate legislation for the entire country, and the fact that Members' experience and knowledge are primarily of the interests of the people in their States, mean that the right to listen and the right to learn are indispensable for every Member. Is there any Senator possessed of such detailed and comprehensive knowledge of every section of our country that without further education of a kind—the kind of education to be derived from exhaustive debate—he can give full consideration to interests shared by people in States of the East and West, North and South? Is there any Senator who would presume to propose laws binding on the people of a State far distant from his own without giving careful and patient attention to Senators from that State who have the most direct and intimate knowledge of the problems and needs and achievements of the people whom they represent?

Or should any group of Senators, because they are in the majority or because the combined numbers of people they represent are a majority of the Nation feel justified on the basis of numbers in denying to other Senators freedom to make known to the majority the points of view and the communities of interest shared by people in their own States?

The framers of the Constitution wisely undertook to counterbalance and limit every kind of power which the Constitution grants. Legislative authority is limited by enumeration of the powers of Congress and is counterbalanced by the executive and judicial branches. These latter branches are likewise limited and balanced.

But there remains another kind of power which must also be limited—the power of the majority. Limitation of majority power is more urgent today than ever before, perhaps, because there appears to be an increasing number of people today who take the term "liberalism" to mean the right to free use of political power.

It seems to be more and more an accepted proposition, for example, that the President, because he is elected, in reality, by a national majority, should have his own legislative program carried through Congress with a minimum of opposition. Those who may oppose one or another part of the President's program render themselves open to the charge of defying the Nation's will.

At the same time, the indispensable regulation and limitation of debate in the House facilitate control over the course of business by the majority leadership so that the minority can offer

less effective opposition than can a minority in the Senate. In this connection, I should like to quote a statement which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made several years ago and which appeared in the Congressional Digest of February 1953. He said:

If the majority had the power, such as you have in your House of Representatives, to come in with a rule, that even prevents an amendment to a bill, that the debate shall be very limited on a bill, and permit a bare majority to jam through such a proposal, not only would the Senate lose its value as a bulwark of individual liberty in this country, but it would be subordinated completely to the will of the party in power.

The many are not always right. Just as they are not always wrong. All I ask is a safeguard to insure that when they are wrong and the few are right that the ideas of the few have time to be heard, to be planted and to grow.

As James Roscoe Day said:

The individual champion of a cause is more likely to have thought seriously and safely that the blind followers of partisan leaders. The world's history is strewn thick with such incidents. Nearly all of the great issues have been lamentably in the minority and the men who have stood in the front of them have had to bear abuse.

The great consideration is not the voices of today but the voices of the tomorrows into which will be streaming the light of accomplished facts.

It is safe to assume that the voice of progress will be vindicated by the ages. To protest small concepts, to champion great proportions is sure prophecy. It is out in that direction that we find the purpose and plans of God. It is out in that direction that we follow the orbit of large and noble human events.

The right to be heard is inherent in man and fundamental in his free land. The right to be followed must depend upon what reason and sound arguments he makes known.

If no age, neither his own nor any succeeding one, hears him, he has spoken in vain. If he utters truth and wisdom, somewhere at some time it will accomplish that whereunto it is sent. It will not return void. If it proves to be a mistake, nevertheless he who speaks his convictions has the ennobling satisfaction of having obeyed the command of duty as he saw it.

It has been argued, Mr. President, that our governmental system and its two-thirds rule are wrong because no other corresponding body in any other country adheres to this principle.

That argument is invalid.

Given the position of the United States in the world today, it would be my position that perhaps other nations should be copying what we do rather than our looking to them for precedents and procedures.

When all is said and done, Mr. President, when the heady haze of oratory clears away, we find ourselves in debating this issue, face to face with one, simple basic question. Will we continue to guarantee that a group of men in the U.S. Senate—whomever they may be and whatever the issue—shall have the right to defend their position within reasonable limits to the best of their ability.

As one who has watched this body with great respect and admiration from afar for many years, and who now is fortunate enough to join in its councils, I prayerfully hope so.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. BYRD of West Virginia. 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. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Carolina for the very fine and able speech he is making on this subject.

The Senator from Louisiana hopes before this debate is concluded that he will have an occasion to address himself to this subject also.

When I first came to the Senate, there was a fight over a change in the rules, in 1949. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration at that time, and to stand for the position for which the Senator from South Carolina is contending at this time.

It certainly entailed a great deal of hard work and diligence on the part of the Senator from South Carolina to study this matter to the extent he has done in order to make his views available to the Senate.

I commend the Senator for his very diligent efforts to prepare himself and for the very fine speech he has made on this occasion.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his remarks.

THE PROPOSED MERGER OF AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO. AND INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this country has had an opportunity to have the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] with respect to the proposed merger of the American Broadcasting Co. and International Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Many times I have been critical of the Justice Department for not actively and more vigorously pursuing the antitrust laws of this Nation. In this instance, however, I believe the Justice Department is in error. As a matter of conscience and consistency, I feel I should make my position clear with regard to this matter.

I served as chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business for so many years that I have almost forgotten when it started. Last year I resigned that seat in order that one of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], might make a contribution more fully in that field.

Over many years it has been my feelings that the purpose of the antitrust laws should be to stimulate vigorous competition rather than to stifle it in any respect.

The action of the Federal Communications Commission, on which that Commission acted properly, in my opinion,

would make it possible for a third network, ABC, which up until now has had difficulty in competing with the other two giants, National Broadcasting Co. and Columbia Broadcasting System, to merge with a large company, acquiring able management, a better corporate structure, and putting the corporation in a position where it could more effectively compete with National Broadcasting Co., which, as we all know, is owned by Radio Corp. of America.

It would seem to me that if this merger were permitted to go into effect, it would mean the capital structure of that third network would be parallel to that of the other two networks.

Most people share the belief that at this time American Broadcasting Co. is not in any position to give very effective competition to CBS, much less NBC.

Speaking only as one Senator, and I mean to cast no reflection, on a Sunday night, for example, one may turn the TV dial to that beautiful color of NBC and just leave it there. Once in a while the Columbia Broadcasting Co. may come through with a program such as "The Honeymooners," with "The Jackie Gleason Show," for which they undoubtedly pay a huge sum of money, and put it in a position to have some people turn their dial away from channel 4. I regret to say that very seldom on prime time are there many people who turn to channel 7, which is the ABC outlet.

What American Broadcasting Co. and the International Telephone & Telegraph seek to do is to join and present such strength that they can have parallel organizations to the other two major national broadcasting companies.

In my judgment, if the proposed merger were permitted to go into effect, the competition would be more vigorous, and as a result of the more vigorous competition the public would get better performances.

Many Senators are aware of what has happened with regard to the televising of sports. There has been tremendous bidding to televise great sports programs. Because there has been so much available in the way of showing sports over television for the public to view, there has been outstanding showing of sports. This has been of tremendous help to colleges, professional football, and professional baseball, so much so that the income from television is the most important source of income to professional football and a major item of income to professional baseball teams.

In my view, as one who has spent a great many years studying antitrust problems, it would be in the public interest to have a third network, compete fully a network which does not have complete nationwide coverage now. Approval of the merger would permit this company to more effectively compete with the two major networks.

In saying that, so far as the Senator from Louisiana is concerned, I would have no objection if the Federal Communications Commission wanted to permit a fourth or fifth or sixth network to be able to engage in such competition as can be generated. But it seems strange that the Justice Department would have sat idly by while the National Broadcasting Co. grew as a part of Radio

Corp. of America, while the Federal Communications assigned NBC what at that time was a monopoly of color television rights, and waited a long time before it began to approve others in that field and to open color television to other networks; permitted all the strength of that network to grow, and now is not permitted to let a third network merge with a company so that it can have a parallel organization so that it can compete with the two broadcasting giants.

We all saw when I.T. & T., bought the Avis car rental concern, and how it became more competitive with the Hertz car rental concern. Hertz is still No. 1, but as a result of that merger, Avis has become a more effective No. 2 car rental service, right behind the Hertz Car Rental Service. The Avis people have been able to improve their service, and they have been able to offer much more vigorous competition to Hertz, all in the public interest, by stimulating more competition rather than less.

It seems to me to be well that we proceed in that direction, and I must say, having reviewed the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], that I do agree with him about this matter. I think it is extremely unfortunate that the Department of Justice would have done as it did; and when I refer to Justice, I am, in my judgment, talking about only one man—Mr. Turner, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division.

If those people intended to make a big antitrust case against this proposed merger, they certainly should have done it a long time ago, prior to the time that the merger was announced, and without having the \$69 million unfavorable impact upon the stock of International Telephone & Telegraph and ABC. So I feel it is sad and unfortunate that Mr. Turner would come into this operation so very late, and seek to reverse the decision, when it was clear that the board knew about it and knew his views when the Federal Communications Commission acted on the proposal.

There is a new member on the Board, Mr. Johnson, who was transferred over from Maritime. In that area, Mr. President, Mr. Johnson made himself so unpopular with the maritime industry that his removal from that position was dictated by virtue of the fact that he had made countless enemies, both for himself and the Johnson administration, from top to bottom of that industry. It would certainly seem unfortunate if Mr. Johnson should now proceed to make himself equally as unacceptable to the communications industry as he was to the maritime industry. But now it seems he is trying to equal that record on the Federal Communications Commission. I certainly hope that will not be the case, but one gains that impression.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I noted with great interest the President's message with respect to the

social security program and the public welfare program. I have not had a chance to do it justice, although I have studied it with a more or less cursory observation.

In general, it is my judgment that the President's recommendations are in the public interest, and that they make good sense, provided we can afford the money that would be required by this proposed increase in social security benefits, and with regard to the improvements of our public welfare program. It is extremely appropriate that we should extend medicare benefits to disabled persons, as is proposed in the message, and the increase in benefits, I am told, will remove 1.5 million people from the poverty brackets.

In addition to that, it would be of great benefit to an additional 4 million retired citizens, as well as a considerable number of widows who would receive this benefit.

There is a question whether we can afford the tax increase which is a necessary part of that. Assuming the House acts on this bill sometime within the next few months, as I am sure it will, we will certainly study it and see if it is necessary to increase taxes, particularly by the rate recommended by the President. Perhaps it might be better to simply extend the tax up to a higher bracket, rather than increase the rate to the extent recommended here.

But on the whole, Mr. President, I feel, and I think most Senators feel, that this is a better way to attack poverty than some of the other programs we have tried in this country—to provide adequate social security and retirement benefits so that persons who have worked for a lifetime and have earned retirement will not have to apply to be part of the welfare burden of their States, but that their income from social security sources will be adequate to provide for the needs of such persons.

Undoubtedly, as we go along with the bill, there will be suggestions both to reduce the tax recommended by the President and also to provide for additional benefits. The Senate has consistently voted to increase benefits on social security in the past, when we have had a social security bill before us. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has, for a number of years, been trying to do something about the retirement age for men, feeling that there are a considerable number of men beyond age 60, but not having attained the age of 65, who, for one reason or other, feel it necessary to retire, even though they are not disabled. In many instances, they have lost a job and simply cannot find other employment, and retirement is pushed upon them against their will.

The Senator from West Virginia will undoubtedly offer his amendment again, if he has not already done so. Seeing him here, I hasten to assure him that the committee will certainly consider his proposal. The Senators know we have accepted that amendment in earlier years in other bills, and when we have a social security bill before us, I certainly will urge the committee to consider the matter.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have offered such an amendment, and I am very pleased to have the assurance of the Senator from Louisiana today that that amendment will be carefully and favorably considered. I feel, as does he, that there are many individuals who, having reached the age of 60 years and being disabled to a point, are unable to find employment, and yet they are not disabled to the extent that they can qualify for disability benefits under the social security program.

So this amendment would permit them to retire at age 60 and accept an actuarially reduced benefit, and thus have an income, and not be forced to rely upon some welfare program in order to make ends meet until they reach the age of 62 or 65.

I thank the Senator for his consideration, and for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I had rather anticipated that such a recommendation would be in the President's message, because it does contain merit. It has had the confidence of the Senate expressed in it a number of times, and it was somewhat surprising to me it was not included in the President's suggestions.

But, as the Senator so well knows, the President has done what he thinks he ought to do. He has discharged his duty as the good Lord gives him the light to see it, and we now have our duty. The President proposes in this case, and it will be up to us to dispose of it.

We will undoubtedly pass a social security bill. We will undoubtedly increase benefits. We will increase them as much as we think we can afford to increase social security benefits, the tax part of it being a major item in the minds of a great number of us.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that we can continue to follow the sound procedure which we have followed in years gone by, in dealing with social security bills. We in the Senate have never voted a social security increase in benefits without providing whatever tax may be necessary to finance it. It is urged by some that some benefits could be increased without increasing the social security tax. We will, of course, consider their views when that measure is before us.

I suspect, however, that the Senate will be disposed to go much farther than those who hold such views. We have done so in earlier years, and the probabilities are that the Senate will not recommend something that costs a great deal less than the President has suggested.

In doing so, I hope very much that we shall be able to avoid any greater tax increase than is absolutely necessary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered, I

move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 19), 1967:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and sections 8373 and 8376 title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John S. Bagby, FV406530, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Robert F. Goldsworthy, FV398709, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. John A. Lang, Jr., FV569020, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. John S. Patton, FV1851377, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

Col. James E. Fain, Jr., FV571605, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Samuel P. Goddard, Jr., FV561102, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Ben J. Mangina, FV490249, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Robert B. Mautz, FV1820787, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Jack R. Miller, FV352874, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Leon C. Packer, FV432101, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Kenneth C. Spengler, FV385107, Air Force Reserve.
Col. Frank H. Spink, Jr., FV562106, Air Force Reserve.

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Edward G. Johnson, FG421750, Oklahoma Air National Guard.
Brig. Gen. Donald J. Strait, FG796042, New Jersey Air National Guard.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Robert E. Buechler, FG666236, Missouri Air National Guard.
Col. Doyle W. Hastie, FG722064, Oklahoma Air National Guard.
Col. Paul E. Hoover, FG2083068, Ohio Air National Guard.
Col. Victor F. Kilkowski, FG824646, Maryland Air National Guard.
Col. Joe F. Meis, FG2006856, Colorado Air National Guard.
Col. Peter R. Phillipy, FG701154, Pennsylvania Air National Guard.
Col. Oliver S. Ryerson, FG680085, Wisconsin Air National Guard.
Col. Alfred C. Schwab, Jr., FG727560, Minnesota Air National Guard.
Col. Marvel M. Taylor, Jr., FG739362, California Air National Guard.
Col. Edwin Warfield III, FG829783, Maryland Air National Guard.
Col. Rodger D. Young, FG2043130, Montana Air National Guard.
Col. Joseph D. Zink, FG825058, New Jersey Air National Guard.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be general

*Lt. Gen. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant general

*Maj. Gen. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20879, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Jay Hayes III, O20134, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Nels Redling, O31516, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederick James Clarke, O20572, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Henry Walker, O20617, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general

*Col. William Ambrose Hamrick, O38878, U.S. Army.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Douglas J. Peacher

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

John R. Blandford

William J. Weinstein

*Indicates ad-interim appointment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1967

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, 49 years ago, on January 22, 1918, a land became free, and a magnificent people rejoiced that dreams harbored for hundreds of years had been realized. That land was the beautiful Ukraine, beloved homeland of more than 40 million people. Today we observe the anniversary of a glorious day in their history.

The independence celebrated so proudly on that January day proved fleeting, for the Ukraine was soon set upon from all directions by those covetous of her abundant natural resources and strategic geographic location. Germany and Austria-Hungary were among the first to invade, installing a puppet ruler to oversee the land. After defeat in the

war, Germany and Austria-Hungary withdrew, leaving a power vacuum at once filled by France. Poland invaded in an attempt to annex Ukrainian land west of the Dnieper River. White Russians and Bolsheviks turned the lovely little land into a bloody battlefield. Finally, in November 1922, the Ukrainians witnessed the sad ending to a chapter in their heroic struggle for national independence. Only a few short years after their magnificent triumph, they were forced to bow to Russian tyranny.

Yet through all the dark years of foreign subjugation the Ukrainian people have carefully preserved their national heritage. They have never forgotten that wonderful yet fleeting moment of independence. They have never ceased to revere the words of the poet laureate of the Ukraine, Taras Shevchenko, who pled for a Ukrainian national leader to arise, who, as the American leader George Washington, would bring his people out of bondage:

When will we receive our Washington,
With a new and righteous law? And receive
him we will some day . . . !

We then may all take inspiration from the wonderful example of the Ukrainian people, who never flinch in the face of adversity, who triumph over hardship, and who have never lost their undying will to be free. On this, their independence day, we salute them and join with them in the prayer that they may soon realize their goal of freedom.

Fino Renews Fight for Lower Social Security Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing legislation to provide that full benefits under social security shall be paid to men at age 60 and to women at